OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

SEVENTH SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

7-8 GEORGE V, 1917

IN SIX VOLUMES

Vol. I—Pages . .	1-1124	Vol. IV—Pages . .	3187-4242
II " . .	1125-2138	V " . .	4243-5270
III " . .	2139-3186	VI " . .	5271-6094

VOLUME CXXVI

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF JANUARY TO THE TWENTIETH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 1917, INCLUSIVE.

OTTAWA
J. DE LABROQUERIE TACHÉ
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1918

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR ROBERT LAIRD BORDEN

P.C., G.C.M.G., K.C., LL.D.

AT THE OPENING OF THE

SEVENTH SESSION OF THE TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

1917

THE CABINET

President of the Privy Council and Secretary of State for External Affairs (Prime Minister)	Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Laird Borden, P.C., G.C.M.G., K.C., LL.D.
Minister of Trade and Commerce	Rt. Hon. Sir George Eulas Foster, P.C., K.C.M.G., B.A., D.C.L., LL.D.
Minister of Overseas Forces of Canada	Hon. Sir George Halsey Perley, K.C.M.G., B.A.
Minister of the Interior and Superintendent General of Indian Affairs	Hon. William James Roche, M.D., LL.D.
*Minister of Public Works	Hon. Robert Rogers.
Minister of Railways and Canals	Hon. Francis Cochrane.
Minister of Finance	Hon. Sir William Thomas White, K.C.M.G., B.A.
Postmaster General	Hon. Pierre Edouard Blondin.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Minister of the Naval Service	Hon. John Douglas Hazen, K.C., B.A., B.C.L.
Minister of Justice	Hon. Charles Joseph Doherty, K.C., D.C.L., LL.D.
Minister of Militia and Defence	Hon. Sir Albert Edward Kemp, K.C.M.G.
Secretary of State and Minister of Mines	Hon. Esioff Léon Patenaude, B.A.
Minister of Labour	Hon. Thomas Wilson Crothers, K.C., B.A.
Minister of Inland Revenue	Hon. Albert Sévigny, K.C., B.A.
Minister of Customs	Hon. John Dowsley Reid, M.D.
Without Portfolio	Hon. Sir James Alexander Lougheed, K.C.M.G., K.C., Senator.
Minister of Agriculture	Hon. Martin Burrell.
‡Without Portfolio (Solicitor General)	Hon. Arthur Meighen, K.C., B.A.

NOT OF THE CABINET

Parliamentary Secretary of the Department of Militia and Defence	F. B. McCurdy, Esq.
Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs	Hugh Clark, Esq.

*Resigned 15th August.
†Resigned 12th June.
‡Became Secretary of State and Minister of Mines 25th August.

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Speaker ..... Hon. EDGAR N. RHODES, B.A., LL.B.
Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees... J. H. RAINVILLE, LL.B.

Clerk of the House ..... THOS. B. FLINT, M.A., LL.B., D.C.L.
Sergeant-at-Arms ..... *Lieut.-Col. HENRY R. SMITH, C.M.G., I.S.O., A.D.C.

Editor of Debates ..... THOMAS P. OWENS.
Associate Editor of Debates ..... A. C. CAMPBELL.

Official Reporters of Debates :—
English : George Simpson, Robert C. Dunbar, C. S. Blue, F. W. S. Galbraith, Earl C. Young, H. E. Oliver.
French : J. O. Marceau, Alphonse Desjardins.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES :

Messieurs : Ames (Sir Herbert), Burnham, Descarries, Devlin, Foster (Sir George), Hanna, L. A. Lapointe, Lemieux, Marcil, Perley (Sir George), Rainville, Schaffner and Taylor.

Chairman : Jas. D. Taylor.

---

*Deceased 20th September.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

SEVENTH SESSION, TWELFTH PARLIAMENT.

1917

ACHIM, HONORÉ—Labelle.
ALGUIRE, DUNCAN ORESTES—Stormont.
AMES, SIR HERBERT BROWN, K.B.—Montreal, St. Antoine.
ARMSTRONG, J. A. MACDONALD—York, Ont., N. Riding.
ARMSTRONG, JOSEPH E.—Lambton, E. Riding.
ARTHURS, JAMES—Parry Sound.

BALL, R. J.—Grey, S. Riding.
BARNARD, GEORGE HENRY—Victoria, B.C.
BARRETTE, JOSEPH ARTHUR—Berthier.
BÉLAND, Hon. HENRI SÉVÉRIN—Beauce.
BELLEMARE, A.—Maskinongé.
BENNETT, RICHARD BEDFORD—Calgary.
BENNETT, WILLIAM H.—Simcoe, E. Riding.
BEST, JOHN A.—Dufferin.
BICKERDIKE, ROBERT—Montreal, St. Lawrence.
BLAIN, RICHARD—Peel.
BLONDIN, Hon. PIERRE EDOUARD—Champlain.
BOIVIN, GEORGE HENRY——Shefford.
BORDEN, RIGHT HON. SIR ROBERT LAIRD, P.C., G.C.M.G.—Halifax.
BOULAY, HERMÉNÉGILDE—Rimouski.
BOURASSA, J. BOUTIN—Lévis.
BOWMAN, JAMES—Huron, E. Riding.
BOYCE, ARTHUR CYRIL—Algoma West.
BOYER, GUSTAVE—Vaudreuil.
BOYS, WILLIAM ALVES—Simcoe, S. Riding.
BRABAZON, GERALD H.—Pontiac.
BRADBURY, GEORGE HENRY—Selkirk.
BRISTOL, EDMUND—Toronto Centre.
BRODER, HON. ANDREW—Dundas.
BROUILLARD, OVIDE—Drummond and Arthabaska.
BUCHANAN, WILLIAM ASHBURY—Medicine Hat.
BUREAU, JACQUES—Three Rivers and St. Maurice.
BURNHAM, JOHN H.—Peterborough, W. Riding.
BURRELL, HON. MARTIN—Yale-Cariboo.

CARDIN, PIERRE JOSEPH ARTHUR—Richelieu.
CARRICK, JOHN JAMES—Thunder Bay and Rainy Riv.
CARROLL, W. F.—Cape Breton, South.
CARVELL, FRANK BROADSTREET—Carleton, N.B.
CASH, EDWARD L.—Mackenzie.
CHABOT, JOHN LEO—Ottawa.
CHAMPAGNE, ALBERT—Battleford.
CHARLTON, WILLIAM ANDREW—Norfolk.
CHISHOLM, ALEXANDER W.—Inverness.
CLARK, HUGH—Bruce, N. Riding.
CLARK, MICHAEL—Red Deer.
CLARKE, ALFRED HENRY—Essex, S. Riding.
CLARKE, W. A.—Wellington, N. Riding.
CLEMENTS, HERBERT SYLVESTER—Comox-Atlin.
COCHRANE, HON. FRANCIS—Nipissing.
COCKSHUTT, WILLIAM FOSTER—Brantford.
COPP, ARTHUR BLISS—Westmorland.
CROMWELL, FREDERICK ROBERT—Compton.
CROTHERS, HON. THOMAS WILSON—Elgin, W. Riding.
CRUISE, ROBERT—Dauphin.
CURRIE, JOHN ALLISTER—Simcoe, N. Riding.

DAVIDSON, AVARD L.—Annapolis.
DELISLE, MICHEL SIMÉON—Portneuf.
DEMERS, MARIE JOSEPH—St. John and Iberville.
DESCARRIES, JOSEPH A.—Jacques Cartier.
DEVLIN, EMMANUEL B.—Wright.
DOHERTY, HON. CHARLES JOSEPH—Montreal, St. Anne.
DONALDSON, SAMUEL J.—Prince Albert.
DOUGLAS, JAMES M.—Strathcona.

EDWARDS, JOHN WESLEY—Frontenac.
ELLIOTT, GEORGE A.—Middlesex, N. Riding.
ETHIER, JOSEPH ARTHUR CALIXTE—Two Mountains.

FISHER, JOHN HENRY—Brant.
FORGET, SIR RODOLPHE, KT.—Charlevoix and Montmorency.
FORTIER, EDMOND—Lotbinière.
FOSTER, RIGHT HON. SIR GEORGE EULAS, P.C., K.C.M.G.—Toronto North.
FOWLER, GEORGE WILLIAM—Kings and Albert.
FRIPP, ALFRED ERNEST—Ottawa.

GAUTHIER, LOUIS JOSEPH, St. Hyacinthe.
GAUTHIER, LOUIS PHILIPPE—Gaspé.
GAUVREAU, CHARLES ARTHUR—Témiscouata.
GERMAN, WILLIAM MANLEY—Welland.
GIRARD, JOSEPH—Chicoutimi and Saguenay.
GLASS, S. FRANCIS—Middlesex, E. Riding.
GORDON, DAVID ALEXANDER—Kent, E. Riding.
GRAHAM, HON. GEORGE P.—Renfrew, S. Riding.
GREEN, ROBERT FRANCIS—Kootenay.
GUILBAULT, JOSEPH PIERRE OCTAVE—Joliette.
GUTHRIE, HUGH—Wellington, S. Riding.

HANNA, A. E.—Lanark, S. Riding.
HARTT, THOMAS A.—Charlotte.
HAZEN, HON. JOHN DOUGLAS—St. John City and County.
HENDERSON, HON. DAVID—Halton.
HEPBURN, BERNARD RICKART—Prince Edward.
HUGHES, JAMES JOSEPH—Kings, P.E.I.
HUGHES, HON. SIR SAM, K.C.B.—Victoria, Ont.

JAMESON, CLARENCE—Digby.

KAY, WILLIAM FREDERICK—Missisquoi.
KEMP, HON. SIR EDWARD, K.C.M.G.—Toronto East.
KNOWLES, WILLIAM ERSKINE—Moosejaw.
KYTE, GEORGE W.—Richmond, N.S.

LACHANCE, ARTHUR—Quebec Centre.
LAFORTUNE, DAVID A.—Montcalm.
LALOR, FRANCIS RAMSAY—Haldimand.
LANCTÔT, ROCH—Laprairie-Napierville.
LAPOINTE, ERNEST—Kamouraska.
LAPOINTE, LOUIS A.—Montreal, St. James.
LAURIER, RT. HON. SIR WILFRID, P.C., G.C.M.G.—Quebec East, Soulanges.
LEMIEUX, HON. RODOLPHE—Rouville.
LEWIS, EDWARD NORMAN—Huron, W. Riding.
LOGGIE, WILLIAM STEWART—Northumberland, N.B.

MACDONALD, EDWARD MORTIMER—Pictou.
MACDONELL, ANGUS CLAUDE—Toronto South.
MACLEAN, ALEXANDER K.—Halifax.
MACLEAN, WILLIAM FINDLAY—York, Ont., S. Riding.
MACNUTT, THOMAS—Saltcoats.
MCCOIG, ARCHIBALD BLAKE—Kent, W. Riding.
MCCRANEY, GEORGE E.—Saskatoon.
MCCREA, FRANCIS N.—Sherbrooke.
MCCURDY, FLEMING BLANCHARD—Shelburne and Queens.
MCKENZIE, DANIEL D.—Cape Breton, N.
MCLEAN, ANGUS A.—Queens, P.E.I.
MCLEAN, HUGH HAVELOCK—Sunbury and Queens.
MCLEOD, HARRY F.—York N.B.
MCMILLAN, JOHN ANGUS—Glengarry.
MARCIL, HON. CHARLES—Bonaventure.
MARCILE, JOSEPH EDMOND—Bagot.
MARSHALL, DAVID—Elgin, E. Riding.
MARTIN, MÉDERIC—Montreal, St. Mary's.
MEIGHEN, HON, ARTHUR—Portage la Prairie.
MERNER, JONATHAN JOSEPH—Huron, S. Riding.
MICHAUD, PIUS—Victoria, N.B.
MIDDLEBRO, WILLIAM SORA—Grey, N. Riding.
MOLLOY, JOHN PATRICK—Provencher.
MONDOU, A. A.—Yamaska.
MORPHY, H. B.—Perth, N. Riding.
MORRIS, JAMES—Châteauguay.
MORRISON, ALEXANDER—Macdonald.
MUNSON, CHARLES ARTHUR—Northumberland, Ont., W. Riding.
MURPHY, HON. CHARLES—Russell.

NESBITT, EDWARD WALTER—Oxford, N. Riding.
NEELY, DAVIS BRADLEY—Humboldt.
NICHOLSON, DONALD—Queens, P.E.I.
NICKLE, WILLIAM FOLGER—Kingston.
NORTHRUP, WILLIAM BARTON—Hastings, E. Riding.

OLIVER, HON. FRANK—Edmonton.
OSLER, SIR EDMUND BOYD, KT.—Toronto West.

PACAUD, LUCIEN TURCOTTE—Megantic.
PAPINEAU, LOUIS J.—Beauharnois.
PAQUET, EUGÈNE—L'Islet.
PARDEE, FREDERICK FORSYTH—Lambton, W. Riding.
PATENAUDE, HON. E. L.—Hochelaga.
PAUL, WILLIAM JAMES—Lennox and Addington.
PERLEY, HON. SIR GEORGE HALSEY, K.C.M.G.—Argenteuil.
PORTER, EDWARD GUSS—Hastings, W. Riding.
POWER, WILLIAM—Quebec West.
PROULX, EDMOND—Prescott.
PUGSLEY, HON. WILLIAM—St. John City.

RAINVILLE, JOSEPH HORMISDAS—Chambly and Verchères.
REID, HON. JOHN D.—Grenville.
RHODES, HON. EDGAR N.—Cumberland.
ROBB, JAMES ALEXANDER—Huntingdon.
ROBIDOUX, FERDINAND JOSEPH—Kent, N. B.
ROCHE, HON. WILLIAM JAMES—Marquette.
ROCHON, GÉDÉON—Terrebonne.
ROGERS, HON. ROBERT—Winnipeg.
ROSS, DUNCAN CAMPBELL—Middlesex, W. Riding.

SCHAFFNER, FREDERICK LAURENCE—Souris.
SCOTT, FRANK STEWART—Waterloo, S. Riding.
SÉGUIN, PAUL ARTHUR—L'Assomption.
SÉVIGNY, HON. ALBERT—Dorchester.
SEXSMITH, JOHN A.—Peterborough, E. Riding.
SHARPE, SAMUEL—Ontario, N. Riding.
SHEPHERD, FRANCIS HENRY—Nanaimo.
SINCLAIR, JOHN H.—Guysborough.
SMITH, WILLIAM—Ontario, S. Riding.
SMYTH, WILLIAM ROSS—Algoma, E. Riding.
STANFIELD, JOHN—Colchester.
STEELE, MICHAEL—Perth, S. Riding.
STEVENS, HENRY HERBERT—Vancouver.
STEWART, DUGALD—Lunenburg.
STEWART, THOMAS JOSEPH—Hamilton West.
SUTHERLAND, DONALD—Oxford, S. Riding.

TAYLOR, JAMES DAVIS—New Westminster.
THOBURN, WILLIAM—Lanark, N. Riding.
THOMPSON, ALFRED—Yukon Territory.
THOMSON, LEVI—Qu'Appelle.
THORNTON, CHARLES JONAS—Durham.
TOBIN, EDMUND WILLIAM—Richmond and Wolfe.
TREMAIN, HADLEY B.—Hants.
TRUAX, REUBEN E.—Bruce, S. Riding.
TURGEON, ONÉSIPHORE—Gloucester.
TURRIFF, JOHN GILLANDERS—Assiniboia.

VERVILLE, ALPHONSE—Maisonneuve.

WALKER, HENRY JOSEPH—Northumberland, Ont., E. Riding.
WALLACE, THOMAS GEORGE—York, Ont., Centre.
WARNOCK, DAVID—Macleod.
WEBSTER, JOHN—Brockville.
WEICHEL, WILLIAM GEORGE—Waterloo, N. Riding.
WHITE, GERALD VERNER—Renfrew, N. Riding.
WHITE, WILLIAM HENRY—Victoria, Alta.
WHITE, HON. SIR THOMAS, K.C.M.G.—Leeds.
WILCOX, OLIVER J.—Essex, N. Riding.
WILSON, CHARLES AVILA—Laval.
WILSON, GORDON CROOKS—Wentworth.
WRIGHT, WILLIAM—Muskoka.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

SEVENTH SESSION, TWELFTH PARLIAMENT.

1917

ALGOMA, EAST—William Ross Smyth.
ALGOMA, WEST—Arthur Cyril Boyce.
ANNAPOLIS—Avard L. Davidson.
ANTIGONISH—
ARGENTEUIL—Hon. Sir George Halsey Perley, K.C.M.G.
ASSINIBOIA—John Gillanders Turriff.

BAGOT—Joseph Edmond Marcile.
BATTLEFORD—Albert Champagne.
BEAUCE—Hon. Henri Sévérin Béland.
BEAUHARNOIS—Louis J. Papineau.
BELLECHASSE—
BERTHIER—J. A. Barrette.
BONAVENTURE—Hon. Charles Marcil.
BRANDON—
BRANT—John Henry Fisher.
BRANTFORD—William F. Cockshutt.
BROCKVILLE—John Webster.
BROME—
BRUCE, N. RIDING—Hugh Clark.
BRUCE, S. RIDING—Reuben E. Truax.

CALGARY—R. B. Bennett.
CAPE BRETON NORTH AND VICTORIA—Daniel D. McKenzie.
CAPE BRETON, SOUTH—W. F. Carroll.
CARLETON, N.B.—Frank Broadstreet Carvell.
CARLETON, ONT.—
CHAMBLY AND VERCHÈRES—J. H. Rainville.
CHAMPLAIN—Hon. Pierre Edouard Blondin.
CHARLEVOIX—Sir Rodolphe Forget.
CHARLOTTE—Thomas A. Hartt.
CHATEAUGUAY—James Morris.
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY—Joseph Girard.
COLCHESTER—John Stanfield.
COMOX-ATLIN—H. S. Clements.
COMPTON—F. R. Cromwell.
CUMBERLAND—Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes.

DAUPHIN—Robert Cruise.
DIGBY—Clarence Jameson.
DORCHESTER—Hon. Albert Sévigny.
DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Ovide Brouillard.
DUFFERIN—John A. Best.
DUNDAS—Hon. Andrew Broder.
DURHAM—Charles Jonas Thornton.

EDMONTON—Hon. Frank Oliver.
ELGIN, E. RIDING—David Marshall.
ELGIN, W. RIDING—Hon. Thomas Wilson Crothers.
ESSEX, N. RIDING—Oliver J. Wilcox.
ESSEX, S. RIDING—Alfred Henry Clarke.

FRONTENAC—John Wesley Edwards.

GASPÉ—Louis Philippe Gauthier.
GLENGARRY—John Angus McMillan.
GLOUCESTER—Onésiphore Turgeon.
GRENVILLE—Hon. John Dowsley Reid.
GREY, E. RIDING—
GREY, N. RIDING—William Sora Middlebro.
GREY, S. RIDING—R. J. Ball.
GUYSBOROUGH—John H. Sinclair.

HALDIMAND—Francis Ramsay Lalor.
HALIFAX—Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Laird Borden, P.C. G.C.M.G.; A. K. Maclean.
HALTON—Hon. David Henderson.
HAMILTON EAST—
HAMILTON WEST—Thomas Joseph Stewart.
HANTS—Hadley B. Tremain.
HASTINGS, E. RIDING—William B. Northrup.
HASTINGS, W. RIDING—Edward Guss Porter.
HOCHELAGA—Hon. Esioff L. Patenaude.
HUMBOLDT—David Bradley Neely.
HUNTINGDON—James Alexander Robb.
HURON, E. RIDING—James Bowman.
HURON, S. RIDING—J. J. Merner.
HURON, W. RIDING—Edward Norman Lewis.

INVERNESS—Alexander W. Chisholm.

JACQUES CARTIER—Joseph A. Descarries.
JOLIETTE—J. P. O. Guilbault.

KAMOURASKA—Ernest Lapointe.
KENT, N.B.—F. J. Robidoux.
KENT, ONT., E. RIDING—David Alexander Gordon.
KENT, ONT., W. RIDING—Archibald Blake McCoig.

KINGS AND ALBERT, N B.—George W. Fowler.
KINGS, N.S.—
KINGS, P.E.I.—James J. Hughes.
KINGSTON—Wm. F. Nickle.
KOOTENAY—Robert Francis Green.

LABELLE—Honoré Achim.
LAMBTON, E. RIDING—Joseph E. Armstrong.
LAMBTON, W. RIDING—Frederick Forsyth Pardee.
LANARK, N. RIDING—William Thoburn.
LANARK, S. RIDING—Adelbert E. Hanna.
LAPRAIRIE-NAPIERVILLE—Roch Lanctôt.
L'ASSOMPTION—Paul Arthur Seguin.
LAVAL—Charles Avila Wilson.
LEEDS—Hon. Sir Thomas White, K.C.M.G.
LENNOX AND ADDINGTON—Wm. J. Paul.
LÉVIS—J. B. Bourassa.
LINCOLN—
LISGAR—
L'ISLET—Eugène Paquet.
LONDON—
LOTBINIÈRE—Edmond Fortier.
LUNENBURG—Dugald Stewart.

MACDONALD—Alexander Morrison.
MACKENZIE—Edward L. Cash.
MACLEOD—David Warnock.
MAISONNEUVE—Alphonse Verville.
MARQUETTE—Hon. William James Roche.
MASKINONGÉ—A. Bellemare.
MEDICINE HAT—Wm. A. Buchanan.
MEGANTIC—L. T. Pacaud.
MIDDLESEX, E. RIDING—S. Francis Glass.
MIDDLESEX, N. RIDING—George A. Elliot.
MIDDLESEX, W. RIDING—Duncan Campbell Ross.
MISSISQUOI—Wm. F. Kay.
MONTCALM—David A. Lafortune.
MONTMAGNY—
MONTMORENCY—Sir Rodolphe Forget, Kt.
MONTREAL, ST. ANNE—Hon. Charles J. Doherty.
MONTREAL, ST. ANTOINE—Sir Herbert Brown Ames K.B.
MONTREAL, ST. JAMES—Louis A. Lapointe.
MONTREAL, ST. LAWRENCE—Robert Bickerdike.
MONTREAL, St. MARY—Méderic Martin.
MOOSEJAW—William Erskine Knowles.
MUSKOKA—William Wright.

NANAIMO—Francis H. Shepherd.
NEW WESTMINSTER—James Davis Taylor.
NICOLET—
NIPISSING—Hon. Francis Cochrane.
NORFOLK—Wm. A. Charlton.
NORTHUMBERLAND, N.B.—William Stewart Loggie.
NORTHUMBERLAND, ONT., E.R.—Henry Joseph Walker
NORTHUMBERLAND, ONT., W.R.—Charles A. Munson.

ONTARIO, N. RIDING—Samuel S. Sharpe.
ONTARIO, S. RIDING—William Smith.
OTTAWA CITY { Alfred E. Fripp. / John Leo Chabot.

OXFORD, N. RIDING—Edward Walter Nesbitt.
OXFORD, S. RIDING—Donald Sutherland.

PARRY SOUND—James Arthurs.
PEEL—Richard Blain.
PERTH, N. RIDING—H. B. Morphy.
PERTH, S. RIDING—Michael Steele.
PETERBOROUGH, E. RIDING—John A. Sexsmith.

PETERBOROUGH, W. RIDING—John H. Burnham.
PICTOU—Edward Mortimer Macdonald.
PONTIAC—Gerald H. Brabazon.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE—Hon. Arthur Meighen.
PORTNEUF—Michel Siméon Delisle.
PRESCOTT—Edmond Proulx.
PRINCE ALBERT—Samuel James Donaldson.
PRINCE, P.E.I.—
PRINCE EDWARD—Bernard R. Hepburn.
PROVENCHER—John Patrick Molloy.

QU'APPELLE—Levi Thomson.
QUEBEC CENTRE—Arthur Lachance.
QUEBEC EAST—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, P.C., G.C.M.G.
QUEBEC WEST—William Power.
QUEBEC County—
QUEENS, P.E.I. — { Angus A. McLean. / Donald Nicholson.

RED DEER—Michael Clark.
REGINA—
RENFREW, N. RIDING—Gerald Verner White.
RENFREW, S. RIDING—Hon. George P. Graham.
RESTIGOUCHE—
RICHELIEU—P. J. A. Cardin.
RICHMOND N.S.—George W. Kyte.
RICHMOND AND WOLFE, Q.—Edmund William Tobin.
RIMOUSKI—Herménégilde Boulay.
ROUVILLE—Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux.
RUSSELL—Hon. Charles Murphy.

ST. HYACINTHE—Louis J. Gauthier.
ST. JOHN CITY, N.B.—Hon. Wm. Pugsley.
ST. JOHN CITY AND COUNTY, N.B.—Hon. J. Douglas Hazen.
ST. JOHN AND IBERVILLE—Marie Joseph Demers.
SALTCOATS—Thomas MacNutt.
SASKATOON—George Ewan McCraney.
SELKIRK—George A. Bradbury.
SHEFFORD—George Henry Boivin.
SHELBURNE AND QUEENS—Fleming B. McCurdy.
SHERBROOKE—Francis N. McCrea.
SIMCOE, E. RIDING—William Henry Bennett.
SIMCOE, N. RIDING—John Allister Currie
SIMCOE, S. RIDING—William Alves Boys.
SOULANGES—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, P.C., G.C.M.G.
SOURIS—Frederick Laurence Schaffner.
STANSTEAD—
STORMONT—Duncan O. Alguire.
STRATHCONA—James M. Douglas.
SUNBURY AND QUEENS, N.B.—Hugh H. McLean.

TEMISCOUATA—Charles A. Gauvreau.
TERREBONNE—Gédéon Rochon.
THREE RIVERS AND ST. MAURICE—Jacques Bureau.
THUNDER BAY AND RAINY RIVER—John James Carrick.
TORONTO CENTRE—Edmund Bristol.
TORONTO EAST—Hon. Sir Edward Kemp, K.C.M.G.
TORONTO NORTH—Right Hon. Sir George Eulas Foster, P.C., K.C.M.G.
TORONTO SOUTH—Angus Claude Macdonell.
TORONTO WEST—Sir Edmund Boyd Osler, Kt.
TWO MOUNTAINS—Joseph Arthur Calixte Ethier.

VANCOUVER CITY—Henry Herbert Stevens.
VAUDREUIL—Gustave Boyer.
VICTORIA, ALTA.—William Henry White.
VICTORIA CITY, B.C.—Geo. Henry Barnard.
VICTORIA, N.B.—Pius Michaud.
VICTORIA, ONT.—Hon. Sir Sam Hughes, K.C.B.

WATERLOO, N. RIDING—William George Weichel.
WATERLOO, S. RIDING—Frank Stewart Scott.
WELLAND—William Manley German.
WELLINGTON, N. RIDING—W. A. Clarke.
WELLINGTON, S. RIDING—Hugh Guthrie.
WENTWORTH—Gordon C. Wilson.
WESTMORLAND—Arthur B. Copp.
WINNIPEG—Hon. Robert Rogers.
WRIGHT—Emmanuel B. Devlin.

YALE-CARIBOO—Hon. Martin Burrell.
YAMASKA—A. A. Mondou.
YARMOUTH—
YORK, N.B.—Harry F. McLeod.
YORK, ONT., C. RIDING—Thomas George Wallace.
YORK, ONT., N. RIDING—J. A. Macdonald Armstrong.
YORK, ONT., S. RIDING—William Findlay Maclean.
YUKON TERRITORY—Alfred Thompson.

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, January 18, 1917.

This being the day on which Parliament is convoked by proclamation of the Governor General for the despatch of business, and the members of the House being assembled:

Thomas B. Flint, M.A., D.C.L., the Clerk of the House, read to the House a letter from the Governor General's Secretary, informing him that the Chief Justice of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, would proceed to the Senate Chamber on Thursday, the 18th of January, at 3 p.m., to open the session.

A message was delivered by Lieut.-Col. Ernest J. Chambers, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:—

His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor-General desires the immediate attendance of this Honourable House in the Chamber of the Honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, the House went up to the Senate Chamber, when the Speaker of the Senate said:—

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

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

And the House being returned to the Commons chamber:

VACANCIES.

The Clerk of the House, standing on the lower step below the Speaker's chair, said: I have the honour to inform the House that, during the recess, notifications have been received of the following vacancies having occurred in the representation, viz.:—

Of the Electoral District of Antigonish, by the resignation of William Chisholm, Esq.

Of the Electoral District of Yarmouth, by the decease of Bowman Brown Law, Esq.

Of the Electoral District of Montmagny, by the resignation of David Ovide L'Espérance, Esq.

Of the Electoral District of Nicolet, by the resignation of Paul Emile Lamarche, Esq.

Of the Electoral District of Regina, by the resignation of William Melville Martin, Esq.

Of the Electoral District of Brome, by the decease of George Harold Baker, Esq.

Of the Electoral District of Stanstead, by the decease of Charles Henry Lovell, Esq.

Of the Electoral District of Toronto East, consequent upon the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown by the Hon. Albert Edward Kemp.

Of the Electoral District of London, by the decease of William Gray, Esq.

Of the Electoral District of Quebec County, by the decease of the Hon. Thomas Chase Casgrain.

Of the Electoral District of Dorchester, consequent upon the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown by the Hon. Albert Sévigny.

NEW MEMBER.

The Clerk said: I have also the honour to inform the House that, during the recess, I have received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of:

Hon. Albert Edward Kemp for the Electoral District of Toronto East.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Dr. Flint, it has become necessary for this House to elect a new Speaker.

The speakership is an office which, as we are all aware, is invested with great importance and distinction in this country as in other countries. The duties of a Speaker and the importance of the office which he fills have been noted by all constitutional writers. He is called upon to discharge functions of the highest order, and the conduct of the business of the House depends upon the ability, the impartiality, the firmness, the courtesy and the tact with which those duties are discharged. There is a member of this House, Mr. Edgar N. Rhodes, member for Cumberland, who, although a comparatively young man, has spent nearly nine years in the service of his country in Parliament; and who, in the discharge of his duties as Chairman of Committees and Deputy Speaker, has, in my judgment, given evidence of the qualities to which I have alluded. Last year when I had the honour of proposing that he should be Chairman of Committees, very warm tributes were paid to him by many members of the House, and I am confident that his record in the discharge of the duties of that office was such as to show that those tributes were properly rendered. We have rules, written and unwritten, which govern the conduct of business in this House and govern also the conduct and demeanour of its members; and I would say that in this House, as in all deliberative assemblies, there is one unwritten rule which is not less important than any of those promulgated in written form; and it is this: that all the written rules of the House must be administered with fairness, with impartiality, with firmness and with tact.

I have no doubt whatever that Mr. Rhodes will discharge the duties of this office in accordance with the best traditions of the past and in accordance also with the principles to which I have alluded, principles which I am sure will be accepted by all the members of this House as proper and appropriate.

I therefore have very great pleasure in proposing, seconded by Mr. Rogers, that Mr. Edgar N. Rhodes, member of this House for the electoral district of Cumberland, be Speaker of this House.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Quebec East): Dr. Flint, on behalf of the members of this House who sit on this side, I have to declare that we will accept the nominee of the Government for the high position of Speaker of this House with very great pleasure. Indeed I am happy on this first day of this session to be able to join with my right hon. friend in the first motion he makes. I wish it could be so all through the session—a wish which perhaps may not be fulfilled in its entirety; but if all the motions which are to be made by my right hon. friend in this House are of the character of this one, we shall have an easy and pleasant session indeed. Mr. Rhodes has already given evidence in the capacity of Chairman of Committees that he is highly endowed for the position of the first officer of this House in character, education and judicial temperament. In fact, having been a colleague of Mr. Rhodes now for some nine years, and, if I may say so, having been a friend of his during that time, I know of no blemish in him except that he is a Tory. But it is not given to everybody to be a Grit—it is a special dispensation of Providence. At all events, even if Mr. Rhodes is a Tory at the present time, I have no doubt at all that when he ascends the steps which will lead him to that chair, he will leave his Toryism behind him, and that he will be a true, an honest, an impartial presiding officer of this House, and will administer the rules of this House, as has been said by my right hon. friend, with absolute impartiality and fairness; that he will be the arbiter between the two sides of this House, and that he will maintain the traditions of the high office to which he has been called. For my part, I offer him my congratulations upon his unanimous election to the speakership of this House.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Dr. Flint, I am very much obliged to my right hon. friend for the handsome way in which he has welcomed the first measure which I have had to propose at this session, and while, as he observes, I cannot anticipate that everything I shall propose during the session will meet with his approval, I can assure him that everything which I shall propose will be equally meritorious.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is boasting.

The Clerk of the House declared the motion carried in the affirmative, nemine contradicente, and Edgar N. Rhodes, Esquire, member for the electoral division of Cumberland, duly elected to the Chair of the House.

Honourable Mr. Rhodes was conducted from his seat in the House to the Speaker's Chair by Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Borden and Hon. Robert Rogers.

Mr. SPEAKER-ELECT said: I beg to tender to this House my sincere and hearty thanks for the high honour it has conferred upon me by electing me as its Speaker. It shall be my pleasure, as well as my duty, to endeavour to deserve that high honour by dealing with all questions which come before me in my official character with firmness and with impartiality. I am fully sensible of my unfitness for the position. but I rely confidently upon the co-operation of hon. members on both sides of this House to assist me in maintaining and in preserving our rights and privileges, and in preserving the freedom and dignity of debate according to ancient usage.

APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY SERJEANT-AT-ARMS.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Serjeant-at-arms has appointed Louis Charles Panet, Esquire, with my approval, to be his deputy.

TRIBUTES TO DECEASED MEMBERS.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns to-day, it is proper that we should give expression to our sympathy in respect to the loss which this House has sustained in the death of four of its members, who have passed away since the last session. They are, as hon. members know, the Hon. Thomas Chase Casgrain, Postmaster General; Lieut.-Col. George Harold Baker, member for Brome; Mr. William Gray, member for London; and Mr. Charles H. Lovell, member for Stanstead. Mr. Casgrain, who was not only a colleague, but a warm personal friend of mine, had a distinguished record in the public life of this country. He entered the Provincial political arena in Quebec in 1886, and, I believe, continued in that arena until he was elected to this Parliament in 1896, the year in which I entered public life. It was then that I first became acquainted with him, and I had the privilege of enjoying his intimate friendship ever afterwards. He filled several very important and distinguished positions in public life, among others those of Attorney General of his native province, Battonier-General of the province of Quebec, Chairman of the Canadian Section of the International Joint Commission, and Postmaster General of Canada, a position which he filled for more than two years. The very great ability of Mr. Casgrain, whether at the bar or in public life, was universally admitted; and his high character, his fine spirit, his splendid enthusiasm for everything that interested him, and his charming personality were such as to endear him very closesly indeed to those who had the privilege of knowing him intimately and who were associated with him in political affairs. He also, I believe, endeared himseslf to those who, although opposed to him in public life, had the privilege of knowing him intimately. He had not been in robust health for nearly a year before his death. Last spring his condition became worse, and he was obliged to take a long rest from his public duties; indeed, he was not sure whether the condition of his health might not then bring about his enforced retirement from public life. However, he came back from England with renewed strength, and took up with his accustomed devotion and energy the work of his department. The last occasion on which I had the privilege of speaking to him was in the city of Quebec, where we both addressed the same public meeting. I was shocked at his apparent illness at that time, and strongly urged him to take a rest, a long respite from work. He promised to do so, and I next heard from him shortly after my return from the West when on Christmas day, although then very ill, he sent me a message of greeting and remembrance. I mourn his loss as that of a very dear friend and I am sure that all the members of this House will join in conveying their deep sympathy to his widow and the members of his family.

I did not know Mr. Lovell so well. He had not been in Parliament very long. I knew better his father who preceded him in public life. He was, I believe, a man well informed in public affairs, and although he did not often address the House, I realize that he commanded the complete confidence of those who entrusted him with their mandate in this Parliament. To his family as well, I am sure we will all join in the expression of our sympathy.

I had known Mr. William Gray, of London, for a long time before he entered public life. He had been intimately associated for many years with the political affairs of the constituency which he afterwards represented. He was a man of great energy, who took a keen interest in public affairs; a strong partisan, but a man of warm and generous instincts. I deplore the loss which the House has sustained in his death, and his family and children will also receive our deep sympathy.

I had known Lieutenant-Colonel George Harold Baker for some years before he en-

tered this Parliament. He is the first member of the Parliament of Canada who has made the supreme sacrifice for the cause of liberty and justice, the cause for which this Empire is fighting in this war. He came of a family that had great traditions in public life. His grandfather was in the Legislature of the province of Quebec as far back as 1834. His father had a service of no less than twenty-five years in this Parliament, and, I believe, of nine years in the Legislature of the province of Quebec. Lieutenant-Colonel Baker came into this Parliament in 1911. His voice was not very often heard here, but, knowing him well, I had the warmest appreciation, not only of his character and ability, but of the great promise which he gave of usefulness in the future public life of this country. I do not think it is too much to say that there is no place in the public life of Canada to which, if he had been spared to serve his country in this Parliament, George Harold Baker might not have aspired. I remember very well, when he spoke to me about his offer of military service, the over-mastering sense of duty to his country which he evinced. I remember well my conviction that it was not possible for me to interpose any objection in the face of such a sense of duty as that which possessed him. He took up his work in a characteristic way. He knew the necessity of absolute thoroughness of training, and he searched not only Canada, but the other side of the Atlantic, and even India, to have associated with him a man who could undertake duties for which he believed himself not adapted by previous training and experience. He went to the front. I remember that shortly before he left I had the privilege of making him acquainted with a very distinguished American gentleman who was on a visit to Ottawa at that time. This gentleman, after conversing with Lieutenant-Colonel Baker for a short time, said to me, " If your Canadian officers and men are of the type of that man I do not wonder at the splendid record that they have made at the front." We know of the splendid spirit and magnificent courage and patriotism that have animated, and still animate, the men of the Canadian Expeditionary Force; but I venture to think that no finer spirit, no truer patriot, no man of more brilliant promise, ever left the shores of Canada to make the supreme sacrifice beyond the seas than George Harold Baker. Somewhere in France is his grave. I believe that in the House, as in the country, all who knew him mourn his loss. I feel that in him the country has lost a man of the highest possible promise in public life, and personally I know that I have lost not only a loyal follower, who was most truly an encouragement and a support to me on many difficult occasions, but one of the most valued intimate friends I have ever known since I entered public life.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with every word which has been spoken by my right hon friend with respect to the four colleagues whose loss we mourn. My right hon. friend has spoken fittingly of them, especially of his colleague the late lamented Postmaster-General. Mr. Casgrain was not long enough in this present Parliament to give to it his full measure of strength. His health was not good, and it was noticeable to all who had known him formerly, and especially during last session, that perhaps we might anticipate what has occurred. Everything that my right hon. friend has said of Mr. Casgrain is perfectly true. He was, as those who knew him in a former Parliament know, a very able member; and those who knew him before he came to Parliament know that he was not only a very able man, but just as courageous as he was able, and as fair in debate and in political combat as he was courageous. I have known him personally since he was a law student. I met him when he had been called to the bar, and afterwards, when he had entered politics. It was my lot to meet him upon many platforms and in very hot contests, at a time when the political atmosphere was rather charged with electricity, and I am proud to remember at this date, now that he is no more, that not a single offensive word ever passed between us; nor did I ever hear such a word used by him. I may say further that, though we were opposed on almost every question, there was always between us what I will not call an intimate, but a very strong friendship.

With regard to the late Mr. Lovell and the late Mr. Gray, one sitting on one side of the House and one on the other, both seemed to me to be of very much the same character; men unobstrusive in this House, but endowed both with a very high sense of honour and strong common sense, and upon whose judgment the leader of the party could always depend for solid advice.

As to Lt.-Col. Baker, it was not my privilege to meet him except on the floor of this House, but it was my privilege to meet his father, whom I knew very intimately in the province of Quebec, and in this House

especially. The father of our late lamented friend was, like Mr. Casgrain, a man of absolute integrity, sincerity and courage, and if his son was endowed in any way like his father, I am not at all surprised that he took the part he did in the tremendous struggle in which we are now engaged. Of a man of his character, though we may lament his death, I am sure that we may say he has met the death which he would have wished above all others. We extend our deepest sympathy to the families of our four deceased colleagues.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the tributes which have been so eloquently paid by my right hon. friends to the memory of our comrades who have passed away, and particularly I desire to refer to my personal friend and deskmate, the late Hon. T. Chase Casgrain, Postmaster-General. I had the advantage of his acquaintance over many years. Originally I knew him when I was engaged in business in the city of Montreal. He was at that time one of the most eminent counsel of that great metropolis. On many occasions I had the privilege and advantage of his advice on matters of financial and commercial importance. Later I had the honour to be associated with him as member of the Government. I desire to bear testimony to the fine integrity of his character, to the exquisite urbanity of his disposition, and to the genial qualities of head and heart which endeared him to all, and made him so charming a comrade and friend. I wish to speak particularly of his unremitting devotion to the duties of his office, duties greatly increased by the exigencies of this unprecedented time through which we are passing. The late Postmaster-General had a very high sense of duty. He was unsparing of himself to the work of his department, and I am convinced that it was his unflagging devotion to the duties of his office which impaired and undermined his constitution, and thus laid him open to the insidious disease which carried him off. I desire to express my personal sorrow and my sympathy with his widow and the members of his family, and the sense which I entertain of the loss to the people of Canada through his untimely death.

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARYSHIPS.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I desire to lay on the table of the House an Order in Council passed on the 15th of July last, providing for the office of Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, and an Order in Council of 21st October, appointing to that office Mr. Hugh Clark, member of the House of Commons for the Electoral District of North Bruce. Also an Order in Council of 13th July last, providing for the office of Parliamentary Secretary to the Department of Militia and Defence, and an Order in Council of 19th of July last, appointing to that office Mr. Fleming B. McCurdy, member of the House of Commons for the Electoral District of Shelburne and Queens.

MINISTER OF THE OVERSEAS FORCES.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I also lay on the Table of the House an Order in Council approved on October 28, 1916, providing for the office of Minister of the Overseas Forces of Canada, and an Order in Council, approved on October 31, 1916, appointing to that office the Hon. Sir George Halsey Perley.

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE CORRESPONDENCE.

On the motion of Sir Robert Borden for the adjournment of the House:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is it the intention of the Government to lay on the table at as early a moment as possible the correspondence with regard to the proposed Imperial Conference?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes. I do not know of any reason at the moment why it should not be laid on the table of the House. I think it has practically all been made public so far. There has been no very extended correspondence.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: At all events you will bring down whatever there is?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Whatever there is we shall bring down. I hope to lay it on the table of the House to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3.45 p.m.

Friday, January 19, 1917.

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

OPENING OF THE SESSION.

Mr. SPEAKER read a communication from the Governor General's Secretary an-

nouncing that His Excellency would proceed to the Senate Chamber at 3 p.m. on this day for the purpose of formally opening the session of the Dominion Parliament.

A message was delivered by Lieut.-Col. 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 the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

Then the Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes, Speaker-elect, said:

May it please Your Excellency.

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

The Honourable the Speaker of the Senate addressing the Honourable the Speaker of the Commons then said:

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

Then His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to open Parliament by a Speech from the Throne.

And the House being returned to the Commons Chamber:

BILL INTRODUCED.

Bill No. 1, respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—Hon. J. D. Hazen.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Hon. J. D. Hazen moved:

That a special committee be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of this House under Rule 10; said committee to be composed of Sir Robert Borden, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Messrs. Reid, Pugsley, Stanfield and Pardee, and that that portion of Rule No. 10 limiting the number of members of the said committee be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Joint report of the Librarians of Parliament.—Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Speaker.]

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

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

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I desire on this occasion to express my respectful appreciation of the honour conferred on me by the King in appointing me to the distinguished office of Governor General.

I esteem it a high privilege to become closely identified with Canada at the time when she is taking so splendid a part in the world-wide struggle, and I look forward to her ability and capacity to exercise an ever-increasing influence in bringing the war to a victorious conclusion.

When peace is again happily restored I am confident that the vast resources of the Dominion will continue to be developed for the lasting benefit of the Empire and in the best interests of liberty and humanity.

Although nearly two and a half years have elapsed since the outbreak of war yet that period has not been more than sufficient for the enormous preparation necessary to enable our Empire to throw its full strength into the struggle.

The events that have transpired since prorogation give convincing testimony of the efficiency of the measures thus taken and bear splendid tribute to the valour and heroism of His Majesty's forces in every theatre of war.

With preparation already so ample and still increasing we may confidently anticipate that the not distant future will bring such success to the allied arms as will assure the full maintenance of the purposes and ideals for which we have engaged in this war.

The Canadian forces dispatched overseas during 1916 numbered more than 165,000 and the aggregate of enlistments in Canada since the outbreak of war is nearly 400,000. In attack as well as in defence the valour, endurance and resourcefulness of the Canadian troops have been conspicuous on every occasion when they have met the enemy, and they have splendidly upheld the highest traditions of their country.

Equally notable and impressive has been the fine spirit of loyalty displayed by the people of this Dominion who have freely dedicated their energies and their material resources to the common defence of our Empire.

Steps have been taken by my advisers for better organization of National Service, and attention has been given to the more thorough utilization of our natural resources. Measures have also been taken in co-operation with the Government of the United Kingdom to facilitate the increased production of munitions in Canada.

The Government of the United Kingdom have invited the First Ministers of the Dominions to attend a series of special and continuous meetings of the War Cabinet (of which for this purpose they will be members) to consider urgent

questions affecting the prosecution of the war the possible conditions on which the Allied Nations could assent to its termination, and the problems which would then immediately arise. This invitation has been accepted on behalf of Canada.

The Fiftieth Anniversary of the foundation of this Dominion draws near and brings with it the inspiring memory of all that has been accomplished during the half century in the upbuilding of a united and powerful nation. My advisers believe that, notwithstanding the continuance of the war, there should be an appropriate commemoration of an event so notable in the history of Canada.

The life of the present Parliament will expire in October next, and under existing legislation a dissolution and election would be necessary in the early future. My advisers, however, are of opinion that the wishes of the Canadian people and the urgent requirements of the war would be best met by avoiding the distraction and confusion consequent upon a general election at so critical a time.

That purpose can only be effected through the medium of legislation by the Parliament of the United Kingdom. A resolution authorizing and requesting the enactment of such legislation as will further extend the life of this Parliament will be presented to you.

Although in some parts of the Dominion weather conditions affected adversely the excellent prospects of an unusually large harvest, yet taking the country as a whole, the labours of our husbandmen have been abundantly rewarded.

The commercial, industrial and financial stability of the country has been well maintained during the past year. There is every reason to believe that the Dominion will be in a position to meet satisfactorily the readjustment of conditions which must ensue upon the termination of the war.

Important measures designed to aid in meeting these new conditions have been in preparation and some of them will be submitted for your consideration.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

The accounts for the last and the estimates for the next fiscal year will be submitted to you without delay, and you will be asked to make the necessary financial provision for the effective conduct of the war.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

The lofty patriotism, the fine courage, and the inflexible purpose which have animated all His Majesty's Dominions in upholding our great cause are in nowise abated. In common with the rest of the Empire the people of this Dominion are firmly resolved that in this war which has entailed so much sacrifice and which we have undertaken for the highest ideals of humanity and civilization our efforts shall be continued and strengthened until they are crowned with an abiding peace.

I commend to your attentive consideration all measures submitted to you for that great purpose, and I pray that the Divine blessing may attend your deliberations.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Hazen, it was ordered that the speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both Houses of Parliament be taken into consideration on Monday next, and that this order have precedence over all other business except the introduction of Bills until disposed of.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Hon. Albert Edward Kemp, member-elect for the electoral district of East Toronto, by Hon. Sir Thomas White and Hon. J. D. Reid.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Hazen, the House adjourned at 3.45 p.m until Monday next.

Monday, January 22, 1917.

The House met at three o'clock, the Speaker in the chair.

IMPERIAL WAR CONFERENCE—CORRESPONDENCE.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I lay on the table a copy of the correspondence relating to the Imperial War Conference of 1917. I had intended that this should be laid on the table of the House on Friday, but finding that that had not been done, I directed that a copy be sent to my right honourable friend who leads the Opposition, and I think he received it.

ROSS RIFLE—CORRESPONDENCE.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I lay on the table a copy of the correspondence relating to the withdrawal of the Ross rifle from the Canadian army corps. It ought to be explained that the asterisks to be found in the correspondence represents matter which, for military reasons, and at the express request of the War Office, has been omitted.

Mr. OLIVER: Is this the report of Sir Douglas Haig that was spoken of at the end of last session of Parliament?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not recall that any report from Sir Douglas Haig was referred to, but all the papers that can be brought down are here. There is a report by Sir Douglas Haig among the papers that are now submitted. I am not sure, however, that it ante dates the end of last session.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does my right hon. friend not recall that at the end of last session he informed the House that a very full investigation and report would be made by Sir Douglas Haig as to the working of the Ross rifle?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not recall that; I was merely explaining to my hon.

friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) that there is a report by Field Marshal Sir Douglas Haig upon the matter among the papers that have been brought down. I am not sure, however, that it ante dates the end of last session.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report of the Department of Naval Service for the year ended 31st March, 1916.—Hon. Mr. Hazen.

The Forty-ninth Annual Report of the Fisheries Branch of the Naval Service for the year ended 31st March, 1916.—Hon. Mr. Hazen.

Report of the Department of Labour for the year ended 31st March, 1916.—Hon Mr. Crothers.

Ninth Report of the Registrar of Boards of Conciliation and Investigation of the proceedings under "The Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907," for the year ended March 31, 1916.—Hon. Mr. Crothers.

Annual Report of the Department of the Interior for the year ended March 31, 1916.—Hon. Mr. Roche.

Annual Report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the year ended March 31, 1916.—Hon. Mr. Roche.

LIMITATION OF RACING MEETS.

Mr. WILCOX moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 2, to amend the Criminal Code.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Explain.

Mr. WILCOX: The object of this Bill is to add a provision to sub-section 2 of Section 235 of the Criminal Code, enacted by Chapter 19 of the Statutes passed in 1910, and assented to on 1st April, 1912. This legislation was intended to deal effectively with the limitation of race meets throughout Canada. The racing men have evaded its spirit by adding different units, thereby obtaining an unlimited number of racing days. The object sought by Parliament after a full investigation, that the limitation should be fourteen days, has thus not been carried out. The amendment will provide that in any town, city, or county where more than one race track exists the total number of days available for racing on all the tracks shall not exceed the number prescribed by this Act for one race course or race track. With this explanation I would like the House to assent to the first reading, and I shall endeavour to explain the Bill at greater length when we reach the second reading.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

NATIONAL SERVICE COMMISSION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I ask the Government if they will bring down the Order in Council creating the National Service Commission, which is mentioned in the speech from the Throne, and the appointments made in connection with that Commission.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Certainly.

MARITIME EXPRESS SERVICE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would invite the attention of the Minister of Railways to a report which appears in the St. John Telegraph of the 20th inst. with reference to the proposed withdrawal of the trains between St. John and Moncton, which make direct connection with the Maritime Express. I may say to my hon. friend that there is no direct connection between St. John and the Ocean Limited, and there has not been for a number of years, the result being that passengers from St. John to Montreal, and also from points between St. John and Moncton to Montreal, have been obliged to wait at Moncton to connect with the Ocean Limited. The same condition has applied to passengers travelling by the Ocean Limited to St. John. But there has always been, as my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows, a direct connection with the Maritime Express. It is now proposed to take off the train between St. John and Moncton, which makes that direct connection with the Maritime Express. The consequence will be that passengers from St. John and intermediate points who desire to take the Maritime Express will be obliged to wait several hours at Moncton, as shall also the passengers by the Maritime Express who desire to make direct connection with St. John and intermediate points. In my judgment it would be a very great mistake to discontinue that connection. The result will be to place St. John, even more than it has been for some years past, in the position of a city on a branch of the Intercolonial railway. It will cause very great inconvenience and the most intense dissatisfaction, and I am greatly surprised that Mr. Gutelius, the general manager of Government railways, should have come to the conclusion to discontinue this service. I sincerely trust that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and

Canals, will have the matter looked into immediately and give orders to countermand the determination at which Mr. Gutelius appears to have arrived. Mr. Gutelius was interviewed upon the subject by the reporter of the Telegraph, and he admitted that this was the conclusion which had been arrived at. I would also like my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) to look into the matter and give to the Minister of Railways and Canals the information which I know he can give, and which, I am sure, will satisfy the minister that it is not desirable to take this very backward step as far as it concerns connection between St. John and important points on the north shore of the province, as well as points in the province of Quebec. It will prove of very great inconvenience to the people of St. John and also the people on the north shore of the province.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways and Canals): I will be very glad to look into the matter and report to my hon. friend.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

The House proceeded to the consideration of the Speech of His Excellency the Governor General at the opening of the session.

Mr. GORDON CROOKS WILSON (Wentworth) rose to move that an Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, offering the humble thanks of this House to His Excellency for the gracious speech which he has been pleased to make to both Houses of Parliament. He said:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the address to be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, allow me to thank the Government for the honour conferred upon me. I would have preferred to have listened to some more worthy and capable member, more competent than I am to deal with the subject, at such an important time in our country's and Empire's history, but I accept the honour, not as a personal one, but rather one for the constituency which I have the honour to represent. I, therefore, ask the indulgence of the House while I make a few brief remarks.

Allow me to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, upon your elevation to the office of first Commoner. Your fitness for the position has been voiced by both the distinguished leaders in this House.

I believe that I am voicing the unanimous sentiment of this Parliament when I express deep regret at the departure from our country of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Connaught and the Princess Patricia. During the most critical period in the history of our country it was fortunate that we had in our councils His Royal Highness, with his experience, mature judgment and splendid patriotism. We welcome, however, to our country the head of one of the most historic houses in Britain, and believe that in His Excellency the Duke of Devonshire we have a worthy successor to our late Governor General. In this connection it is interesting to know that when this Dominion was in the making, about 1865, his father, Lord Edward Cavendish, was for some time a resident of Canada as an officer in the Rifle Brigade, then a part of the British garrison in Canada, and stationed in Hamilton, a part of which city I represent here.

To the Duchess of Devonshire, we bid an especial welcome. She is no stranger to Canada, and we feel that her residence in this country, during the period when her father, that veteran statesman, Lord Lansdowne, represented the Crown here, has made a bond of union with us that her present residence will enhance.

The third year of the world's greatest war, and we hope the last, finds Canada's participation of such magnitude and importance as to call forth the admiration of our allies and neutral nations, and even astonishes us, who at the outbreak of hostilities, never dreamed that we possessed the military and financial resources that we have put into the combat. If any member of this parliament had at that momentous session of August, 1914, expressed the opinion that we would, during the war, enlist an army of 400,000 men, transport 300,000 to Europe, place and maintain in the fighting line four divisions, finance from our own resources the enormous expenditure for the maintenance of this army, create credits for the British Government of $250,000,000, manufacture for the allies a billion dollars of war supplies, he would have been designated a dreamer, or even a stronger term would have been used. But Canada has done this and more. Under the leadership of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), the Canadian people have played, and will continue to play, an effective and glorious part in the great fight against militarism and for the preservation and consolidation of

the Empire. Let me take this opportunity to pay tribute to the valour of our Canadian troops. They have proven their worth in the desperate fighting on the West Front and shown themselves worthy to fight alongside the veterans of France and England. They have met the much vaunted Prussian Guard and at Ypres, Festubert, St. Eloi, Zillebeke and the Somme, have shown their superiority.

When I heard, Sir, the eloquent tribute of the Prime Minister to the late Colonel Harry Baker, I thought it should not rest there, but that this House should recognize, in a fitting memorial, the fact that he was the first member of the House of Commons, to make the supreme sacrifice in this great struggle.

Coming from the part of Canada that I do, I think I am justified in speaking of the courage and sacrifice of our troops, There are ten military districts in Canada and the one from which I come has furnished nearly twenty-five per cent of the enlistments. From my own constituency of Wentworth over 3,000 men have joined the colours and nearly as many more have volunteered but failed to pass the rigid examination. We have paid the price in the loss of scores of our best and bravest, but our people are undaunted and are giving, and will continue to give, in men and money to the utmost of our resources. In my constituency, the county insures the life of every soldier from our county funds, we give four thousand dollars a month from the same source to the patriotic funds and the voluntary contributions exceed even this amount. In addition large sums have been subscribed to the Belgian Relief, the Red Cross Society and Sailors Aid. In a three days' campaign held last week for the city of Hamilton and Wentworth Patriotic Fund the sum of $500,000 was aimed at and about $700,000 raised. The chairman of this Fund received a cheque for $5,000 from a Cleveland firm, accompanied by these words: "We feel sure that most Americans realize that Britain and her Allies are fighting the battle of civilization and it is as much our cause as any one's" —a practical and true expression of the American people.

I cannot let this opportunity pass without paying tribute to the splendid spirit of Canadian womanhood. No greater courage has been shown by our troops in France, than has been shown by their mothers, wives and sisters at home—working, waiting, praying. Their's is the hardest part.

[Mr. G. C. Wilson.]

With us they are all at work—in the patriotic societies, in munition plants, in caring for the wounded and invalided who have returned. Canada's part in the war has been great and glorious, and no factor contributed more to this result than the courageous women of our country.

This country must deal justly and generously with the men, and the dependents of the men, who have fought our fight in this great war. The revised scale of pensions made by a joint committee last session has, I believe, been generally found satisfactory. In the treatment and care of returned soldiers great advances have been made, and the experience gained in the early stages of the war has been utilized to the best advantage. It is a great problem, the care and rehabilitation of those who have suffered. They must be dealt with generously, and fitted for a return to civil life, educated and instructed for suitable occupations. I understand the Government has prepared a land settlement policy that will give occupation to those who wish to engage in agricultural pursuits, and that they have consulted with the provincial governments to this end. But placing the returned soldier on the land is not alone sufficient. He must be protected and encouraged until his success is assured. These men who have served the Empire have given years of their lives, have sacrificed positions and business, have made such an abrupt break in their usual vocations that they must start life over again. They and the dependents of those who have fallen are the wards of the nation, and as the nation deals with them, so in a great measure, will a strong and enduring patriotic spirit be maintained in this country. Where education to fit men for new occupations is necessary, it must be given to them. There must not now, nor in the years to come, be permitted any case of a man who served and suffered, or the dependent of one who made the supreme sacrifice, being pointed out as an object of charity. This country must keep faith with its defenders.

Speaking for my own district, I can say that we welcomed the steps taken by the Government to secure a national stock-taking of the man power and natural resources of the country. From the splendid reception accorded the Prime Minister in his long tour across the continent advocating this proposal, I feel convinced that all Canada welcomed such an innovation. That it is necessary is evidenced by the action

of the Prime Minister, who, even with the great and pressing problems he must deal with daily, considered it imperative that he should give his earnest advocacy to the scheme. Three weeks after Canada had announced the appointment of a Director of National Service, came a similar announcement from Great Britain. War has taught us many lessons, and none more forcibly than the necessity of the mobilization and direction of the man power of the Empire. It was the present Prime Minister of Great Britain who a few weeks after the outbreak of the war gave the slogan, 'Business as usual." No longer do we hear that cry. The whole business of the Empire now is the winning of the war. England has felt the necessity of the proper direction of her man power to achieve results. Equal to four divisions of the army have been brought back to England from France, because they could serve the great cause at home, better than in the trenches. Men necessary to the production of munitions, equipment, and all that makes for the success of the army, must be kept at the occupations where they can serve best. A national inventory is necessary. In the ultimate analysis, the utilization of the knowledge, skill and science of each individual Canadian, in the avenue of effort for which he is best fitted by training and experience, and the co-ordination of these efforts of our people is the best way to obtain results. The Government is making an inventory of the man power of the Dominion. It is also making an inventory of our natural resources, and to that end they have appointed Professor MacCallum of Toronto University, and associated with him, some of our greatest scientists, to formulate plans how these can best be used for the benefit of the State. We have in Ontario an example of the benefit to the State and to the individual of intelligent development of our resources. Compare the Western Ontario of fifteen years ago with the same district to-day; the wonderful advancement in the industrial and agricultural development can be attributed in a great measure to the intelligent development of our water-powers and the distribution of electric energy. What position would the manufacturers of Ontario be in to-day were it not for the " white coal " of Niagara? In the district from which I come there is to-day a most serious shortage of coal. Some misconceptions may have arisen as to the object of the national inventories of man power and natural resources, but such is always the case with any innovation. I feel confident, however, that time will justify the wisdom of these policies by the good results that will accrue to the state and to the individual.

I desire to touch briefly on the financial stability of Canada, and here allow me to congratulate the Minister of Finance upon his great success in financing this war. That it has been a pleasant surprise as well as a source of pride to all true Canadians, goes without saying. The confidence of the Finance Minister in the Canadian people has been more than reciprocated by the strong approval of the course he has pursued, as expressed in their over-subscribing to the war loans. The war has taught us our financial strength. It would have been a bold man who in 1914 would have prophesied that we would place enormous federal loans in Canada. Previous to the courageous policy of the Finance Minister we looked entirely to London for our financial requirements. Now we meet them at home, and in addition, create enormous credits for the purchase of supplies in Canada by the Imperial Government. To maintain this position we must practice thrift and economy so earnestly advocated by the Finance Minister. Extravagant and unnecessary expenditure will deprive Canada and the Empire of the most potent weapon in winning the war. Canadians are prosperous, and the result of that prosperity should be placed at the service of the State. A great Canadian financier has aptly described the situation and its demands on the state and citizen, in these words:

> Thrift for the individual is excellent, but just now, that is of minor importance. Thrift for the sake of Canada, thrift for the sake of the Empire, thrift to win the war, should be our cry. We shall not fail for men, difficult as enlistment may be. We shall not fail because of inability to make or procure war supplies. If we fail, it will be because we have wasted on unnecessary things the money that would have won the war. The man or woman who works hard at making shells may take much comfort in helping to win the war, but the man or woman who, in addition, saves a part of the present high wages due to the war and buys a war security, or helps a bank to do so, has helped twice, and the second kind of help is the most vital. The manufacturers of the United States will make war supplies for money. We are doing better only if we supply them on credit.

Nearly fifty years ago the first parliament of the Dominion assembled. In it were the statesmen who had brought under one government, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. These

men, Macdonald, Brown, Cartier, Tupper and others whose loyalty, determination, and courage laid the foundation of the present great Dominion, have been justified in their work by the growth, solidity and importance of this country. Confederation saw four provinces, with little common interest except loyalty to the Crown, brought into union; a half century has passed and the Canada of 1867 is now a mighty empire, stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, one-half of North America, comprising all the British possessions on this continent except Newfoundland. And, Sir, I know I voice the desire of all, when I express the hope that that ancient colony, from union of fighting forces with us in the Empire's cause, will seriously consider complete union in government and thus make British North America one dominion. I believe even in this time of stress the fiftieth anniversary of Confederation should not be allowed to pass without some fitting commemoration of the event. The fathers of Confederation laid the foundation of a vaster country than they believed possible at the time. Then Canada was a colony of Great Britian; to-day she is a partner in world affairs, whether of peace or of war.

A little over fifty years ago representatives from the four provinces met in London to consummate Confederation. Then there were doubts as to the stability of the proposed union; even as to the worth of overseas Dominions to the Empire. What a change in fifty years. Within a few weeks there will be another conference in London, when representatives from the overseas dominions will sit in the councils of the Empire determining the best policy to pursue to win victory in the great world's war, and with that victory, the preservation and strengthening of the bonds of Empire. What imperial or colonial statesmen in 1867 would have even dreamed that within such a brief period the overseas dominions would have won a partnership in the great British Empire? I know that the Prime Minister can assure the representatives of the motherland and of the overseas dominions that Canada is prepared to assume the responsibility of Empire for the future, in the same or even to a greater degree than she has done during the past three years.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to quote the message of the respected leader of the Opposition as given to the public in the recent issue of the official publication of his party and reprinted in the Toronto Globe of Friday last. The right hon. gentleman says:

> Let us here and now sink passions, prejudices, vain and idle recriminations. Let us, when criticism is needed, criticise without bitterness, only by appeals to reason, and above all, let us bend all our energies toward making Canada an effective factor in the struggle.

Those, Sir, are the sentiments that have actuated the people of my constituency since the outbreak of the war, or they could not have given as freely of their manhood and wealth as they have. They have sunk party passions and prejudices; they have not indulged in vain and idle recriminations; they have had but one object—the winning of the war. And, Sir, the places where the people have been guided by these sentiments can easily be ascertained by an examination of the recruiting returns and the contributions to the various patriotic funds.

In conclusion, let me express my firm belief in the success of the allied cause. That success is assured; its early realization is dependent upon ourselves and the citizens of the allied countries. To make 1917 the year of decisive victory we must give freely of our resources, and co-ordinate our efforts to secure the best results. I can but speak of my own district, but in that part of Canada every one is working in harmony and has but one object—the victory that means a lasting peace. Anything that would tend to divert attention or divide efforts to secure this object would not meet the wishes of my constituents. We are united in this object; we will fight our private battles when we have won the victory for which we all are now striving. We are fighting for national existence; we are fighting against German aggression and militarism; we are fighting in the interests of humanity and civilization; we are fighting for a just cause; we are fighting for a lasting and abiding peace and until, in the Providence of God, we have secured the same, Nelson's historic message should be our's, namely, "England expects every man will do his duty.

Mr. J. A. DESCARRIES (Jacques-Cartier) (translation): Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion of my honourable colleague, the member for Wentworth (Mr. G. C. Wilson) who has moved that an address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to the speech delivered by His Excellency to a joint meeting of the members of the Senate and the House

of Commons at the opening of this Parliament.

I wish to congratulate the hon. member on the splendid address to which we have just listened. He has shown himself equal to the task imposed on him both by the importance of the questions with which he had to deal and the solemnity of the occasion on which he addressed the House.

I must, therefore, Mr. Speaker, ask your indulgence and that of the hon. members for my audacity in rising in my turn to speak before this awesome assembly, having as an audience the men in Canada who are best gifted with eloquence and its most distinguished citizens. Mr. Speaker, I cannot enter into an explanation of the reasons for my approval of the sentiments expressed in the speech from the Throne without first of all referring to the heavy toll taken by the grim reaper from our midst since last session. Naturally I recall the memory of the late Postmaster General, the hon. Thomas Chase Casgrain. Alas, who could have foreseen when we parted last spring that such a polished gentleman, a politician of great renown, a famous lawyer, a truly patriotic Canadian, a citizen all devoted to his country and the Empire, would depart so soon, stricken down suddenly in his full vigour and the full maturity of his intellect. Let us bow reverently to the decrees of Providence and find in his life an encouragement ever to tread the path of honour and cultivate a love for all good and noble causes.

Mr. Speaker, the Reaper has snatched other victims from our ranks. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Baker) is not in his seat. He has fallen on the field of honour, felled by his country's enemies. I miss also the faces of our distinguished colleagues, the member for London (Mr. Gray) and the member for Stanstead (Mr. Lovell). These also has death mowed down. For the memory of each of our lamented friends let us give a kind thought, while we also offer to their disconsolate relatives our most heartfelt sympathies.

Mr. Speaker, after mourning over our cherished departed let us turn our thoughts to the living present. I learned with much pleasure that by the unanimous voice of your colleagues you had been appointed to the first Commoner of the land. The distinction is of the highest, but it is well deserved indeed. Your parliamentary record, your gentlemanly bearing, the high standard of your life, your profound knowledge of constitutional law, of which we have had frequent instances during your career as a member of this House and as deputy Speaker, left no alternative to your fellow-members but to appoint you to the presidential chair. Allow me to congratulate you most heartily and to offer my very best wishes that success may crown your tenure. I am convinced that by your impartial control of debates, your term of office will not only prove honourable but also useful to this House and to the country at large.

Congratulations and wishes are also due your hon. predecessor, the new Minister of Inland Revenue, the ex-member for Dorchester (Mr. Sevigny); but his duties keep him at present out of the House. I look forward to another occasion to express to him my congratulations and wish to him, a brilliant career in the Government, a career replete with honour to himself and fruitful of good results for his country and particularly for the province of Quebec of which he becomes officially a representative in the Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, His Royal Highness, the Duke of Connaught, left Canada after his governorship had expired with the regard and regrets of the whole Canadian people. He won the admiration of all by remaining a truly constitutional representative of the Crown, a statesman imbued with the true spirit of royalty and fully comprehending the ideals of the Canadian subjects of His Majesty. And all regret his departure, because during his stay in this country, he won not only our respect, but also our affection and our devotion, which take their source in our steadfast loyalty to the great Empire, which he represented in our midst.

True we have lost an illustrious Governor, but it has been our good fortune to see vice-royalty entrusted to a noble lord, who will not hesitate to follow in the footsteps of his distinguished predecessor. His Excellency the Duke of Devonshire has already won the confidence of the people of this country. I feel convinced that under his wise and enlightened administration, Canada will continue its onward march towards its glorious destiny.

Mr. Speaker, the Address delivered by His Excellency gives some indication of the Government's policy. According to our political constitution, His Excellency's advisers are responsible for every one of his official pronouncements. The speech is therefore expressive of the policy of the Government of which the right hon. Sir R. L. Borden is the head.

Are the suggestions therein contained wise and desirable? Is the legislation proposed such as to meet the issues with which Canada is confronted today? Has the public treasury been entrusted to faithful trustees? Has Canada done its duty in the frightful war in which it has to participate? Has sufficient attention been given to the aftermath of the struggle, so that the country's onward march may not be checked? Is Canada prosperous? Is the Government striving to improve existing conditions? Are means being taken to alleviate the burdens which the nation has to bear in the present extraordinary circumstances? To all those questions I answer unhesitatingly in the affirmative. When, Mr. Speaker, were there to be found in this country a Prime Minister and a government which had to face the tremendous difficulties which the present Government has to solve? For two years past Europe has been devastated by the most terrible war which is recorded in history. An emperor, reigning over a domineering people, has risen in his pride, dragging after him other potentates. Without reason, through sheer spirit of conquest, moved by an unbridled ambition, he threw his horses against Belgium and France, hoping to make an easy prey of those two countries. God was watching over the Franks. From all sides the nations of the the Old World rushed on to the battlefield. Russia, Italy, Japan, Portugal, Montenegro, Serbia, Rumania took up arms and went to meet the invaders.

Well, Mr. Speaker, could the great Empire of which we are part and parcel, could the British Empire whose glorious flag has been unfurled on every sea and every continent, remain neutral in the struggle for the freedom of the world? Casting aside forever old rivalries centuries old which had prevented her from extending to France the hand of friendship, Great Britain took sides with her southern neighbours. Her soldiers went over to France, and shed their blood alongside the French soldiers and from their united sacrifice has sprung victories which have startled the world and repelled the invader.

England's navy has patrolled the seas, cleared of German ships the highways of trade and bottled the Hun vessels in the Kiel canal. At an enormous cost, England has put under arms an army of 5,000,000 men. To her dominions beyond the seas she appealed for assistance. Canada has nobly answered the call. Our country has equipped nearly four hundred thousand men, three hundred thousand of whom are already overseas or on the battlefields of Europe. The Old World stands amazed at the valiance of our troops. The echoes of Ypres, Saint-Julien, Festubert, Langemark, Saint-Eloi, la Somme, Courcelette, Salonica, the Dardanelles are resounding with their glorious deeds. Our boys, our sons, our brothers, some of our colleagues, have proven to the world that on the shores of the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes, on our western prairies and in the country of Evangeline, on the borders of the southern republic and amidst the Arctic floes, there lives a young people who remembers the valorous exploits of Wolfe and Montcalm, who has treasured the ideals of its forebears, whose soul has been moulded after that of the great nations from which it sprung, and who makes it its duty to do its share in the frightful war which, for the safety of the world and the preservation of the freedom of nations, must have no other issue but victory accomplished by our motherlands, France and England, with the help of their powerful Allies.

The Government which had to face such tremendous issues and responsibilities, has done its duty nobly and firmly; such has been its grasp of the situation, that political parties disappeared and Parliament, without a dissentient voice, voted with enthusiasm and loyalty to the Empire the necessary moneys to send our volunteers to the front, and the hundred millions of dollars necessary for their maintenance and equipment.

I therefore wonder, Mr. Speaker, at the discordant echoes which are to be heard to-day in Dorchester, from Liberal quarters, on the eve of the election which is made necessary on account of the death of the late lamented Postmaster General. Doubtless we shall hear from the right hon. leader of the Opposition and his party that they disavow the conspiracy of the young politician whose conduct on this occasion is prejudicial to Canada's determination to put forth every possible effort to win the war, when victory requires the whole energy of the country.

Mr. Speaker, the imperious needs of the struggle have suggested to certain individuals and to certain newspapers the possibility of the Government establishing obligatory military service. Should I say that the right hon. Prime Minister and many of his colleagues have refused to consider the suggestion and have stated that the Government had given the subject no thought. I believe, in any case, Mr. Speaker, and I think I am voicing the opinion of the

majority of the hon. members in stating that the constitution of the country forbids sending our soldiers to fight outside of Canada, without special legislation being enacted in this House and that no such legislation altering the very basis of our constitution would be enacted without its being first submitted to the people of Canada. No, Mr. Speaker, there can be no question of conscription. Obligatory enlistment is not needed. The people of Canada have given noble proof of their loyalty. Freely and voluntarily, four hundred thousand men have already answered the call. If they are required, one hundred thousand more will follow of their own free will. And thus the Prime Minister will have given to the Empire and the allied nations a royal and magnificent contribution to restore the peace of the world, which, let us hope, Providence will soon grant to Europe.

Mr. Speaker, it does happen that the very best intentions are misconstrued. The Government, as is referred to in the speech from the Throne, has undertaken to organize the national service with a vigour to put to better use our natural resources. In many quarters, this scheme has been misinterpreted, connecting the proposal with the bugbear of conscription, they concluded that the Government's purpose was to bring about conscription either military or industrial. The Prime Minister, the leader of the Opposition, members of this House, bishops, provincial ministers have raised their voices, they have explained the scheme, and stated that national service had nothing to do with military conscription; that it meant only the organization of labour in all its spheres. Always people will be found who will not harken to logic, or, I dare say, Mr. Speaker, who try to find in this proposal a pretext to turn the people against the Government and make petty political capital, as is being done in Dorchester, out of a project which, if carried out, will have an immense influence on the future progress and prosperity of Canada; not launching it on the war-path, but along the highroad of commercial, agricultural and industrial development and all the other fields of national energy.

Mr. Speaker, it is stated in the Address of His Excellency that the prime ministers of the Dominions have been invited to take part in the conferences to be held in England for the purpose of discussing matters connected with the war. The Dominions are honoured thereby. But the honour has been well deserved, if one takes into account their unflinching loyalty and the sacrifices they have made in men and money. The ties that bind us to the mother country have been cemented by the blood of our boys. In the future, our voice will be heard in the Parliament of Nations for the maintenance of peace, because we have paid our full share of human lives to obtain the supreme result.

It may be, Mr. Speaker, that in those conferences our position in the Empire after the war is over will be discussed. The subject is full of anxiety and serious speculation for any Canadian who loves his country and who sees those weighty problems already looming up. I feel convinced that the right hon. Prime Minister who presides over Canada's welfare with such tact and firmness, with love for his country and loyalty to the British Empire will approach these great questions with all the prudence that characterizes all his public acts and that he will not allow any change in our status in the Empire without the consent of the people of Canada.

His Excellency reminds us that the life of the present Parliament will expire next October. In that case, general elections are in order within a short time. How then could the Prime Minister leave the management of the country's business to go to England to take part in the war conference? Is it reasonable that he should be forced to throw the country into an electoral turmoil while war is raging and his whole attention should be devoted to one single aim, so to say: ultimate victory.

There is to be no election in England during the war. Even the ministers recently chosen have been relieved of the obligation of returning before the people to have the selection ratified. I am not surprised then, Sir, of the announcement made by the Government that a resolution will be submitted for authority to ask the Parliament of the United Kingdom to pass an Act for the continuance in office of this Parliament. Moreover, it is but a further extension of the delay we requested last session. No possible change could justify our throwing the country into the confusion of a general election in which political passions play such an important part and which might divert the minds of the people from the great end it is serving by helping the Empire. I am therefore convinced that this resolution will be unanimously passed by the House; it is of public urgency and necessary for the safety of Canada and of the Empire.

With His Excellency, we must, Sir, thank Providence for the abundant crop with which Canada has been favoured last season. Our agricultural population has been richly rewarded by its labours. Our generous soil has nothing to refuse to the industrious and intelligent husbandman. Our rural population is happy. They have abundant means as the result of their labours, and our public institutions protect their rights and liberties. Doubtless, as everywhere else, difficulties may arise from time to time. But with good will, public spirit and patriotism, peace must finally reign supreme where intolerance and nefarious ambition sought their ends.

His Excellency told us, Sir, that the financial, commercial and industrial conditions of Canada were of the best. Who could have thought, in fact, that in the very midst of the war, we could show a surplus of about $80,000,000? This has never been seen before, in full time of peace and prosperity.

Our trade has expanded in an extraordinary way. Our industrial development has attained undreamt of proportions. All the statistics will doubtless be submitted to us in the course of the debate on the Address.

Have we not there, Sir, an evident proof of the progressive administration of the country's affairs by the present Government. I well know that the political tactics of the opponents of the Government lead them to spread all kinds of accusations among the public. But is there a single one of such charges which has been connected with a member of the Cabinet? Inquiries have been held both by committees appointed in this House or chosen from the judiciary. The Government came out unscathed. I ask you, Sir, and I ask every thinking man free from party bonds, can the political history of Canada show us that at any time, whether in peace or war, there has been an Administration more economical, more energetic, more prosperous and in better accord with the aspirations of the electors and of the people of Canada.

We shall, therefore, Sir, vote the various estimates for the next fiscal year, knowing well that they will be wisely applied by the Government to promote the welfare and prosperity of the country.

His Excellency has reminded us of the approaching date of the fiftieth anniversary of the birth of our Canadian Confederation, and tells us that notwithstanding the continuance of the war, there should be an appropriate commemoration of an event so notable in our history.

This cannot but be most agreeable to this House and to the people of Canada. Who could remain indifferent to the splendid showing of our country to-day? Fifty years ago, four provinces sparsely peopled and of meagre resources existed without any common bond in the vast territory of British North America. Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Upper and Lower Canada joined together on the 1st of July, 1867 and formed the Canadian Confederation.

Our country to-day comprises nine provinces extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the forty-fifth degree of latitude to the North Pole. This immense territory is peopled by over 8,000,000 inhabitants, and could give life and happiness to a population of 100,000,000 souls.

With what great enthusiasm shall public gratitude proclaim the hallowed names of the fathers of confederation: of Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir George Etienne Cartier, Sir Charles Tupper, Sir Etienne Pascal Taché, Sir Leonard Tilley, Hon. Darcy McGee and of numerous others who are not so highly renowned, but whose deeds and works history will report.

I am then assured that this hon. House will welcome any measure proposed for the worthy celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of Confederation. Our nation shall offer to the world the spectacle of a united people commemorating the glorious episodes of its history. No race rivalry will cloud the beautiful sky of our land. All Canadians, whether English or French blood flows in their veins, will then clasp hands in friendship, with the resolution to live in peace and harmony forever, in this country of Canada.

Our land is so vast and its soil so fruitful, its sun so warm and its resources so abundant that the sons of its first settlers, English and French, may live together without jealousy and antagonism, but with sentiments of sincere fraternity, each offering homage to the Almighty according to his creed and in the language of his ancestors.

The speech from the Throne, Sir, concludes by alluding to the fine courage and the inflexible purpose which have animated all His Majesty's Dominions in upholding the great cause for which we are fighting with the rest of the Empire.

This proves that the Government is ready to do its duty to the very end. The nation has supported the Administration and shall continue to support it without hesitation.

Is it to be wondered that prior to the war opinions differed on that point? But to-day, with the terrifying sight of nation rushing against nation in appalling battles that ruin the countries, decimate their manhood, and even reduce their population to serfdom; when military despotism aims at enslaving the liberty of nations; who dare remain indifferent and refuse to answer the call of our mother-countries for assistance? Before taking up arms in self-defence shall we then wait until we are in the fetters of the foe? To run to the aid of the Empire and France, must we wait until the power of those great countries has been shaken in its very foundations? No, Mr. Speaker, Canada stands unflinching in its determination. Victory alone will put a stop to our endeavours. His Majesty's loyal Opposition deserve our thanks for the support they have given in the past to all our war legislation. Following the example of His Excellency, who concluded his address by praying that the Divine blessing may attend our deliberations, allow me, Mr. Speaker, as I chose, to invoke the God of Hosts, the Divine Protector of Canada, France and the British Empire to bestow on our arms the strength that ensures victory, on Canada the blessing of prosperity and on the Canadian people continued happiness.

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in seconding the motion of the honourable member for Wentworth, who moved that an address be adopted expressing to His Excellency the Governor General the thanks of this House for his Address at the opening of this session.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, in the two addresses to which it has been our privilege as well as our pleasure to listen, there was very little to which exception might be taken; and, if there were anything from which I might be tempted to differ, it is not my intention on this occasion to enter into controversy upon it. Occasions of controversy will arise in due course, when the measures of the Government come up for discussion. There was much, very much, in these addresses on which the House will be happy to express commendation and present its congratulations to the two hon. members. Particularly timely and well-conceived were the remarks of my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. G. C. Wilson) upon the departure of His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught. If the hon. gentleman will permit me to say so, I very much admire the tenor of his speech on that point; what he said on the subject could not have been better said.

It has often been remarked, but not too often, that Canada has been particularly fortunate in the character of those who have been selected to be the representatives of the royal authority. They have all been men of great eminence, whether eminence by character or eminence by ability, and most of them have been eminent for both ability and character. It is due to those who have occupied that high office to say when they had fulfilled their term and the time came for them to sever their connection with us, they carried with them the gratitude, the esteem, the respect of all classes of the community. But, Sir, I think I am within the mark when I say that no Governor General who ever left our shores was followed with so much of the blessings and the affection of the people of Canada as was His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught. Undoubtedly, the peculiar enthusiasm with which His Royal Highness was received by us when he came to preside over the destinies of Canada was due to the fact that he belonged to the royal family. But if he left the shores of Canada with a more than usual share of the gratitude and respect of the Canadian people, his connection with the royal family was not the only cause—the main cause was his own personal qualities; his devotion to duty; his high sense of honour; his simple, affable manners; and, if I may say so,—and I think I may say so rightly —his straightforward, democratic ways.

And if the whole truth is to be told, I believe everybody will agree with me that in the impression which he made in Canada he himself was not the sole factor; a great deal was due also to his gracious consort, a lady who, in her high station, gave, during the time she was with us, an example of those domestic virtues ever dear to the British heart. There had been a rumour prevalent for a long time that when the invitation from high quarters came to His Royal Highness to become Governor General of Canada he hesitated, as his personal interest would have kept him in England, and it was understood that he had accepted the office for a period of not more than two years. I do not know to what extent that rumour may be well founded, but it seems to have had some foundation, because, as will be remembered, announcement was made in the session of 1914 that His Royal Highness was to close his connection with the governorship of Canada during that year. On the day of prorogation in the Month of May, 1914, the two Houses

of Parliament presented an address of appreciation for his eminent services during his stay amongst us, and on that occasion he bade an official farewell to the people of Canada. But before the date set for his departure war broke out, and then, it is understood, at the request of high authorities, he consented to remain for the duration of the war. When the usual term of five years had expired, for reasons unknown to me, and as to which I have no opinion to offer, it was thought preferable to follow the usual course and to appoint a successor to His Royal Highness. "The King is dead, long live the King!" Such was the form by which, under the old French monarchy, announcement was made to the people of the close of one reign and the beginning of another. In these words we might well express our welcome to the Duke of Devonshire. Following the long line of precedent, the British authorities have sought a Governor General of Canada from the most illustrious families of the realm. The Duke of Devonshire has the honour of being the bearer of a name made famous by a long line of statesmen, who, for centuries, and especially in the time of the Stuarts, have been prominently connected with the events which have brought England to the proud position she occupies to-day. The family to which he belongs has in all generations displayed those qualities of firmness, moderation and courage, qualities which certainly afford a splendid augury for the welfare of the Canadian people. It was not our fortune to be acquainted with His Excellency the Duke of Devonshire otherwise than by reputation. We knew of his family, but we did not know him. We are more fortunate in the case of Her Excellency the Duchess of Devonshire. We had known her when she was a young girl in the house of her father, when he occupied Rideau Hall as Governor General of Canada. Again she takes up her residence in Rideau Hall, but now as the lady of the manor, and she can feel assured that to her we offer a double welcome for the sake of auld lang syne.

It is the misfortune of the Duke of Devonshire, our new Governor General, and it is our misfortune that on the occasion when he first opened the session of the Canadian Parliament we should still live under the shadow of the terrible struggle which has been going on now for thirty months, and which is still extending the circle of its baneful activities. It would be beneath our own dignity, it would be unworthy of the place we wish to occupy in this war, if we were to close our eyes to the stern realities, if we were to view the situation in any other than its true light, or to indulge hopes which events might not justify. We must confess that the expectations which the splendid opening of the campaign of 1916 had caused were not realized—because the campaign of 1916 did open most splendidly. It opened with the roar of the guns at Verdun, where the Crown Prince of Germany, day after day, week after week, and month after month was launching the flower of the German army against that noble fortress. After six months of this terrible battering he had to abandon the contest and withdraw into his own lines, having left on the hills of Verdun no less than 500,000 men. These figures are appalling in their immensity, but, appalling as they are, there is every reason to believe that by actual computation they would be found to be well within the reality. Then followed the offensive on the river Somme, when the Allied nations of England and France made a dash upon the German trenches and swept the enemy back several miles, with immense losses to the Germans in men and material. On the eastern front the campaign opened by an attempt of the Austrians to invade Italy. That attempt was easily repulsed. The Austrians were thrown back across the mountains into Austria, and the Russians in Asia Minor and in the Balkans carried on successful operations almost in the heart of that country. And then came the entrance of Rumania into the contest, an event that had long been looked for. We had hoped that it would come, and when it came we were inclined to look upon it as portending the beginning of the end. But, alas, our expectations in that respect have been sadly disappointed. After a few months fighting Rumania has been invaded and its capital taken; it has met the same fate as that of Belgium and Poland. I should add that, on the part of the Allies, the only decisive battle during the campaign of 1916 was the resistance at Verdun, which caused to the enemy a loss of something like 500,000 men and gave them no compensating advantage. On the other side, it must be admitted that the overrunning of Rumania by the German armies gave them a new prestige, and we know that prestige in war always counts. But, Sir, though this is the case, is there any reason to be discouraged? Is there any reason why we should not hope? On the contrary, it seems to me that there are circumstances which may lead us confidently to expect that at the end of this year, 1917, we shall see

the beginning of the great victory for which we have been fighting during the last thirty months. What are the reasons for this hope? Sir, there are not a few evidences that the vital forces of the enemy are commencing to give way. Though at this moment, the beginning of the year 1917, Germany is still in possession of Belgium and a sixth part of France, of Serbia, and a large part of Rumania, evidences are percolating through the severe German censorship that Germany is being invaded by two foes more formidable and more dangerous even than soldiers and guns: these foes are famine and exhaustion. The attempt, made only some weeks ago, by the German Government to enter into peace negotiations goes far to justify this expectation. The language of the German Chancellor when he made these overtures of peace was not the same language that we heard in 1914. Arrogant it was, but not the same kind of arrogance that characterized his tone in 1914. To-day we do not hear that the Germans are fighting to dominate the world. To-day their appeal to the people of Germany is that they are fighting for their fatherland; that they are fighting to maintain their existence as a country. Far different language this from that which we heard only thirty months ago. It is evident, however, from the tone of the German Chancellor's overtures, that he still poses as a conqueror. Sir, it is not usual for the victor to be the one to offer peace or to talk peace. Instances, however, have occurred where he who claimed to be the victor saw approaching a new danger perhaps more formidable than the one which he had just overcome. Napoleon is the most striking example of them all. In 1812 Napoleon had invaded Russia. He had carried everything before him. He had reached Moscow, the old capital, the holy city of all the Russias, and from the Kremlin, the palace of the old Czars, he offered a peace to his opponent. What was it that prompted Napoleon, himself an insatiable conqueror, to adopt that course? Was it magnanimity? Was it a sudden horror of shedding blood? No; we know that nothing of that kind ever interfered with Napoleon's plans. The reason was that he saw fast approaching another enemy far more formidable to him than those whom he had just overcome, and that enemy was the Russian winter. The Emperor of Russia refused all overtures. Events proved that Napoleon had been right in his fear, because the Russian winter did what Russian armies had failed to do—indeed, could not have done. The Russian winter simply annihilated the army of Napoleon. Though he continued the great struggle, he never recovered from that blow, which was his first step towards St. Helena.

There is a similarity between the position of Napoleon in 1812 and that of Germany in 1917, in that another enemy has to be faced whose presence has not been anticipated. Last year, speaking upon this subject, I ventured to say that in my humble judgment the only complete victory which had been won up to that time had been won by the British Navy. After the passing of a year I think I can repeat that the only complete victory which is being won in this war is the victory which is being achieved by the British Navy.

When I said so last year, I did not refer to the engagements which had taken place from time to time, and in which the British navy had participated so successfully. Neither do I refer this year to the battle of Jutland when the German navy dared to come out from cover, soon again to seek cover in order to avoid the victorious pounding of the fleet of Sir David Beatty. No, what I refer to is the unseen, silent, relentless pressure of the British navy upon the trade and commerce and resources of the enemy. I refer to the silent pressure of the British navy, whose powerful grip is slowly, surely, effectively strangling the vitality of the enemy; and there is every reason to believe that with further efforts on our part, whatever may be its success on land, undoubtedly the German nation must come to her knees because of that silent, unseen pressure of the British navy.

The speech from the Throne refers to the offers of peace on the part of the German Government. The Allies have met the offer in the only way it could be met. They have refused to go into conference until they know the terms upon which Germany would negotiate. They went further: They even placed upon the table the terms upon which they are ready to have peace, and by their answer they have shown that they are ready this day, any day, to negotiate for peace, which shall not be simply a truce to be broken again at the option, will, caprice, or ambition of any party, but a peace which shall be founded upon the rights of mankind, upon freedom and justice, and which shall lift humanity and civilization to a still higher level than before the war.

His Excellency in his speech states:

The Canadian forces dispatched overseas during 1916 numbered more than 165,000 and the aggregate of enlistments in Canada since the outbreak of war is nearly 400,000.

Then His Excellency says:

In attack as well as in defence the valour, endurance and resourcefulness of the Canadian troops have been conspicuous on every occasion when they have met the enemy, and they have splendidly upheld the highest traditions of their country.

Every word of this is true, and it is very well said. Sir, it is not a vain boast for us to say that the conduct of our young volunteers upon the battlefield has been a cause not only of wonder, but even of surprise. It is a fact well known in history, known by all the experience of wars, that the first shock of battle is always a severe ordeal for young recruits. Old generals, experienced officers, will not place upon young recruits the same reliance that they place upon veterans; but our young Canadian soldiers have shown from the first that they can fight like veterans. Every one knew that they would do well, nobody expected that they would do so well as they did from the very first. They behaved like veteran soldiers who had known nothing else but the life of a soldier, and, as was referred to a moment ago by my honourable friend in moving the address, they have on more than one occasion done things which must fill the hearts of the Canadian people with pride. In some battles they saved the day by their valour; and it is beyond doubt that at St. Julien it was they who barred the way of the Germans who were at the time not far distant from Calais.

Such has been the conduct of our soldiers, but here the question arises: The soldiers have done everything that could be done; they have done as much as we could expect from them. Have the Government, in a like way, risen to the opportunity and to the occasion? Have they accomplished what they should have accomplished? Have they fulfilled the whole duty which we had a right to expect from them? Sir, the answer to this question is found in the correspondence which was exchanged between my right honourable friend, the Prime Minister, and my honourable friend (Sir Sam Hughes) the late Minister of Militia. Whatever may be said to the contrary, I speak without any passion. If it is said that I am a partisan, I do not deny the impeachment. If anybody will castigate me for that or blame me for that, let him cast the first stone. But, Sir partisans as we

are, I believe that we are all disposed at this time, under the tremendous responsibility which weighs upon all of us, to be fair, and to give justice to whomsoever justice is due. At all events, that is my intention, and I shall leave myself to the judgment of the House as to whether I prove true to that intention.

In the correspondence that has been exchanged the evidence is irresistible, the evidence is abundant, the evidence is positive and incontrovertible that in the council of the Government there was no unity of thought or of action, but there was jarring and friction from the first to the last moment. The cause of the difference, as exposed in the correspondence between the two ministers, was the control of the Canadian troops when they had reached England. The question was, whether those troops, when they had reached England, should continue to be under the control of the Canadian Government represented by the Minister of Militia, or whether they should be under the control of the British War Office. In other words, the question was whether the control of our troops in England should continue to be Canadian control, or whether it was to be British control. I am sorry to say that upon this question there was not that immediate decision which should have taken place; and this is the first reproach which I have to convey to the Government, that on that occasion, instead of being firm and decisive right away and making a decision either one way or the other, the thing was allowed to drag and drag and become confused until the resignation of the Minister of Militia. As to whether it should have been Canadian control as desired by the late Minister of Militia, or whether it should have been British control as desired by others in the Cabinet, I am not here to pass judgment.

I will leave that aside altogether. There may have been and probably there were strong reasons, for one view or the other, but what I assert, and upon this I place myself within the judgment of the House, and of the Canadian people, is that there should have been a decision at once. It should have been a decision for Canadian control, or for British control but there should have been no hesitation upon it. Hesitation is always fatal but hesitation is never so fatal as in war. In the correspondence which I shall refer to in a few moments I shall give chapter and verse. But I wish

to point out that the former Minister of Militia asserted that during the first year he was not in control, that he was hampered and then he says that having submitted for the first year under protest, after great effort, he succeeded in obtaining some control and that then he enacted several important reforms. At all events, the whole matter is very much confused. So confused is it that even on the day which preceded the day of my hon. friend's resignation, there was a controversy upon this point between him and the Prime Minister. The ex-Minister of Militia will pardon me if I say that he does not mince matters as to what he has to say. In a letter which he addressed to the Prime Minister on the first of November last he referred to this complaint again and there he stated that in his administration he had been hampered—hampered by some of his colleagues, and hampered by commissions. My hon. friend on this point as to commissions speaks in no unqualified language. This is what he says, addressing himself to the Prime Minister:

> Permit me to draw your attention to nearly every Commission which has been formed. They look beautiful on paper, but few, if any of them have been anything like perfect in practice. The Hospitals Commission, the Pensions Board and the National Service Commission all seemed lovely when sent out, but every one concerned with them knows of the absurdity therein contained.

That is a judgment in regard to which I think many in this House will not be disposed to differ from my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia, but let that pass. On this occasion he refers again to the fact that he had not control in Great Britain and the Prime Minister has answered him already when he has said:

> So far as I am aware you exercised the same control and direction over the forces in Great Britain during the first year as subsequently.

Then comes the rejoinder of the ex-Minister and it is a rejoinder in which we recognize our friend of old. This is what he writes to the Prime Minister:

> Sir Robert, no one knows better than you that this statement is incorrect. This last year, with the full concurrence of the War Office, our management and direction have been given every consideration, and by their request.

There is between the Prime Minister and his colleague an absolute diversity as to the facts. Which is in the right, and which is in the wrong with regard to them, it is not for me to say, but I repeat that this is a further evidence that during those two years there was constant jarring and friction and no unity of thought or action. The Minister of Militia was at that time engaged in a close controversy with the Prime Minister and he was threatened with dismissal. But he made a further complaint; he made, then and there, the complaint that he had been hampered in his administration not only by commissions, but even by his colleagues, and he framed his complaint in these terms:

> Further, had I ventured to conduct this force on the basis of formal Orders in Council, the first division would not have left Valcartier yet, and you know yourself how, by technicalities, the second division was held up for four months through little petty haggling on the question of motor trucks.

That is pretty direct and pretty positive but it is immediately followed by another letter of the 9th November which contains another and a still more positive statement:

> Moreover—

He says, again addressing himself to the Prime Minister:

> —it is difficult for me to recall where you have actively supported me in the passage of any Order in Council concerning the upbuilding of the militia when opposed by two members of the Cabinet usually antagonistic to anything proposed by me. As you are aware, it took up four months in the midst of this great war to fight through the principles of purchasing, for the second division, trucks at the lowest wholesale prices instead of allowing large commissions to local agents who would have nothing whatever to do with securing the order.

Now, Sir, that is a pretty serious charge. Here is a charge made by the ex-Minister of Militia that for four months he was prevented from sending the second division by the interference of some of his colleagues who were fighting over the principle of purchasing at the lowest prices. I recall very well that the atmosphere at one time was highly charged, that there were charges and counter-charges. I have no opinion to offer, I have no right to express an opinion, but we have the evidence of the ex-minister who says that he was hampered for four months at a time when minutes were as precious as hours and weeks and months. He says that he was prevented from sending the troops of which we were in such need on the battle field. I have only to remark that I have not found in the whole of the correspondence any denial of that statement made by the ex-Minister of Militia.

Now, I come to the main subject. I said a moment ago that the cause of contention

between the Prime Minister and the ex-Minister of Militia and his colleagues was the question of the control of the Canadian forces in Great Britain. It is due to the ex-Minister of Militia to say that he stated forcibly his views and his complaints upon this matter. On the 18th October last the Prime Minister sent to the ex-Minister of Militia a letter enclosing a draft order in council for the reorganization of the Department of Militia and Defence and the control of the forces in Great Britain. The draft order in council is not included in the correspondence but it is manifest from the context that it was an order which was passed at a subsequent period to create a second portfolio of militia in Great Britain and to have two Ministers of Militia, one residing in Canada and one residing in Great Britain. The ex-minister went at length into the whole subject and took occasion to put his case quite fully before the Prime Minister. I call the special attention of the House to the reasons which he gave for claiming the control of the forces in Great Britain. This is what he says:

From the outset I strongly objected to the fact that practically the entire management of our force, our supplies, our equipment, our transport, etc., had been taken completely out of our hands, and was controlled by the British authorities, we, notwithstanding, paying the bill.

In October, 1914, in conversation on the subject with the late Earl Kitchener, he pointed out that the Canadian High Commissioner had intimated to him that it was the desire of the Canadian Government that these troops should be regarded as purely British, and that Canada should have nothing to say in their management while in England or at the front. I drew his attention to Section 177 of the Army Act, and to the spirit and principles of the Constitution, but he again intimated that he understood it was the desire of the Canadian Government that the troops were to be handed over to them absolutely as "British Regulars." To this I objected, and pointed out that I fully believed that our force, under officers of our own selection should, at the front, be under the command of the British Commander-in-Chief, yet the appointment of officers at the front, and the control of everything in connection with the force while in Britain, should be entirely with Canada; but I further stated that I felt in such a great struggle where each was actuated by proper motives, there should be no need of friction.

He goes on:

I do not know whether the Canadian High Commissioner had the authority of the Canadian Government or not; but a day or two later that gentleman, of his own initiative, strongly spoke to me and briefly said: "You do not pretend surely to have anything to do with the Canadian soldiers in Britain." I suggested that he might be well advised to study not alone the Canadian Military Law, but the British Army Act, as well as comprehend the spirit of the Constitution. I felt then, as I feel today, and as I am pleased to say the entire British Government and War Office officers also realize to-day that our officers and men being in the pay of Canada, Canada should absolutely control them in Canada and in Britain, excepting in so far as securing camping grounds is concerned; and at the front for everything excepting the command and general administration under the command.

He goes on to say:

I had to accept, under protest, for the first year, this management of the Force in Britain. The anomaly of such a state of things is apparent. The Canadian soldier in the trenches must voice his complaint, if any, through the Parliament of Canada and the Minister of Militia and Defence must accept responsibility. How could the Canadian soldier obtain redress through the British House of Commons? Kipling's lines hold good:

'Daughter in her Mother's house,
Mistress in her own.'

As well as another standard maxim, 'Taxation implies representation and brings responsibility.'

Sir, let me call the attention of the House to this very remarkable letter. The ex-Minister of Militia says to the Prime Minister that when he went to England for the purpose of looking after the Canadian soldiers, he was told by Lord Kitchener that it was understood that he was not to look after the troops but that they should be handed over and treated like British regulars. He was told also by the High Commissioner that he could not presume to have any control over Canadian troops while they were in England. Is that parliamentary government? Is that constitutional administration? Here is a minister of the Crown told by one of his colleagues in England that he has no authority when he wants to exercise such authority. What does it mean? It means, as I said a moment ago, that there was no unity of purpose, no unity of thought, no unity of action and, when there is no unity, is it possible to expect efficiency? That is the complaint which I have to make. My right hon. friend, in one of his letters to the Minister of Militia, states that at a time when all the energies of the Prime Minister should have been absorbed in the war, they were employed in smoothing out these petty quarrels. Here are his words:

My time and energies, although urgently needed for much more important duties, have been very frequently employed in removing difficulties thus unnecessarily created.

Sir, I can believe that. The Prime Minister had an enormous load upon his shoulders; immense responsibilities to tax his time and energies to the utmost. And

if his time and energy had to be devoted to these petty quarrels, whose fault was it but that of my right hon. friend himself? If he had exercised his proper authority, these petty squabbles would have been avoided, and he would have been free to devote his time and energies to the war.

But there is much more to come. The Minister of Militia and Defence proceeds to give the reason why he insists upon having control. The reason he gives is simply this: that he could administer things better than they were administered in England, and he gives a specific example. Sir, everybody within the sound of my voice is aware that persistent rumours have been coming from England, by everyone who has come back from there during the last two years, that the equipment which the Canadian troops took with them to England, and which was purchased in Canada, had to be scrapped as soon as our troops reached England, and cast aside as of no value whatever. You, Sir, have heard that charge. Everyone has heard it. Well, Sir, it was an extraordinary condition of things if it was true. Here we are in the midst of a great war, incurring an enormous expenditure. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) in his zeal has very properly constituted himself a Peter the Hermit of a Holy Crusade, not only against extravagance, but even against unnecessary expenditure. He has advocated retrenchment on every possible occasion, and he did right; he only did his duty. But while he was preaching economy we have the evidence here, in a letter which I shall quote, that equipment amounting to millions of dollars was cast aside in England as of no value whatever, and all that money was lost. Am I exaggerating? Am I stating a thing which I cannot justify by actual evidence?

5 p.m. I quote from this same letter of the Minister of Militia to the Prime Minister, in reference to the control of the forces, dated the 23rd of October. The Minister of Militia says:

> I spoke to you at the time about the rejection of all our stores and supplies of every description, and proved to you that the excuses—

Mark the word.

> —of the British officers were totally without foundation. You have my memorandum at the time, proving the utter falsity of their bogus excuses regarding our wagons.

Here is the evidence that the Minister of Militia told the Prime Minister what was being done with our equipment and supplies in England. As soon as they reached there, they were scrapped, thrown on the ash heap, and the Minister of Militia says this was done by British officers without any cause whatever. The Minister of Militia in using that language took a very great responsibility upon himself. It is no light charge to make against the British officers that they scrapped all those supplies without any cause whatever. The fact, however, remains that for ten months those supplies continued to be cast aside without the matter being rectified. One of two things is true: either those goods were scrapped or cast aside for cause, or they were cast aside without cause. If they were cast aside for cause, the reflection is upon the Minister of Militia, that he supplied the Canadian troops with unserviceable articles of inferior and unsound quality. If, on the other hand, the Minister of Militia was right, and the British officers were wrong, it is for him to show what the truth was. To-day, however, without knowing whether my hon. friend is right, or whether the British officers were right, the fact remains that for ten months the Minister of Militia continued to send overseas contingent after contingent, division after division, armed and equipped in Canada at great cost, and that as soon as those troops arrived in England, all that equipment was cast aside. For ten months in Canada we continued equipping, and in England the British authorities continued scrapping. This is the condition which we have before us today.

The Minister of Militia stated to the Prime Minister in the same letter that the Pay and Medical services were chaotic, and he added, after Canada had obtained control:

> We have reorganized and reformed the Pay and Medical services in Britain and to-day have placed the Force there on a good basis.

As to the Pay service I have nothing to say, as I have found no particulars in the correspondence in regard to it. As to the Medical Service, I have found nothing more than I have stated, namely, that it was deficient, but we have a good deal of information in the public press upon this subject. I think, however, that my hon. friend was well advised and made an excellent move when he secured for the Medical service of the Canadian troops in England the services of Dr. Bruce of Toronto. Dr. Bruce is one of the eminent men of his

profession in Canada; his name carries weight wherever it is mentioned; he is known to be a man pre-eminent amongst the most eminent in surgery. In Toronto, moreover, he has the reputation of being a man of the highest character and integrity, and the very soul of honour. It is known that Dr. Bruce has made a report in which he has absolutely justified the charges made by the Minister of Militia; but it is known also that when the Minister of Militia ceased to be in office, a commission was appointed which controverted and denied everything that was affirmed in the report made by Dr. Bruce. Wherever Dr. Bruce had approved, the commission blamed, and wherever he had blamed the commission approved. We have not those reports; we should have them, and I hope we shall have them during the present session. In their absence it is not for me to pronounce either in favour of Dr. Bruce or in favour of the commission; but as far as my personal sentiment on the matter is concerned, I must say that, without further evidence, any information which is presented to me signed by Dr. Bruce will bear the character of truth, from the very fact that it bears the signature of Dr. Bruce.

After reviewing the evidence, not with any malice or passion, I am justified in concluding, as I stated at the beginning, that the Canadian Government have shown themselves throughout lax in the administration of affairs. They have allowed confusion to percolate all through the service, and it is obvious that without any cohesion and sound direction, and without unity of purpose and unity of action, it is impossible to expect anything like efficiency in the service.

The speech from the Throne refers to three things which I will briefly mention. First of all, it refers to the National Service. On this point I am disposed to take some issue with my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Wilson), but I will not discuss the matter to-day. It would not be right, nor would it be doing justice, to undertake to discuss the National Service Commission until we have before us the Order in Council which has created it and the proceedings which have followed its creation. When these are brought down it will be useful to take up the subject.

The speech from the Throne mentions only two measures which are to be brought to our attention during the present session. One is the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of Confederation; the other is the extension of the term of this Parliament. I will not say anything about these matters to-day. When matters of policy are mentioned in the speech from the Throne, it is always better to wait to discuss them when they are brought down. All I can say is that when they are brought down we shall discuss them, as we have done in the past, with absolute impartiality, looking only to the merits of the case.

The third subject which is mentioned is the Imperial Conference, to which the Prime Minister has been invited. At the opening of the House to-day my right hon. friend, the Prime Minister, stated that it was his intention to lay the papers on the table on Friday, but something intervened to prevent that being done. He also stated that he sent me the papers on Saturday, and I owe him the courtesy to say that I received them. There is nothing new in them except the answer made by the Government of Canada to the invitation. Although the invitation was published about a month ago, it may be well to recall it to the attention of the House. It is contained in the following despatch of the Colonial Secretary to His Excellency the Governor General:—

> I wish to explain that what is contemplated by His Majesty's Government is not a session of the ordinary Imperial Conference, but a special War Conference of the Empire. His Majesty's Government therefore invite your Prime Minister to attend a series of special and continuous meetings of the War Cabinet in order to consider urgent questions affecting prosecution of the war, the possible conditions on which in agreement with our Allies we could assent to its termination, and the problems which will then immediately arise.
>
> Your Prime Minister for the purpose of these meetings would be a member of the War Cabinet.
>
> In view of the extreme urgency of the subjects of discussion, as well as of their supreme importance, it is hoped that your Prime Minister may find it possible, in spite of serious inconvenience involved, to attend at an early date—not later than the end of February. While the presence of your Prime Minister himself is earnestly desired by His Majesty's Government, they hope that if he sees insuperable difficulties, he will carefully consider the question of nominating a substitute, as they would regard it as a serious misfortune if any Dominions were left unrepresented.

As to the character of the conference, the outline seems to be rather hazy, but I offer no comment upon that. I may, however, in passing, offer an observation upon the statement here made:

> Your Prime Minister . . . . would be a member of the War Cabinet.

There may be a constitutional question as to how the Prime Minister of Canada, who, though a member of the Privy Council, is

not a member of the British Parliament, either of the House of Lords or of the House of Commons, can be a member of the War Cabinet. I do not speak of that in any other way than to call the attention of my right hon. friend to it. I doubt not that when he is in England the matter will be carefully considered. The answer sent by the Governor General is in these words:

Paraphrase of a telegram from His Excellency the Governor General to the Colonial Secretary.

Ottawa, Ontario, January 5th, 1917.

My Prime Minister and his colleagues have taken into earnest consideration the very important announcement set forth in your telegram of 25th December which has since been made public. He and his colleagues concur in the view that it is his duty to attend this Conference without regard to any difficulties here which his absence may occasion With that view Parliament has been summoned for the 18th instant in order that business may be facilitated and advanced as much as possible before his departure. He would greatly appreciate information of a more definite character as to the questions to be considered, especially those touching the prosecution of the war and conditions of peace so far as they have been considered. He would also be grateful for earliest possible information as to latest date to which he may delay his departure for England and as to probable length of proposed series of meetings if that has been considered.

Devonshire.

That ends the correspondence. The desire of my right hon. friend to have some information as to the nature of the conference apparently has not yet been gratified.

The answer given by the Government was the only answer that could be given to such an invitation. The conference being called under such circumstances as those of to-day, and the prime ministers of the several dominions being invited, it follows as a matter of course that the answer sent from Canada must be an affirmative answer. We on this side of the House realize this as to hon. gentlemen opposite. We realize, also, that with the great burden of labour that has been thrown upon the Prime Minister by the war he cannot get away without serious inconvenience to himself, to his colleagues in the Government, and to Parliament. But all these considerations must be set aside, and the only one considered must be that which I have stated. We on this side of the House have every desire, so far as in our power lies, to facilitate the Prime Minister in the trip which he has to undertake. This is the twenty-second day of January. The conference is to meet at the end of February. If my right hon. friend is to leave in time that he may not be overburdened in Canada or overburdened after he has arrived in England, he must take his departure from Canada at an early day in the month of February. We, therefore, are prepared to say at once to the Government that if they will postpone all other measures of public consideration, we are ready immediately to vote the necessary war credits that may be demanded, and also to grant a vote on account of the ordinary expenditures of the country for the time during which my right hon. friend will be absent from Canada, and to adjourn the House whenever it is convenient over any time that may be necessary to give him ample latitude for his business. I conclude by saying that, though we may differ on many things, upon this thing at all events we shall endeavour to meet the views of our friends on the other side, and to offer every possible facility for the carrying on of the Government of His Majesty the King.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): I desire to join my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in congratulating the mover and seconder of the Address upon the very admirable speeches which they have made in the discharge of the duty devolving upon them to-day. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. G. C. Wilson) has referred to the departure of His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught, and it is my desire to associate myself with all that was said by him and by my right hon. friend with respect to the service which His Royal Highness gave to this country and to the Empire as Governor General of Canada. I have said more than once that the life of His Royal Highness has been distinguished by the characteristic of devotion to duty. It is perfectly true that when he assumed the duties of Governor General it was not contemplated that he should remain here for more than two years. A resolution of both Houses of Parliament was adopted expressing the appreciation of Parliament and the country of the services which he had given up to that time. But before the time arrived which had been set for his departure war broke out, and, though there were domestic circumstances which made it extremely difficult for him to prolong his stay in Canada, he did remain until he had served the full term of five years. I desire to express my very great appreciation of his counsel, and of his consideration in every way toward myself and

toward the members of the Government, during the period of his service, appreciation also of the keen interest which he took in the welfare of this country, and especially of the services which he was enabled to give to Canada by virtue of his great military knowledge and experience. I associate myself also most heartily with what my right hon. friend has said with regard to the Duchess of Connaught. In every way both she and the Princess Patricia aided and encouraged patriotic work during the progress of the war; and I am sure that their Royal Highnesses left Canada, bearing with them the esteem, the admiration, and the respect of the Canadian people. I do not doubt that their memories of their sojourn in Canada will be agreeable as ours are of their stay amongst us in the service of King and Empire.

His Excellency the Governor General, the Duke of Devonshire, comes of a family invested with great traditions in the service of the Empire, a family that has had a most distinguished record in public affairs for more than two centuries. There have been many men of great ability and distinction who have served as Governor General in this country, but no Governor General has come as an inheritor of finer traditions of public service or with a more comprehensive grasp of public questions, as they touch not only this country and the United Kingdom, but the whole Empire, than the Duke of Devonshire. He has already given earnest of the keen interest which he will take in all that concerns this country, its resources, future prosperity and development and its relation to the greater whole of which it forms a part. As my right hon. friend has said, the Duchess of Devonshire is the daughter of one who may be justly regarded as among the "Elder Statesmen" of the empire, one who served for a full term as Governor General of Canada; and it has been an especial pleasure, I know, to the people of Canada to welcome her once more to this country, in which, indeed, she has shown an intense and abiding interest ever since the early days when she was resident at Rideau Hall.

My hon. friend the member for Wentworth (Mr. G. C. Wilson) spoke in very eloquent terms of the services which the womanhood of Canada have given to this country since the war broke out. I join most heartily in that tribute which he has so deservedly paid. We know what a wonderful spirit the womanhood of Canada, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, have shown in this war. They have not been backward; they have been to the front in all patriotic work. More than that, they have shown a magnificent and indomitable spirit in yielding to the service of the country those who are nearest and dearest to them, and in bearing with fortitude and resignation the sad news which has only too often come of the loss of those who are near and dear.

I should like to express here my deep sympathy with my fellow-members in this House who since prorogation have had tidings of loss and sorrow to them and their families. One consolation there is to them, as to all those who have suffered such bereavement, that these young men have fallen doing their full duty to Canada and to the Empire, and that their memory will never be forgotten by Canadians of to-day and of the years to come.

My. hon. friend the member from Wentworth spoke also of the ancient colony of Newfoundland, so near to us and so closely associated with us by ties of kinship, of common interest and of common allegiance. It is a colony which has done its part splendidly in this war, because there have been no finer or braver men at the front than those of the Newfoundland contingent. The hon. gentleman has expressed a hope that at some later date it may be possible to embrace within the union of this Confederation that ancient colony. It would be inappropriate for me to express any opinion or make any suggestion on that subject beyond this: that the initiative in such a matter, it seems to me, would properly lie with Newfoundland herself. If advances should be made by this Dominion in that regard, they might be misunderstood; but it is not inappropriate for me to say that I am voicing the opinion of the Canadian Parliament and people in assuring Newfoundland that if she desires to take the initiative and to come with any proposal, we should in this Parliament and in this country cordially welcome the advance and give to the proposal our most careful and attentive consideration.

My hon. friend the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. J. A. Descarries) whose speech was very eloquent indeed, referred to the splendid efforts which Great Britain has made in this war, and especially to the work of the navy. I wish to associate myself with what he has so finely and so worthily said in that regard. It is difficult for us in this House to realize the immensity of the ocean and the tremendous task which has confronted the British navy from first to last. Now and then a raider has got

through; now and then submarines have carried on their barbarous warfare, not only against ships of the Allied nations, but against ships of neutral nations as well. But when we take everything into consideration the highest possible tribute must be paid to Sir John Jellicoe, Sir David Beatty, and the admirals, officers and men of the British navy for all the splendid work that they have accomplished under almost insuperable difficulties ever since this war broke out. The mere guarding of the North Sea itself, the awful vigil in winter as in summer, under all weather conditions, in mist and ice and snow, with hidden danger at hand all the time—the hidden danger of the submarine—that task of itself was one that might daunt all but the bravest hearts. In addition to that, they have had the task of keeping the whole ocean free, so that to all intents and purposes the pathways of the ocean have been almost as safe to us as in time of peace—a wonderful tribute to the power of the British navy, and to the valor, heroism and endurance of the officers and men who man it.

The same may be said, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the work which Britain has done in organizing her army. You know what the condition was at first: ability to send overseas 80,000 or 120,000 or 160,000 men to fight the battles of the Empire upon the continent of Europe if occasion should arise. I desire to pause here to pay just tribute to the memory of that man who organized the army which will yet win victory for Britain and for the allied nations: I mean Lord Kitchener. We deplore his death, which was a great loss not only to his mother country but to all the Allied nations and to the world. He did a great work. To his standing as a great soldier, as the virtual head of the British army at the time; to his military ability, to his indomitable will, which had been tested on so many occasions, the people of the united Kingdom and of the whole Empire looked in the day of trial, and they did not look in vain. To enlist, to train, to discipline, to arm, to equip that vast army was a task which none of us here could adequately comprehend. He had done a great work when his untimely death occurred, and he would, I believe, have done a still greater work if he had been spared to the Empire.

The work which the British army has accomplished in this war has been referred to by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. While it is well for us to remember the valour and heroism of our own men, and the resourcefulness which they have shown at every time of testing or of trial, let us not forget what those splendid men from the United Kingdom have done on the soil of France and Belgium; and let us not forget the tremendous losses which the population of the United Kingdom has suffered in this war during the past three years, and suffered without repining, suffered without for one moment relaxing the indomitable will and the firm resolve with which they entered the war, and which I am sure will be maintained until the end.

My right honourable friend has spoken of some matters to which I will allude in a moment; but the first to which naturally I should direct my attention is the progress of the war during the past year. I am not quite prepared to view the progress of the war during the past twelve months so unfavourably as my right honourable friend would suggest. If we compare the end of 1916 with the end of 1915, I think we shall find that very considerable progress has been made by the allied nations, and that the successes of Germany have, perhaps, been more spectacular than real. I remember that at the end of 1915 we had abandoned Gallipoli, and Serbia had been crushed; the outlook was not very good at that time. There has been since a spectacular German success in Rumania, and they are entitled to whatever consolation they may find in that; I think there is good reason for believing that it may be found more spectacular than real. My right hon. friend has referred to the German defeat at Verdun. It can be classed as nothing else—a continuous, persistent effort for five months, with an enormous sacrifice of men, ending in absolute defeat after the magnificent armies of France had won back in three or four days all that the Germans had gained during five months, and won it back at a cost of probably one-twentieth of what the Germans had expended in winning it in the first instance. That was followed by the magnificent Russian success, which involved the capture of no less than 500,000 prisoners from the enemy, and probably a total loss of one and a half million men. Since then we know that the British and French have demonstrated in the battle of the Somme their ability to break the German line when it becomes worth while to do so. From what we have learned from the press—I speak from no official information on the subject—there can be no doubt that if two more weeks of fine weather had

been vouchsafed last autumn to Sir Douglas Haig, the results of the fighting on the Somme would have been very much greater than they proved to be.

But, it seems to me, there is something more than that to encourage us. Let me pause, however, to say that, while I speak with no official information on this subject, I am only giving my own impression to the House as it is derived from the public press. Military experts of neutral nations hold the view very strongly that, at the end of 1916, Germany was not only relatively worse off than she was twelve months before, but actually worse off, so far as the man power of the contending nations is concerned. An apparently very capable man—I do not know his name—who is spoken of as a great military expert, has reviewed the situation very carefully and thoroughly, in an article which I recently read. He gives as the net result of the fighting during the past year an advantage to the Allies of no less than 700,000 men in estimating the casualties on the one side and the other. Remember that the man power of the allied nations is vastly greater than that of the nations with which we are contending. An actual advantage of 700,000 men, means a relative advantage very much greater. It happened that weather conditions on the Somme were not favourable at the end of the year. It happened that in the battle of Jutland two more hours of daylight were needed. If these two more hours of daylight had been vouchsafed to Jellicoe and Beatty, can any one doubt that the German navy would have been crushed? Can any of us doubt that if two or three more weeks of good weather had been given to General Sir Douglas Haig and to the French generals, much greater results than those obtained would have been recorded?

In speaking of the effort of the allied nations, I desire also to add my tribute to the successes which have been won by Italy. I have already spoken of Russia. They are all putting forth great efforts, and it becomes us, as part of an empire which is involved in this struggle, to do our part. And so it is proper for me to review, as I will review in a moment, what we have done in this country since the outbreak of war. My right honourable friend in a very eloquent letter which he recently adressed to the press, through a publication which he controls, used this language.

> Reviewing all that has been accomplished during the last thirty months, it is no vain national boast that the Canadian people have far exceeded the expectations laid down at the outset.

I think that is a very fair estimate of the situation, and I am thankful that my right hon. friend takes so reasonable a view. We have accomplished a great task in this country, and I give my hon. friend, the late Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) all possible credit for his work. He did a great work in assembling on Valcartier Plains and dispatching overseas about 33,000 men within the first six weeks of the war. We thought, and rightly thought, that this was a great thing for a country like ours, quite unprepared for war on a great scale. To-day the casualties in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces number over 70,000, or more than double the number of men that were then gathered together to fight the battles of the Empire. What are our enlistments to-day, and how many men have the citizens of Canada supplied for the purpose of aiding the allied armies to achieve the victory for which we all hope? The enlistments in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces up till to-day number 392,647. Besides that, we have called out of the Active Militia 9,052 men who are now serving under arms, and we have a permanent Force in Canada numbering 2,470 men, making a total of 404,169. In addition to that, we have enlisted from the citizens of Canada in the Canadian naval service 3,310 men, making a total of 407,479. We have done more than that; we have provided for the British Naval Service 1,600 men, we have provided for the Imperial Mechanical Transport 1,200 men and for munition works in Great Britain at least 3,000 men. One thousand six hundred went over through the co-operation of the Department of Labour with Mr. Barnes, now a member of the British Government, and other gentlemen who visited Canada about eighteen months ago. If you add these three items together you have 5,800, which, being added to the previous total, makes 413,279.

But that does not tell the whole tale of what the manhood of Canada has furnished in this war. I applied to the Department of Militia and Defence for a statement of the number of British reservists in Canada who joined the British colours at the commencement of the war. The number given by the Department of Militia and Defence is 2,750, but I am told by those who ought to be in a position to know that this is very much less than the actual number. I am told that very many more than 2,750 British reservists in this country joined the British

forces at the commencement of the war, but I take the figure as it has been given to me. I made application to the Department of the Naval Service for the number of British naval reservists who returned to serve in the Navy, and the figure given is about 1,000. For the purpose of getting the best information on the subject, I have asked the consuls as to natives of allied countries who were subject to military service and who have left Canada to join the colours of their respective countries. The numbers that have been given to me are as follows:

French Reservists	5,000
Russian "	7,500
Italian "	5,000

If you add these to the total whch I have already given, it will be found that out of the manhood of Canada not less than 434,529 men have joined the Canadian colours, the British colours, or the colours of the Allied nations.

Now, some information is due to the House in regard to the Overseas Forces and how they are disposed of. The Canadian forces which have been actually sent overseas up to the 31st December number 280,562. We have sent also, as mentioned, to the British Islands 1,600 for the Naval Service, 1,200 for the Mechanical Transport, 3,000 for munition works, British Army and Naval reservists, 3,750, and Allied reservists, 17,500, making a total of 307,612 who have actually gone overseas. If you add to that the number of men who have enlisted in the Canadian Naval Service and who are not within this country at the present time, but who are serving in the navy, the number being 3,310, you have 310,922 as the number of men who have actually left this country to do service in one way or another for our cause. At present there are training in Canada 48,312 men. There are on guard duty 9,052 men, and there are of the Permanent Force 2,470, making a total of 59,834 men in Canada.

It may also be of interest to the House to know something as to the casualties, the number of which I have already given. The statement is as follows:

Killed in action	10,854
Died of wounds	4,010
Died of sickness	494
Presumed dead	1,108
Wounded	48,454
Missing	2,970
Prisoners of war	2,373
Total	70,263

Now, a word as to those who are actually at the front, or who have been at the front since the commencement of the war. There are now at the front, in France and the Mediterranean, about 110,000 men, nearly all of whom are in France and Belgium. There are at present under orders to proceed to France nearly 10,000 men.

Then there are other items which to some extent are explanatory of the discrepancy between the number of men enlisted and the number of men who are at the front. There are in England, in Forestry and Railway construction battalions and reinforcements, 3,998 men, and in the Pay and Records offices 2,752. In miscellaneous services, such as Headquarters Staff, veterinary, postal services, etc., there are engaged 1,947 men; medical, ordnance stores and Army Service Corps, 8,686. These items make up total of 17,383. Casualties who are at present unfit to rejoin number 39,559. The total number who have seen service in France or in the Near East is a little over 175,000 men. This information, I give as I have gathered it from the various departments of the Government here, and also through communication with the Minister of the Overseas Military Forces.

The Forces which we despatched overseas in 1916 comprised more than 165,000 men. Comparisons are not always useful, but that force, despatched in that one year, numbered seven times the British force under Wellington at Waterloo. We have sent overseas a force greater by 120,000 than the largest British expeditionary force proposed by the War Office before war actually broke out; that is, the force we have sent overseas is 120,000 greater than the force which the War Office thought itself capable of sending across the Channel for service on the Continent in case a war should break out in which Britain must take part. Our enlisted force is about double the British military establishment before the war, and it is greater than the British force that was engaged in the South African war.

I dwelt a moment ago on the tremendous organization necessary in Great Britain for her very large forces, and the effort was equally great for us, perhaps greater, because we had not the military organization Great Britain possessed, nor had we in the same proportion men available for training purposes. The enlistment, the training, the disciplining, the clothing, and equipping of our forces have entailed enormous labours on those responsible. The provision of arms and ammunition, the creation of lines of communication units and ammunition and supply columns, trans-

port, commissariat, medical service, hospitals of all kinds, the enlargement to an unprecedented degree of the Pay and Records Office—all this entailed great organization. We must also take into account the enormous area over which this enlistment has taken place, and the enormous distance over which our troops have to be transported. Those enlisted in Canada have to be sent across the ocean to France, Belgium, Greece, Egypt, or wherever they may be engaged, and the transportation across the Atlantic has of itself been a tremendous task The Canadian forces of more than 400,000 men are scattered to-day over half this continent, and in Great Britain, France, Belgium, Greece and Egypt.

The reorganization of the Quartermaster's Department, provision of field ambulances, dressing stations, stationary hospitals, base hospitals, and the organization of the commissariat on an unprecedented scale, all this involved unceasing attention and effort.

I might give illustrations which indicate what has been done in other directions. Thirteen field ambulances and seven general hospitals are now on the Continent of Europe, and nine stationary hospitals with the Canadian forces overseas, besides sanitary sections, and depots for medical supplies and laboratories. Then we have had to undertake, and lately on an increasing scale, the care of men returned from Great Britain who were wounded in the tremendous fighting on the Somme. As every one knows, the casualties on our side in that battle were enormous, and the casualties in the enemy ranks were still greater, as with good reason it is believed. It has been found necessary to bring back to Canada as many of our men as possible in order that they may have active treatment in our own hospitals. The hospitals in Great Britain are cleared to that extent. I have asked the Military Hospitals Commission for some information on this subject, which I shall communicate to the House as the magnitude of this work is not generally understood in this country. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) referred to the Military Hospitals Commission in the correspondence, and my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) alluded to it also, as a commission which had been a failure, and had not accomplished much. As a matter of fact, the Military Hospitals Commission was constituted by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence himself. It was not through the initiative of any other member of the Government that that Commission was constituted in the first instance, and I cannot understand why my hon. friend should have alluded to it in that way.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am not aware that I have ever said the Commission was a failure. What I stated was that the constitution of the Commission could be greatly improved, and I think the Prime Minister will agree with me that it should be.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Perhaps I may have misunderstood my hon. friend's allusion in the correspondence. I am glad he thinks the commission is doing a great work. I entirely agree with him in that. There are four classes of patients dealt with by the commission in hospitals and convalescent homes in various parts of the country; (1) treatment of active cases; (2) convalescents; (3) men suffering from tuberculosis; (4) special purposes, such as shell-shock, rheumatism, etc. The commission has under operation or under construction for the above purposes the following institutions: Number of hospitals or homes for class (1) 16, with accommodation available now or in the near future for 2,600 men; for class (2) 27 institutions, with accommodation now or in the near future for 4,700; for class (3), 18 institutions, with accommodation now or in the near future for 900; for class (4), 4 institutions, with accommodation now or in the near future for 200. The numbers which I have given correspond to the classes I mentioned a moment ago. The number of men who have passed through the hands of the commission to date is approximately 9,500. There are now 2,211 patients in the various institutions, and 1,004 out-patients receiving medical attention in connection with these institutions. The commission has established at Toronto an artificial limb factory, and all men returning from the front requiring artificial limbs are now sent direct to this institution.

A large number of buildings have been placed freely at the disposal of the commission by their owners. In other cases a rental has been asked covering only their interest charges. Owing to the recent fighting on the Somme the commission has been obliged to arrange for a considerable increase in the hospital accommodation in Canada. This has entailed also certain capital outlays. Had this not been undertaken it would have been necessary to build further hospitals in England. The commission now has in sight sufficient accom-

modation for all who are likely to be sent to Canada for some time to come.

The commission is also engaged in providing vocational training and instruction in the convalescent hospitals, and special training for men whose disabilities prevent their return to their previous occupations. Such subjects as freehand and mechanical drawing, market gardening, automobile engineering, typewriting, accountancy, poultry and bee farming are taught.

In conjunction with the Department of Militia and Defence the commission is administering a command known as the Military Hospitals Commission Command, into which are drafted all returned invalids, and men in Canada who require convalescent treatment.

Each province has established a commission for the purpose of assisting men at their discharge to obtain employment. The Military Hospitals Commission co-operates with the provinces in this respect in the furnishing of information, and acts as a general clearing house.

The work of the commission is only in its infancy, but the way in which the problem has been handled augurs well for the future.

I desire to pay my tribute to the provincial governments which have co-operated with us in the most cordial spirit and have aided in every way within their power in carrying on the work.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I was speaking of the great organization necessary in connection with so large a force as that which Canada is maintaining in this war. I omitted a reference to the Canadian Dental Service which, as I am informed by the officers of the Department of Militia and Defence, has made it possible for about fifty thousand Canadians to pass the examination and to enter military service who otherwise might have been unable—probably would have been unable—to do so. Canada was one of the first countries in the world to establish this service, and the results which have been obtained are eminently satisfactory in every way.

If I may be permitted to allude to some other departments of the Government upon which unusual burdens have been cast in this war, I would mention the Naval Service. The coast defence of this country has been largely under the control of that department. It is perfectly true that in the early months of the war, when we consulted the British Government, we were asked to concentrate our efforts upon military organization and to leave the question of naval defence to the Admiralty. Nevertheless, it has been necessary to establish patrols, and a number of patrol boats have been secured by the department; I should not be surprised if such efforts must engage their attention still more in the future. That department has had charge of the closing and guarding of our harbours and of the censorship of wireless stations. Upon that department also has devolved the duty of establishing and maintaining naval bases upon a war footing on both coasts, which bases have been utilized not only for the ships of the British Navy but for the ships of allied navies as well. The training of the officers and men who have enlisted has also been a matter of serious import for the Minister and officers of that department. They have kept in constant touch with the Admiralty in these matters. Further, the Minister of Naval Service has been chairman of the sub-committee of Council which has had charge of arrangements respecting the Admiralty transport. I shall speak of that more later on, as in that connection highly important duties have been imposed upon the Minister of the Naval Service.

It would be undesirable for me to omit allusion to the fact that the production of munitions in this war is quite as important as the enlistment of men. I have said before, and now repeat, that this is a war in which applied science and applied mechanics play a part as important as the armies themselves. It has been recently stated by the chairman of the Imperial Munitions Board, and I have no doubt that the statement is correct, that Canada is to-day producing more munitions of war than any country produced before the war, with the single exception of Germany. To give an idea of the magnitude that these operations have assumed, I am informed by the chairman of the Imperial Munitions Board that the workmen and inspectors engaged in these operations at the present time number more than 304,000; that there are 630 factories, chemical plants and loading stations which are producing or otherwise dealing with munitions; and that the orders, including the expenditure for an aeroplane factory which is in progress, and including also the anticipated orders for aeroplanes, exceed $700,000,000. It is a very gratifying thing to the people

of this country, and I know to the gentlemen of this House, to know that $250,000,000 has been provided in Canada for the purpose of enabling this work to be done. Of this sum, $100,000,000 has been provided by the banks of Canada. I desire to pay a tribute of appreciation to the banks for their splendid co-operation in making that provision, and in other matters connected with the carrying on of the war. The balance, $150,000,000 has been provided by the Government of Canada, and it is anticipated that arrangements can be made which will enable the Government of Canada to provide further large sums for this purpose in the future. If we are to have munitions produced on a great scale in Canada, we must make some provision ourselves to assist the British Government in financing those arrangements. There has been the most hearty co-operation between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United Kingdom for this purpose, and that co--operation will continue to the end.

The production of copper, zinc and lead has been encouraged through the production of munitions, and important tonnage has been created. All the cartridge cases and fuses are being manufactured in Canada today, I understand. One verv gratifying feature, which gave me some surprise considering the enormous extent of the orders, is that ninety per cent of the steel necessary for this purpose in the year 1917 will be produed in Canada. That is a great tribute to the management of the steel industries of Canada, because it is obvious to all the members of this House that the requirements of steel for the production of so enormous a quantity of munitions must be very great indeed and far beyond what would have been possible in this country under ordinary conditions.

The production of gun cotton and of the necessary acids for the manufacture of nitrocellulose powder, acetone, and many other important articles requisite for munitions, including tri-nitro-toluol, has been firmly established. I could speak at great length on what has been accomplished in the production of munitions in this country, but the subject has been very fully dealt with by the chairman of the Imperial Munitions Board in recent utterances.

Another very important matter which the department of the Government have dealt with is the execution of vast orders from the British and Allied Governments, and from the Governments of New Zealand and South Africa. I have not an exact statement of the amount to which those orders have run; certainly it is not less that $150,000,000, and probably well up to $200,000,000. The departments which have been charged with the execution of these orders are the Department of Militia and Defence, the Department of Trade and Commerce and the Department of Agriculture. Remember, Mr. Speaker, if you please, that the execution of even a million dollar order, involving contracts with, perhaps, 40, 50 or 100 people all over this country, and involving also inspection of articles produced and arangements for their transportation—all this imposes an enormous amount of administrative and executive work upon any department of the Government that undertakes it. Consider also the enormous variety of articles which have been purchased in this way: army blankets, artillery harness, gun carriages, limbers, railway cars, saddlery, knitted goods, wheat, flour, oats, hay, and supplies of all kinds. When hon. gentlemen realize that those orders run into $150,000,000 or $200,000,000 and that they involve a very large organization, constant supervision and frequent negotiations with the governments for whom the various departments are acting, they will understand that all this has entailed an enormous amount of labour and responsibility upon the departments that have been actively concerned.

I should allude also to the work of the War Purchasing Commission. It was established, as hon. gentlemen know, in May, 1915, for the purpose of purchasing in the most effective way and with the least opportunity for waste or maladministration all supplies required by any department of the Government in connection with or for the purpose of the war. Nearly every department of the Government has purchased supplies in that way: the Department of Militia and Defence and the Department of Naval Service are naturally the two principal departments—but the Department of Justice in connection with internment operations, and other departments of the Government from time to time apply to the commission as they may require articles which are properly chargeable against the war appropriation. The War Purchasing Commission makes these purchases by tender and contract, unless in exceptional cases, for reasons stated in writing. Some time ago its purchases had aggregated more than $80,000,000. I do not know what they would amount to at the present time—con-

siderably in excess of that figure. A great organization has been created and the business has, as I believe, been conducted with very great efficiency. The grateful thanks of this country are due to the three gentlemen who, without any remuneration and purely as a duty of public service, have devoted their time and their energies for almost two years, to carrying on the work of that commission.

Another subject has engaged the attention of the Government. Two years ago we took up with the Admiralty the very important question of transportation. We all remember how great the difficulties were at the time. It seemed to me that the best course would be to despatch a gentleman of great experience in these matters to Great Britain and endeavour to have him come to arrangements with the Admiralty by which the problem of transportation might be dealt with in a systematic and effective way. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, a corporation which has rendered great service to the Government of the United Kingdom as well as to this Government in matters connected with the war, freely and voluntarily placed at the disposal of the Government the services of Mr. A. H. Harris. Without effective organization of some kind, matters were bound to get into the most extreme confusion. There was the question of transporting supplies and munitions for the British Government, as well as for the Allied Governments, and connected with all this was the question of transporting the general products of the country which were to find a market on the other side of the ocean. The organization was begun in a very small way—I think with ten or twelve ships in the first instance. That was two years ago; the organization now includes seventy-five ocean steamers under the able and efficient direction of Mr. A. H. Harris as Canadian director of overseas transports. The organization handles 2,250,000 tons per year and the traffic is constantly increasing. The organization is carried on under a committee of the Privy Council over which the Minister of Naval Service presides.

I know that hon. gentlemen of this House will realize that very unusual responsibilities and burdens have been imposed upon the Minister of Finance and his officers during this war. He will no doubt, at a later date, speak more fully on that subject than it would be possible for me to do to-night. For two years he has maintained the finances of Canada without resorting to the British market, which has thus been left free to sustain the burdens imposed by the enormous British war expenditure and the requirements of the Allies. I do not believe that any one of us would have believed two and a half years ago that it would be possible for Canada to accomplish the task which has been accomplished under the direction of the Minister of Finance in that respect. The two loans placed in Canada have attained an unprecedented success, the one for $50,000,000 bringing out $110,000,000, and the further loan of $100,000,000 being more than doubly subscribed. Not only has the minister been enabled to leave the British market free for the enormous requirements of the British and the Allied Governments, but he has out of the loans which he has effected in Canada put no less than $150,000,000 at the disposal of the British Government for the purpose of paying for the munitions produced in this country. As I have said, that effort will be continued by him in the future.

Hon. gentlemen of the House will remember that at the commencement of this war we were faced with very grave conditions indeed in Canada.

I do not think that those of my colleagues who were in Ottawa on the first, second and third days of August, 1914, will ever forget the tremendous importance of the problems with which we were faced and the very great responsibilities which we had to assume at that time.

The people of Canada were beginning to think of drawing their money out of the banks in gold. We were threatened with a condition that might have produced a panic which would have paralysed the energies of Canada in this war. Without any legal power, without any legal sanction to do it, we were obliged to take measures which were afterwards ratified by Parliament. We were obliged to prevent the exportation and hoarding of gold. We were obliged to make bank notes good legal tender. We were obliged to provide that Dominion notes need not be redeemed in gold. These measures were accepted unhesitatingly by the country. No one except those who underwent the responsibilities of that time can properly estimate what might have been the loss to this country if those measures had not been taken.

Then we were faced almost immediately afterwards with another very serious problem. I would like the House and the country to realize for a moment what the conditions were at that time. The revenues of this country had shrunk—I do not know by what percentage—but they had shrunk

enormously immediately after the outbreak of the war. Trade was almost paralysed; importation almost stopped, and exportation as well, and in the midst of that we found ourselves confronted with a very serious condition in a very large district in western Canada, in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, a district much larger than some of the other provinces of Canada. There was this condition confronting us: the revenues of the country, as my honourable friend the Minister of Finance graphically described them, were shot to pieces on the one hand, and on the other hand there was the need for some assistance to the people in that drought-stricken district. We had the alternative, to display a lack of courage and to say that, confronted by a war such as was upon us, with shrunken revenues, it would be impossible for the Government to do anything, or, to attack the problem in a courageous way and do what we could to relieve the situation. We determined to relieve the situation and we spent $12,000,000 in providing supplies for the people, fodder for their cattle, and seed grain. I believe that seven and a half million dollars' worth of seed grain went into that district in the following spring. It required some courage to do that, and I venture to say that this expenditure of $12,000,000 so made by the Government has brought in at least $100,000,000 of wealth and has maintained a happy, prosperous, confident population in a district which otherwise would have been partially depopulated; and I believe that practically every dollar of that money will be paid back. It was not handed out as a gift; it was handed out as a loan by this parliament. Gentlemen from the West who are not affiliated with the party to which I belong have concurred with me that probably one hundred million dollars' worth of production had resulted from the action of the Government on that occasion. I am not speaking of this in any boastful way; we did it because it was our duty to do it, and if we had lacked the courage to undertake it at that time we would not have been fit for the positions we hold. I have spoken of its direct benefit to the country, and indirectly it has been of enormous advantage, because of the splendid production in that very district not only last year, but this year as well. Confidence has been re-established. Conditions such as occurred in 1914 are of very infrequent occurrence, and the people of that district may continue in their work of progress and development without undue apprehension.

There is another consideration which I would like to impress upon the House and the country. The commercial and financial stability of Canada during the past two years have been maintained to an extent which was not anticipated by the most optimistic among us two and a half years ago. That has been largely due to two considerations: first, to the abundant crops of the first year, and the high prices obtained therefor, and the still higher prices realized for the less abundant crop of the past year. It is due also to the vast orders for munitions and supplies of various kinds which have come to Canada as a land of great production, and of great possibilities. Without wearying the House with figures, let me allude to the conditions which we find at the close of 1916. The total trade of the country for the twelve months ending 31st December, 1916,—I am including coin and bullion—was as follows: imports, $766,733,991; exports, $1,091,706,403, or a total trade for Canada of $1,850,440,394. I do not wish to be understood as attaching too much importance to these figures. I realize, of course, that a considerable proportion of this amount is due to the higher prices which have been obtained. I realize that a considerable amount of it is due to the production of munitions of war which we cannot expect to continue after the war is over. But even with all these qualifications, it is a remarkable result. I remember when I had been in this House for, I think, four years, in 1900 or 1901, the late Sir Richard Cartwright spoke proudly of the fact that the total trade of this country was approaching the four hundred million mark. I remember precisely his expression —the four hundred million mark. The total trade of this country to-day is approaching the two thousand million mark, and it is very likely that by the 31st of March next it will reach that figure, because I observe that during the first nine months of the present fiscal year, that is the nine months beginning on the 1st day of April and ending on the 31st December last, the total trade of Canada was $1,464,503,766, embracing: imports, $602,873,953, and exports $861,629,813. It is a gratifying feature that the exports of Canada have shown a very large increase over the imports.

For the twelve months ended December 31, 1916, the excess of exports over imports was about $325,000,000, and for the nine months of that period ending December 31, 1916, it was $259,000,000. It will be observed, and it is worthy of note, that the exporta-

tion of Canadian products during the first nine months of the present fiscal year exceeded by $300,000,000 the total trade of this country ten years ago. That is a remarkable fact. It indicates that under war conditions the stability and production of the country have been maintained. It is a tribute to the productive power of this country, the industry, activity and enterprise of the people and their ability to take advantage of their opportunities for production.

Now, there are some other departments of the Government that have had unusual duties to perform as well. The Minister of Justice has taken charge of the internment of alien enemies, and he has established camps in various parts of the country. He and the officers of his department have been charged with enforcing the regulations respecting the possession of arms by persons of enemy nationality who are resident in Canada. At the internment camps, which have been established in different parts of the country, work has been provided and from time to time, as labour conditions seemed to render it necessary, aliens, whose character and conduct had been unexceptionable, and who were of good will, have been permitted to engage in the ordinary activities of the country and to earn their own livelihood. In connection with that, I should observe that two camps which I had the opportunity of seeing during my recent tour in aid of National Service, one situated in the northern part of the province of Quebec and the other in the northern part of the province of Ontario, are, as I understand, to be utilized as experimental and demonstration farms, and that the district where they are situate is of a character to indicate that settlement on a considerable scale may be expected there when once it has been shown, as it will be shown by these demonstration farms, that the opportunities for profitable agriculture are very advantageous.

The Royal Northwest Mounted Police have had very important, and somewhat unusual, duties to perform in connection with the war. I do not think too much credit can be given for the good work which that force has done. They have had to use tact and firmness, and the results in certain communities in western Canada, where one might expect some unrest, have been on the whole all that could be expected or even desired.

The Department of Customs has been charged with the recommendation and enforcement of regulations respecting the exportation of articles useful in connection with the war. An enormous amount of responsibility has been imposed on the Government, and chiefly upon the Minister of Customs and his officials, in this respect. There is scarcely a day, and certainly not a week, in which some subject in this connection has not to be taken up. The object, of course, is to restrict to allied countries the exportation of articles which may be of use to the enemy in connection with the war, and to restrict as much as possible the exportation of these articles under any conditions in which they might become of use to the enemy. In the same way questions have sometimes come up with respect to the importation of articles which were of enemy origin in the first instance, but which are absolutely necessary for the maintenance of some Canadian industry essential to the war. All these questions have had to be carefully considered. We have had to take a great many of them up with the British Government, and in all cases the course which we have taken has been in full co-operation with, and has received the approval of, the British Government.

The withdrawal of a very large number of men from industrial activities has sometimes created difficult conditions in regard to labour, its employment and remuneration. I think a very just tribute should be paid to the labour men of Canada in connection with their attitude in such matters. There has been very little industrial disturbance considering the amount which has taken place in some other countries. The Minister of Labour has had unusually severe responsibilities imposed upon him. The Minister of Public Works has ably co-operated on many occasions with the Minister of Labour and has fully shared these responsibilities. The Minister of Labour has also been charged with duties under the provisions of the law which forbid combination to raise prices and the hoarding of commodities for the like purpose. As far as I understand the situation, these two elements are the only ones which the Government can effectually deal with, as conditions created by the war cannot, of course, be controlled by any governmental action.

Then, in common with all the railway systems of the country, the Canadian Government Railways have had to undertake the vastly increased business created by war conditions. They have transported 300,000 soldiers in Canada since the war broke out, and they have done that without any accident.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Far more than that.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend the late Minister of Militia and Defence thinks that the estimate that I have given of the number of soldiers transported is too low. I have taken this from some source—I cannot quite remember what. Hospital trains have been established on the Intercolonial Railway for wounded soldiers in connection with the Military Hospitals Commission. The Canadian Government railways have carried more than 250,000 tons of munitions and war stores to St. John and Halifax, and the equipment at St. John and Halifax has been very greatly improved to render possible the handling of the increased monthly tonnage. They have undertaken during the winter months to carry 60,000 tons a month to one port and 20,000 to the other.

Mr. COCHRANE: A hundred thousand.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The tonnage which they have undertaken to transport to the ports of Halifax and St. John during the winter is 100,000 tons per month. It has been necessary to make extensions in the yards and various other improvements at the terminals and at other points and the three new berths at Halifax have been assigned to Canadian overseas transport and will be fully occupied.

Now, I could speak of the work which has been performed, and is being performed, by every department of the Government. I should not omit to mention that which has been undertaken by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He has made successful efforts for the use of articles for which there was no ready market. He has undertaken a work of research preparatory to the conditions which will confront us when the war is concluded. He has sent officers specially trained for the purpose into some countries where we might expect to find wider markets in the future, and he has occupied himself generally in the task of inducing the producers of Canada to take into account the conditions which will confront this country when peace shall have been concluded.

I would like to impress upon hon. gentlemen in this House the importance of our realizing those conditions. I shall not speak fully upon this subject to-night. It is possible that some opportunity may come later on when it will be proper to give it more consideration. We shall have to consider the demobilization of 400,000 or 500,000 men and their absorption into the national activities of this country. Do hon. gentlemen realize what the task of demobilizing such a force will mean? Do they realize what a task it will be to transport these men across the Atlantic? If we bring them across the Atlantic at the rate of a thousand a day, if a steamer sails every day, accommodating a thousand of these men, it will take more than a year to bring them back to Canada. Further than that, it would be a very difficult task to absorb them into their former activities in this country if we attempted it at a much greater rate than that.

Then there is the importance of considering the very large number of men at present engaged in the production of munitions in Canada. As I have already said, they number more than 300,000 men. We have the further problem before us of such immigration as may come to this country from Great Britain when the war is ended. It has been the experience, I believe, after former wars, that men have a tendency to go to a new country with the idea of having a different life, a newer life, an outdoor life and so it may be after this war. No one can predict with certainty; but we may have considerable immigration from the British Isles. Undoubtedly the British Government will desire to retain its people in the United Kingdom, and will make every reasonable provision and offer every reasonable inducement to that end. We must not attempt unduly to interfere with such a policy. But the British Government have another policy, which will commend itself to us; and it is this: if there is to be emigration from the British Islands, it should be the duty of the Government of the Mother Country and of the Governments of the overseas dominions to co-operate, so that this emigration may be to a country under our Flag, to one of the overseas dominions of the Empire. We have offered to co-operate, and we shall co-operate, with the British Government for that purpose. We shall also co-operate, and we have offered to co-operate, with the provincial governments of Canada for that purpose. There was a recent conference between the Federal Government and the provincial governments at which these matters were under consideration. The most important purpose that we can have before us with regard to British immigrants as well as our own soldiers returning from the front is that as many as possible of them should settle on the land. It will be the duty of the Dominion Government and of the provincial governments— and I know that they realize this duty—to offer such

assistance and such inducements as will make the settlement of these men upon the land a success. That is one of the subjects which I hope to have an opportunity of discussing when I visit Great Britain this winter. I know that any measures which may be taken by the Federal Government for that purpose will have the hearty co-operation, as to purpose at least, of all hon. gentlemen in this House. We may differ as to details and as to methods, but I know there is no one on either side of the House who would not heartily join with the Government in any well devised effort to accomplish such a result.

I shall come in a moment to some of the more direct observations of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, but before doing so, I shall say a word with reference to the paragraph in His Excellency's speech respecting the extension of the Parliamentary term during the period of the war. I do not purpose to argue that question to-night; it would be undesirable that I should do so after what has fallen from my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I simply desire to put my view in a very few words. I stated the reasons for the proposal last year, and as far as my comprehension goes, the reasons which I then advanced are equally cogent to-day. I stated to the House at that time the view which had been taken by the press of the country, the view which had been expressed by certain hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, the view which had been expressed in very cogent terms indeed by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, when he emphasized the very great undesirability of having an election during the progress of the war. He went so far, if I remember his language correctly, as to say that while he did not have the greatest possible confidence in the Government of the day he never intended to open the portals of office with a bloody key. Well, the casualties and the perils to-day are not such as to make that observation any less cogent now than it was then. I should like to express one thought I did not express last year, and have hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House take it into account, and it is this: I was at the front in the summer of 1915. Before a general election can take place we shall have perhaps 200,000 or 250,000 or 300,000 men in France. I know something of the conditions at the front, and I venture to put this thought before the House and the country: the men at the front will be not only practically, but actually, disfranchised if an election does take place in this country while they are in the trenches. That is my conviction. I say they would be actually disfranchised because, although I render every tribute to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and the committee which had in hand the preparation of the Soldiers Voting Act of 1915, I am not disposed to think that the arrangements made in that Act or in any other act that could be devised are such as to enable those men to vote, or at least any considerable number of them. You cannot predict what conditions may exist. Suppose an election came on in this country when the fiercest drive of the war was taking place. Do you imagine that the paymasters of those regiments and their commanding officers could busy themselves with handing out ballots to men whose souls were engrossed and whose lives were at stake in the enterprise in which they were engaged? There is something more than that. These men at the front have it not in their disposition—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I say that those men at the front have it not in their heart or their soul to consider matters of party controversy under the conditions with which they are there confronted. I believe those men would want to put aside any one who came to talk to them about political issues or partisan controversy, under conditions of life or of death, of victory or of defeat such as confront them in the trenches or while making a drive to bring this war to an end. Further than that, there may be perhaps a hundred thousand men not in France. You might be able to have some of those men vote for Government or for Opposition, not for a candidate, as provided in the Act alluded to; but do you imagine that those men who are putting their lives to the supreme test in going overseas to fight for their country, will be greatly interested in political issues, or that they will desire to hear political speeches, or that they will welcome the distribution of partisan literature? I am not saying whether or not these considerations should determine the issue, but I do say that they are considerations that must be taken into account by every member of this parliament when upon him the responsibility falls as to whether or not there shall be a general election during this war, and I leave it at that.

My right hon. friend has not spoken of the proposal that we should celebrate in Canada the anniversary of a half century of Confederation. I do not propose, nor do I think any member of this House would propose that there should be any spectacular celebration or any considerable expenditure of public money. The celebration should be a grave and serious one, having regard to the great trial through which Canada and the Empire is passing; but it seems to me that it is too notable an event to be permitted to pass without adequate commemoration. When we think of all that has been accomplished in this country in the past fifty years, we have reason to be proud, and to be grateful, and to be humble as well: proud of what has been accomplished; grateful for the magnificent heritage with which Providence has endowed us, and humble because of the very great responsibility that the vastness of that heritage and our duty towards it bestow upon us. And so we should approach the celebration of this anniversary in a reverent spirit. The four scattered, disconnected, disunited provinces have become a mighty nation which has thrown into this war a spirit and an effort that have invested Canada with a new dignity before the world. The fiftieth anniversary of our national life will arrive while we are passing through events, the greatness of which surpasses the most vivid imagination. Those events have already profoundly influenced the spirit of our people. They are continuing so to influence it. We begin to realize, perhaps as never before, that, notwithstanding all our resources, notwithstanding all our material development, notwithstanding all our production and all our wealth, we may be weighed in the balance and found wanting if the character and ideals of the people are not maintained. So I say, it is with a grave and reverent, but with a firm and steadfast spirit that Canada should approach the celebration of her fiftieth anniversary.

I come now in the way of criticism to some of the observations in which my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has indulged this afternoon. He is sure the soldiers have done well; he is not so sure the Government has done well. I understand he expressed himself elsewhere in even stronger terms than that, because I think that, at least at one meeting in which he was assisting in proposals for recruiting, he began his observations by emphasizing his lack of confidence in the Government. I do not think that is a very inspiring topic to enlarge upon at a recruiting meeting, nor do I think a recruiting meeting would be inspired by emphasizing the fact that Great Britain had not come to the aid of France in 1870. We all, however, have our ideas on such matters, and the course taken by my right hon. friend in that regard seemed to commend itself to him. He doubts whether the Government has done well, and he observes that the answer is to be found in certain correspondence that has been made public. He declares that there has been lack of unity and continual jarring and disputing, and he arrives at the conclusion that the interest of the country and the prosecution of the war have suffered materially through that fact. My right hon. friend has had some experience and he can speak with authority on the subject, because we recollect that one of the most prominent colleagues in his own cabinet used to declare publicly, speaking of himself and his colleagues, that they fought like blazes. My right hon. friend is not unaware of the fact that in any cabinet, however constituted, there may be differences of opinion, and that there must be differences of temperament. He seems to find a considerable amount of fault with myself as head of the Government, because he arrives at the conclusion that I have not enough firmness or enough decision. In the course of my public life I have seen some instances which might prevent my right hon. friend from putting his head in the air and talking in that somewhat boastful way, because he evidently intended to institute a comparison between the weakness and lack of decision in the present head of the Government and the firmness and decision which prevailed while he was at the head of the Government. In 1902 I observed in the House of Commons a spectacle which I never saw before, nor do I think that any one else ever saw the like; and that was when his most important colleague in the Government arose in his place in Parliament and openly flouted him to his face, taunting him with his failure to implement his pledges with regard to free trade. The colleague to whom I allude was Sir Richard Cartwright, and if any one doubts it, let him turn to the Hansard of 1902 and observe the statement which Sir Richard Cartwright made on that occasion. My right hon. friend speaks of firmness and decision and the lack of it at present. I did not observe that there was any great firmness or decision on the part of my right hon. friend when it became a ques-

9 p.m.

tion as to what Canada should do to aid the Empire in the South African war. The first pronouncement of my right hon. friend was that not a man nor a gun should go.

An hon. MEMBER: And not a dollar spent.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Practically that. I will not say that is the language, but it was an announcement to the country which produced such an outburst that my right hon. friend, notwithstanding his firmness and decision, came to the conclusion that men should go, and men did go to the extent in two years of about five thousand, the British Government being called upon to undertake their maintenance and support after they left the shores of Canada. That did not end the matter. There were two factions, and the other faction becoming restless under those conditions, my right hon. friend was obliged, in order to placate it, to pass an order in council that this should not be construed as a precedent that Canada was to take any part in the future wars of the Empire. And having said that no men should go, and then afterwards having consented that some men should go provided that Great Britain undertook to maintain them after they left our shores, and thereafter having declared by order in council that this should not be regarded as a precedent, my right hon. friend seems to think that on that occasion he gave an illustration of what firmness and decision should be.

When this war broke out, and before my colleagues had assembled in Ottawa, I took upon myself the responsibility of saying to the British Government that Canada would stand in this war to the end with the British Empire. That was my decision then; and I was ready to stand or fall by it, I am ready to stand or fall by it to-day.

I do not want to waste very much time over the question of who has the most firmness or the most decision, but I am perfectly willing to compare records with my right hon. friend in that regard. The order in council was passed, as I have said, that it should not be a precedent. Well, I am bound to say, it was not a precedent for me. I took the ground that Canada would not only throw herself into this struggle to the full extent of her energies in support of the Empire and of all that the Empire means to the world, but that we should maintain our men at the front and thus bear our share—that Canada would keep up her own expeditionary force. My hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) was good enough to pay his respects to me also on this subject and to allude to the head of the Government as a very weak and undecided person; and to explain that if the leader of the Opposition had been in my place he would have called up the Minister of Militia and Defence on the telephone and dismissed him.

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Well, something very much of that kind.

Mr. GRAHAM: I said he would have called the Minister of Militia and Defence to the office, and if he could not give a reasonable explanation, would have dismissed him.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend (Mr. Graham) must realize that the leader of his Government may perhaps have treated him in one way while he treated more important colleagues in another way. He did not deal with Sir Richard Cartwright, nor Sir Oliver Mowat, nor Sir Henri Joly, nor the Hon. W. S. Fielding, in that way. If my hon. friend is speaking from experience, none of us has reason to doubt his word. "No unity of thought or action" says the right hon. gentleman. I do not think there has been less unity of thought or action in this Administration than there was in that over which my right hon. friend presided. I want to tell him that so far as I am concerned, I have been loyal to every one of my colleagues, and every one of my colleagues, so far as I know and as I most thoroughly and sincerely believe, has been loyal to me. So far as the late Minister of Militia and Defence is concerned, I gave him my loyal support, I gave him, I believe, as free a hand in connection with the conduct of the war as any other minister ever had or as any could desire. I supported him in every possible way. And if he is under an impression to the contrary, he is under a wrong impression.

The criticism to which the leader of the Opposition addressed himself was that there was no immediate decision as to Canadian or British Control. Control of what? Our men at the front are under a British officer, Sir Douglas Haig. They are immediately under Sir Julian Byng. So far as control and direction of them as a military body is concerned, they must, of course, be under the same control and direction as the rest of the British forces. So far as promotions and appointments at the front are concerned, these should necessarily come with the sanction, approval, and

recommendation of the higher officers in command. It would be a dangerous and unfortunate course for this Government to undertake by interference in such matters to hamper or impede military operations.

Mr. MACDONALD: What about our forces while in Great Britain?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As I understand it, the control there has been maintained in Canada. The difficulty of the late Minister of Militia and Defence, so far as I remember, was owing to an order in council, which, it appeared, had not been brought to his attention and by which the Canadian officer commanding in England had greater powers than the Minister of Militia and Defence thought reasonable. When he brought the subject to the attention of Council, an order in council was passed amending it, and the order in council so passed remained in force up to the time he went out of office.

Sir SAM HUGHES: And also in France. Under the order in council that was rescinded, the officer commanding in France, General Alderson, had absolute authority.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not propose to enter into a discussion as to whether he was right or wrong. There was an order in council to which the late Minister of Militia and Defence took exception, thinking that he should have more control, and it was amended upon his initiative and recommendation so as to give him increased control over appointments both in Great Britain and in France.

Now, I desire to say a word as to equipment. In the early months of the war, a difficulty naturally arose because the transport and equipment were not of precisely the same type as those in Great Britain as I understand it—and, of course, I speak without the intimate knowledge of such matters possessed by the officers of the department, and, doubtless, by my hon. friend, the late Minister of Militia and Defence. It is important for an army at the front to have a uniform standard of equipment, transport, and everything else. Otherwise, it is necessary to have supplies of the different types of transport and equipment in the ordnance stores behind the front, and this is a hindrance to military operations. I believe that some equipment supplied was left when the first Canadian contingent departed for France. I have spoken of that in this House before. I discussed the matter with General Carson when I was in England last year. He told me that the equipment was left because it was not of the same type as the British equipment and they did not desire to have two types. He took what seemed a proper and reasonable course. He called a board, on which both Canada and Great Britain were represented, for the purpose of inquiring whether this equipment had been left because it was not a good equipment or because it was not uniform with the other. He told me that the board declared that it was good equipment. And it was taken over and used in the British Islands, and Canada received full credit for the value of it. It is most desirable, if the troops from Canada and from the rest of the Empire are to fight side by side, that all equipment and transport should be standardized, for it is obvious that otherwise operations cannot be carried on so effectively. It might have been better if that matter had been taken into consideration before the war. It was not taken into consideration under the administration of my right hon. friend. I am not saying that by way of reproach, because I suppose no one could have anticipated war upon so tremendous a scale in which Canada would be called upon to take so great a part.

I believe that not only with respect to equipment but with respect to arms, guns and ammunition as well as the Mother Country and the great dominions of the Empire ought to confer and co-operate and select uniform types, and that these types ought to be produced not only in the United Kingdom but in every one of the great dominions of the Empire. I hope also that a rifle to be called the Imperial service rifle may be adopted by the Mother Country and each of the great dominions after necessary expert examination and after consultation between the military authorities of Great Britain and the overseas dominions, so that in the future, in case the need for participation in war should arise, we should not have occasion to discuss differences in arms, transport, equipment or any other matter.

My right hon. friend read some portions of this correspondence; I shall not allude to that very much further. He referred to some remarks with regard to the Military Hospitals Commission, the Pensions Commission and the National Service Commission which had been made by my hon. friend the late Minister of Militia and Defence. So far as the Military Hospitals Commission is concerned, I do not think

there is any absurdity connected with that. As I have already pointed out, it was established upon the initiative of the ex-minister himself. If there is any absurdity connected with the Pensions Commission, it is an absurdity that must be visited upon the whole House of Commons, because that Pensions Commission was appointed upon the report of a committee of this House, unanimously affirmed by the vote of this House. As to the National Service Commission, at the time the observations were made it had not really gone into operation at all. My right hon. friend states that he desires to discuss that commission on some other occasion. I shall be very happy to have him do so and to go into the matter fully then.

With respect to the alleged interference of the Canadian High Commissioner in military affairs, I am not aware of any such interference. I have telegraphed him from time to time asking him to get into communication with the War Office in respect of matters that required the co-operation of the two governments, and whenever I have asked him to do this he has done it. Outside of that, I am not aware that he has personally interfered at all. So far as Lord Kitchener's opinion is concerned, I note what my hon. friend read from the correspondence, but certainly I can say that in my interview with Lord Kitchener in 1915 he never expressed any such opinion to me.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The date to which reference was made was in October, 1914, when Lord Kitchener expressed himself as of the opinion that these troops were British regulars. Will the First Minister not say that I informed him immediately on my return to Canada on that subject?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have no recollection of it.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Of my telling the right hon. gentleman what Lord Kitchener and the High Commissioner—

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really have no recollection of it. I do not say it did not occur; I really have no recollection of it. I am only saying that in his consultation with me Lord Kitchener did not express any such opinion, nor did I find on the part of the War Office or on the part of any of the officials over there any desire to override Canada or Canadian interests. I can say that most sincerely; I have never discovered on the part of the British Government, the British War Office or any of the officials with whom I came in touch over there a disposition to override or to disregard Canadian interests.

Sir SAM HUGHES: May I ask another question?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Certainly.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Has the First Minister a recollection of an objection being made to Colonel Steele, now General Steele, commanding the Second Division?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have a recollection of a question being raised as to whether his years were not so advanced that he could not stand the work at the front, and I have a recollection also that my hon. friend concurred in that view.

Sir SAM HUGHES: If the right hon. First Minister wants me to give an explanation, I can do it, but not now.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend will have to make, of course, any explanation he may see fit. I certainly understood him at the time to concur in that view.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The correspondence will show it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not know what the correspondence shows; I have not looked at it. It is certainly my recollection that my hon. friend concurred in that view. Every one realizes the great ability and the splendid record of General Steele as a soldier. The only question raised to me from first to last, so far as I remember, was as to whether his years were not so advanced that it would be putting too much upon him to entrust him with the command which has been alluded to.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Perhaps it would be just as well if I should set it right now. At the time Colonel Steele was selected to command the Second Division positive objection were made to him that he was unfit—whether it was the question of his age or not. After he had a severe fall from his horse and had one shoulder broken, and after another injury at Shorncliffe, when the question of going over with the division was up, that was the time I agreed that General Steele was not physically fitted to go. Up to that time I had maintained that he was qualified to go.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not charge my mind with these details. The distinct impression I had was that when the time came to appoint an officer in command of that division my hon. friend the late Minister of Militia and Defence concurred in the

view that it would not be prudent or fair to General Steele to ask him to accept that command.

With regard to British officers scrapping equipment merely for the reason that it was Canadian, not British, I am not disposed to think that anything of the kind could have taken place. I believe that if any of our equipment was put to one side it was for the reason that uniformity in equipment was necessary at the front. If any incidents of a contrary nature ever occurred I cannot recall them at the moment. So far as I am concerned, there has not been in the past, nor will there be in the future any failure to uphold Canadian interests in every respect in connection with this war. On the other hand, I do not propose, I have not proposed in the past, and I do not propose in the future to set up my judgment or the judgment of this Government against the opinion of military experts who may say that it is necessary that the type of equipment, of transport, or of anything else necessary in this war ought to be uniform and that the war cannot be carried on effectively unless it is uniform. If the military authorities, men of experience and good judgment in that regard, reach that conclusion, certainly I do not purpose setting up my judgment against it. Subject to that, I am sure that the members of this House and the people of this country may be satisfied that all Canadian interests in this war will be thoroughly upheld by those who are responsible for the administration of affairs to-day.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am very much interested, apart from the question of difference between the late hon. Minister of Militia and the right hon. gentleman, in knowing exactly, in the interests of the men overseas, who are the controlling forces to-day with regard to promotions, appointments and other matters affecting the men overseas in Great Britain before they go across to France.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: So far as I understand, the recommendations would come in the ordinary way from the commanding officers, and the overseas minister would recommend them to the Governor in Council, and they would be gazetted accordingly.

Mr. MACDONALD: Then Sir George Perley has control?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: He would receive the recommendation of his officers, and make his recommendations to the Governor in Council; that is as I understand it.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Mr. MACDONALD: Then the Canadian Minister of Militia has nothing to do with it; it is directed entirely by Sir George Perley?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It would be dealt with by Sir George Perley because the forces over there are under his direction, and he has the same duties in regard to them as the Minister of Militia has in regard to the forces in Canada. There is, of course, wherever necessary, consultation and co-operation.

My right hon. friend has spoken of the war conference, and he has suggested a possible constitutional difficulty. I am bound to say that I do not know precisely what that can be. The War Cabinet, I suppose, could call to their conference any member of the Privy Council. The British Cabinet has called members of the Privy Council who are not members of the Government to their deliberations. I believe there was a precedent for that many years ago. There was a precedent for it in 1915. There was a precedent for it in 1916. I attended a meeting of the British Cabinet in 1915. Mr. Hughes of Australia attended several meetings, I believe, in 1916, and the fact that the present British Cabinet is a small Cabinet, a so-called War Cabinet, does not in any way raise a constitutional difficulty. My right hon. friend has alluded to the wide scope of the conference, to the wide scope of the subjects which are to be discussed at the conference; and certainly they have an exceedingly wide scope. It is for that reason that I sent the telegram which my right hon. friend has read. The subjects to be discussed are: first, urgent questions relating to the prosecution of the war; second, the conditions upon which the allied governments may assent to its termination; and thirdly, the problems which will then immediately arise. There really seems to be little left out of it; the prosecution of the war, the terms upon which peace may be made, and the problems that will then immediately arise. Because the scope was so comprehensive I asked for more information. It has not yet arrived. If it should be of a character that may properly be laid on the table of the House, I shall have no hesitation whatever in acquainting the House with its purport.

My right honourable friend has alluded to the arrangements that may be made in connection with my visit. It is difficult to say at the moment just what the best arrangement might be. On the one hand, I should not desire, if it could be avoided, to

put the members of this House to the inconvenience of a summer session. On the other hand, I thoroughly appreciate the spirit which my right. hon. friend has shown in making the suggestion which he has been good enough to lay before me, and I thank him very sincerely for it. I think it is a very considerate proposal on his part, and he may be sure that I shall take it into account, and consult with him respecting it. It seems to me that there can be no reasonable objection to it, but, on the spur of the moment, I cannot speak very definitely in that regard, and I should require to consult my colleagues with reference to it. It is perhaps desirable during an important session such as this, when measures of a very grave nature are to be proposed, that the Prime Minister of the country should be present while these matters are under discussion. Without desiring to attach any undue importance to my presence here, I believe that honourable gentlemen will see some force in the suggestion which my right hon. friend has made. On the other hand, I do not see that it would be at all proper for me to refuse the call to attend this conference. How useful it may be, remains to be determined in the future; but the call having come, I feel that one in my position must obey it without a moment's hesitation, putting aside all other considerations. And so it may be that the members of this House will have to be put to some inconvenience. I am sure that, if that inconvenience should arise, they will not take it into great account, considering the hardships, the sacrifices that are being made by hundreds of thousands of our own countrymen in the effort to win this war.

With respect to the questions that are to be discussed, it is apparent to my right honourable friend, as it must be to all the members of this House, that I cannot give much information as to the determinations which may be reached. With regard to the prosecution of the war, I can give the conference this firm assurance: that the people of this country are united in their determination to throw all their efforts into the war, and to bring it to that conclusion which alone can bring about a lasting peace.

As to the conditions of peace, the second subject mentioned, my right hon. friend has expressed his opinion with regard to their general character. I am satisfied, and I think the people of this country will be satisfied, to abide by the conclusion which has already been announced by the British Government, that peace will only be granted upon the condition of reparation for the past and guarantees for the future. It is quite impossible for those responsible for this war to make reparation in the highest or fullest sense. Of course, they cannot make reparation to the allied nations, nor indeed to their own people, for all the lives that have been lost, for all the blood that has been shed in their attempt to dominate the world. More than that, I do not suppose that it would be possible for the resources even of the great German nation to make reparation for all the material injury that has been caused in this war. I do not believe that that would be possible; but certain reparation must come. It must come to those people in Belgium who have seen their whole country desolated and devastated. It must come to those people in Belgium who by the hundred thousand have been dragged from their homes into practical slavery under conditions that have shocked the conscience of the whole world and are arousing the most intense feeling among neutral nations to-day. They must make reparation to Serbia. They must make reparation to those countries that they have devastated and desolated, and so far as may be possible—I do not say how far this may be possible—they ought to make reparation for the material losses suffered by those countries whose territory has not been invaded.

First there must be reparation for the past and then guarantees for the future. I absolutely agree with what my right hon. friend said this afternoon, and what I, myself have said more than once, that all the sacrifices that we have made, all the blood that has been shed, all the treasure that has been poured out, would not only be in vain but would be absolutely worse than useless, if we did not bring about a peace with such guarantees as will ensure the world against any such aggression in the future. I say more than that. I say that not only the allied nations but all the neutral nations of the world are profoundly and deeply interested in the conclusion of a peace such as that. You cannot carry on a war under modern conditions which does not touch the whole world. Modern means of communication have brought the whole world together and no nation, no continent, can in future be a hermit. A great world devastating war like this is bound to affect profoundly not only the countries that are engaged in it but neutral nations as well. Therefore, it is to the absolute interest of

all the neutral nations of the world that, we do not consent to a truce but consent only to a peace which shall be lasting and permanent and which shall be safeguarded by effective guarantees.

That is the only kind of peace that will be of use to the world, to civilization, to humanity. I have spoken of the interests of the allied nations, I have spoken of the interests of the neutral nations, I will go farther than that, and say that no peace would be of any advantage to Germany herself unless it was a peace of that character and secured by such guarantees. In the interest of the whole world, it is essential that this peace shall be upon an absolutely permanent foundation and that an assurance shall be given not only to the allied nations but to all neutral nations, to humanity and to civilization itself that such attempts at aggression and world domination shall not be renewed in the future. If I go from you with any mandate, I believe I go from you with that mandate to the British Islands and to the allied nations.

We heard only the other day of a suggestion by Germany that there should be a round table conference at the Hague to bring the war to a conclusion, without any proposals as to terms to be discussed, without any proposition whatever except that there should be a conference. Sir Edward Grey pleaded, almost begged for a conference before this war broke out. What was the answer? You know the answer that was given by the German Emperor. The like answer that was given by the Austrian government. No discussion, said the spokesman of the Austrian Government to the British Ambassador at Vienna, could be accepted on the basis of the Serbian note, a note which had humiliated Serbia to a greater extent than any civilized, self-respecting nation had ever been humiliated before, a note which involved the acceptance of terms of a most astonishing character. What was the answer?

> No discussion could be accepted on the basis of the Serbian note; war would be declared to-day; and that the well-known pacific character of the Emperor, as well as his own—

That is the Speaker himself, the man who was uttering these words—

> —might be accepted as a guarantee that the war was just and inevitable.

It is these men who suggest to-day that there should be a round table conference. The time for such a conference was before

the war, which they forced upon the world after a quarter of a century of preparation.

I spoke this afternoon of the fortunes of war during the past year. One point which I forgot to mention is probably influencing Germany and Austria more profoundly in their desire for peace than any other. Apart from all matters touching the organization and numbers of armies, the Germans realize that the industrial resources which Great Britain has thrown into this war have produced already, and will increasingly produce in the future, such a superiority in artillery and in all modern devices necessary to carry on this war that their day has passed by. They realize more fully than ever that when they failed to win this war in the first six months all chances of winning it passed forever from them. It is for the same reason that the allied nations have entered the new year with renewed confidence and strengthened determination. When the war broke out the enemy nations confronted us with marked superiority in the forces which they could throw immediately into the struggle, with more effective and speedy methods of mobilization, with an overwhelming preponderance in guns, rifles, equipment and munitions of war and in all the mechanical devices without which no army can fight on equal terms under modern conditions. Looking back for two years, it is a matter of profound astonishment that the Germans did not succeed in what they intended to accomplish and had so carefully planned. The British army, relatively insignificant in numbers, but magnificent in discipline and pluck and in efficiency, which went to France in August, 1914, was one of the chief factors in defeating the German purpose. In all the annals of that army there is no more glorious page than that which describes the achievements of the First British Expeditionary Force. The German onrush was stayed and was converted into retreat. Since then the line has been extended in the western theatre from the North Sea to Switzerland and the opposing forces have been closely locked in a struggle which has not yet terminated; but the superiority of the Germans in men, in equipment, in munitions of war, has passed away. We are at least on equal terms to-day, and every moment of the future will bring to us increasing superiority. German shells ten to one against us in 1915. British shells ten to one against the Germans in the Somme advance. And it was in that advance that the Canadians proved themselves so splendidly effective in the offensive. Facing overwhelming superiority in men and in artillery, against the

most horrible and unexpected methods of warfare they had held their own in the defensive, whether at Ypres in the spring and summer of 1915, or in the Ypres salient during the early summer of 1916. Their attack was as sudden and smashing as their defence had been stubborn and inflexible.

The first trench raid was organized by Canadians—a British Columbia regiment. The first daylight trench raid was also organized by Canadians—an Ontario regiment. The officers who organized and carried out this raid were sent by the British Commander-in-Chief to explain and illustrate to the officers in the British army the preparation which had been made and the methods by which the raids had been carried out. In that connection I might read for the information of the House, a telegram which came in this evening from the Canadian War Records office and which is the latest news from the front.

It is dated London, Jan. 22, and is as follows:

To Militia, Ottawa.

The following communique is from Canadian war records office, London. The past week has been one of normal trench warfare. Normal trench warfare of to-day, however, is very different to the normal trench warfare of a year ago. Everywhere the ascendency of our troops over the enemy is most marked. The evidence of prisoners is the most eloquent testimony to the ascendency of our patrols, while bombardments of the enemy's lines which a year ago would have merited a detailed description as important operations are to-day affairs of almost daily occurrence. This continual activity of our artillery and infantry has undoubtedly weakened the morale of the enemy, and is paving the way for victories to come. A great feature in the life of the men at the front is the training which they carry out when in reserve. There is a vigor and purpose about this training which is quite remarkable. Men who have faced the enemy in battle appear to realize what training will mean to them, and by this training, the purpose of which is constantly in the minds of all, the sure seeds of victory are being sown.

Mr. Speaker, the story of our achievement in this war is not less glorious than that of the men from the British Isles, and the other Dominions. Thus it will be to the end. Canada has sent of her best and of her bravest to uphold a cause which appealed most impressively to the soul of her people. It is literally and absolutely true that the fight for this Dominion, for all the traditions, ideals and institutions which are the heritage of its people is being fought beyond the seas, on the plains of France and Belgium. If that battle is lost our future is lost. If it ends even in a truce or a draw, on what can we count or rely for future security? Would Canada be anything more than a pawn in the hands of a combination of enemy nations that had successfully withstood Great Britain, France and Russia? But that battle will not be lost. In the first year the Allies held the enemy, and could do no more. Opportunity for victory passed from the Germans in the first six months of the war. The second year was for the Allies almost wholly a year of preparation. The third year, upon which we have now entered, will be the year of action, of victory and of peace. Then Canada with loftier ideals, more inspiring memories and more glorious traditions will take up her peaceful task anew, upbuilding the splendid structure of her national life upon the eternal foundation of her devotion and sacrifice.

On motion of Mr. E. M. Macdonald, the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at 9.49 p.m.

Tuesday, January 23, 1917.

The House met at three o'clock, the Speaker in the chair.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the name of the Hon. P. E. Blondin be added to the standing committee appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of this House under Rule 10.

Motion agreed to.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN presented a message from His Excellency the Governor General approving minute of Council appointing the Hon. William James Roche, Minister of the Interior and Superintendent General of Indian Affairs; the Hon. John Dowsley Reid, Minister of Customs; the Hon. Albert E. Kemp, Minister of Militia and Defence, and the Hon. Pierre Edouard Blondin, Postmaster General, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons as a Commission under the provisions of the Eleventh Chapter of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, intituled, "An Act respecting the House of Commons."

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Copies of Orders in Council relating to National Service.—Sir Robert Borden.

Eleventh Report of the Board of Railway Commissioners.—Hon. Mr. Cochrane.

Report of War Purchasing Commission.—Hon. Mr. Kemp.

Shipping List for Canada for the year ended December 31, 1915; also Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for fiscal year 1915-16.—Hon. Mr. Hazen.

ABOLITION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT BILL.

Bill No. 3 to amend the Criminal Code and to abolish Capital Punishment.—Mr. Bickerdike.—Read the first time.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT—RE-MARRIAGE OF DIVORCED PERSONS.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (St. John, N.B.): moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 4, to amend the Criminal Code.

Mr. WILCOX: Explain.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This Bill is the same as that introduced at the last session by Mr. Martin of Regina. It stood for the second reading, and I, and I think Mr. Martin as well, had conversations with the Hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and the Hon. the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) in reference to it being considered by a committee to which it was proposed there would be submitted certain other amendments to the Criminal Code.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What is the nature of the Bill?

Mr. PUGSLEY: It adds to the provisions of the Criminal Code, section 307, in reference to criminal prosecutions for bigamy and other similar offences. Section 307 of the Act is rather peculiar in some respects and quite deficient in its provision to prevent cases of injustice arising. Sub-section 3 provides:

> No one commits bigamy by going through a form of marriage if he or she has been divorced from the bond of first marriage.

The courts of this country have held that that means a divorce obtained in Canada, and that it would not apply to the case of a divorce obtained in a foreign country.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In Canada alone or within the Empire?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am not sure as to that. The decisions, I think, are limited to countries which are foreign to the Empire. I do not know about divorces obtained in countries forming part of the Empire, but not in Canada. Paragraph 4 provides:

> No person shall be liable to be convicted of bigamy in respect of having gone through a form of marriage in a place not in Canada, unless such person, being a British subject resident in Canada, leaves Canada with intent to go through such form of marriage.

Under the law as it now is, if a divorce were obtained in a foreign country and a marriage were to take place in that country the party would not be liable for bigamy unless he or she actually went there with the intention of getting married. My hon. friend will see what opportunities for evasion that would present. The Bill which I propose provides for the case of a bona fide divorce obtained from a court having competent jurisdiction and obtained by a party who has become, although previously a resident of Canada, a bona fide resident of such foreign country, residence to be continued at least for a period of one year before divorce proceedings have been instituted. Then there must be notice given to the husband or wife, as the case may be. The divorce must be obtained on a full statement of facts and the marriage must not take place until the expiration of two years from the time of obtaining the divorce. In cases of that kind the Bill provides that there shall be no criminal proceedings instituted by reason of the subsequent marriage. I think it is desirable that proper safeguards should be thrown around cases of this nature in order to prevent scandals which sometimes arise, but instances have come to my knowledge, and they had also come to the knowledge of the then hon. member for Regina, where, when divorces have been obtained bona fide by residents of a foreign country and the parties deciding to return to Canada, criminal proceedings might have been taken both for bigamy and for adultery. When the Bill has passed its second reading it might be referred to a special committee, who might consider it in reference to the whole of the law bearing on the subject.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Is it merely residence that my hon. friend contemplates, or actual domicile?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Bona fide residence for a period of two years. It might be made to cover only the case of domicile if it be thought desirable.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PRIVILEGE.

CORRECTION OF STATEMENT IN TORONTO GLOBE.

On the Orders of the Day.

Mr. WILCOX: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I see that I am reported in the Toronto Globe of yesterday as having made a statement which is inaccurate. The Globe states:—

> Mr. Wilcox's Information is Not All Reliable.
> If Mr. Wilcox is correctly quoted in the Ottawa despatches as to the conditions surrounding racing in his constituency of South Essex and elsewhere, he has got much of his information from very unreliable sources, and the following statement, ascribed to him, is full of inaccuracies: "The tracks at Windsor are operated by the American Turf Association. They operate in Mexico, just over the boundary line, about a mile from El Paso, and also in Florida in winter time."

I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, that I never said in this House or out of it that the tracks in my constituency were operated by the American Turf Association. What I did say is that they are predominated by American influence. I want to say further that I do not want to assume the responsibility of correcting all the inaccuracies that may appear in the columns of the Toronto Globe, but it affords me unbounded pleasure to correct this one.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. G. C. Wilson (Wentworth) for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Monday, January 22.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, I desire to congratulate you, Sir, upon your selection to fill the very high and distinguished office of first Commoner of Canada. Coming as you do from the same province as I do and representing a constituency in close proximity to my own; enjoying as I have all my life the privilege of your acquaintance, I beg to say that I have every confidence that you will maintain the high traditions which have characterized the public men who in the past have shed lustre on this office, and that we look to you to act with distinction and fairness. I desire also to express my satisfaction and pleasure with the high character of the addresses which have been delivered by the hon. mover (Mr. G. C. Wilson) and seconder (Mr. Descarries) of the Address.

The Speech from the Throne does not contain very many subjects which can be said to be matters of controversial discussion. I am glad to know that the Government have recalled the fact that we are nearing the conclusion of fifty years of our national life, and that on the first of July of this present year Canada will be, or should be, celebrating her golden jubilee. Personally, not knowing the proposals which the Government intend to submit to the House in regard to what I assume will be a matter of the special marking of the day, I am unable to say whether these will be approved or not.

Believing as I do, that the event is one which though we are in the midst of war should be commemorated by our people, believing that there is no land like our land, and that it is our duty as representatives of a free people to see that the administration of affairs in this country is fair to the boys who are fighting for us, but also to prepare a condition of affairs in this land that will be worthy of them when they come home again, I think, Sir, that the event should be marked in some special way throughout every portion of this wide Dominion.

We are told that a conference has been proposed between the War Council at the seat of Empire and the premiers of the overseas dominions. I am sure the country will approve of the attitude adopted by the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) yesterday, when he expressed the readiness of all who sit on this side of the House to facilitate in every possible way the attendance of the representative of Canada at that conference. It must be noted that some criticism has been made in Great Britain of the fact that although a change of Government took place there only two months ago with the object of a more vigorous prosecution of the war, and the narrowing down of its control to one or two people, it is now suggested that the Premiers of the overseas dominions be added to that council, that they may assist in considering the great problem of how the war is to be won. I do not know whether the right hon. gentleman who will speak for Canada will be able to give any assistance in bringing about that great consummation which we all hope for. I do not know whether this country gives him any mandate so far as this conference is concerned, other than to say to the Mother Country that Canada stands behind her until victory is won. But as regards ques-

tions other than those immediately concerned with the winning of the war, it would seem to me as a Canadian that Canada will await with interest the deliberations of that conference, reserving to itself as a people and to this Parliament as a Parliament the right of determining what is in her own best interests as one of the self-governing dominions of this Empire.

Over and above every consideration which might appeal to this Parliament at this time is the question of the war. For thirty long months the sad hearts of the people of this country have watched its weary progress. We had yesterday from the two leaders in this House a resumé of the events of the past year, and I am sure, after the figures given by the Prime Minister, that over 310,000 of our sons are now overseas, over 400,000 of our men enlisted, and over 700,000 of our people engaged either in fighting or in work pertaining to the war, we must all realize that there is not a hamlet in this broad land but what is seriously thinking of the terrible consequences of this fateful and world-wide contest. So that the administration of this Government in regard to matters pertaining to the war must be our first interest. If they have failed to do that which they ought to have done, or have done those things which they ought not to have done, the people of this country will expect their representatives in Parliament, without any limitations or reserve whatever, boldly to arraign at the bar of public opinion the conduct of this Government, in order to see whether the right has been done. It must be remembered that this Government is practically the only one among the free peoples of the Empire that maintains during the war a purely partisan attitude in regard to the conduct of its affairs. We have witnessed the changes that have taken place in the Mother Country, where at the mere solicitation of the men who were in control two changes of administration have already taken place, with the object of securing greater efficiency; and we have witnessed the changes that have taken place in other parts of the Empire. I should like to call your attention, Sir, to a statement showing Australia's position, and how that country does business in regard to the war. To quote:

> The essentials of the Australian system are: (1). The War Minister is a political administrator and does not attempt to be an active military officer.

I might remark in passing that there exists on the statute book a provision that there shall be a certain military officer in supreme command of the forces of this Dominion. We have heard of General Hutton, of General Lake and of General Mackenzie, all very distinguished Imperial officers, but who in this country has heard of their successor in this war? There is a general named General Gwatkin, who fills that position to-day. But has the Government given to general Gwatkin, as the Australian Government has given to their chief military officer, exclusive control of the Army? In Australia control is left entirely to a military man, and I think it might be well, having regard to conditions in Australia, for this Government to consider whether or not they have an efficient military head of the forces of this Dominion; and if they have not one, they had better get one immediately, and place in his hands exclusive control of our military affairs. The Australian system provides:

> Political patronage is avoided, and politics are shut out of the army.

My right hon. friend might take a leaf out of Premier Hughes' book—I do not mean Sir Sam Hughes' book—and follow the practice they have in Australia of keeping politics out of the Army. The statement continues:

> Australians are not afraid to give individuals considerable powers in administrative work, such as purchasing supplies. Good men are picked for their posts, are made responsible and are judged by what they do. The knife falls quickly on the incompetent or unreliable.

That is a brief statement of how the Australian Commonwealth is dealing with the war, which I offer for the illumination and consideration of my right hon. friend and his colleagues. But my right hon. friend, disregarding all these considerations and the example of other countries, has from the beginning of the war assumed that because he happened to be in power when the war began, and because an extension of the parliamentary term was given for war purposes, he has been given the absolute right to proceed along the old lines of partisanship and patronage which have always characterized his administration. That, it seems to me, is not right; for in this country there has been no monopoly of patriotism in this fight. The boys have gone forth from the homes of men of all political views in this country, without any regard whatever to political affiliations, eager to play their part in the interest of their native land

in this great battle of democracy against autocracy. We on this side of the House and the people whom we represent in this country have proved our loyalty by more than word of mouth. Sitting not far away from me are three men, the hon. member for Edmonton (Hon. Frank Oliver), the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Cruise), and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), the fathers of three sturdy lads who went out from their western homes to do battle and, if necessary, to die for the triumph of the eternal right. These boys have solved the great mystery. Beneath the blood-stained soil of France their bones are lying and they are at rest, careless alike of the sunshine or of the storm; of the summer days, or of the wild shrill noise of the shrapnel on winter nights. Around me are twenty-six or more men whose boys to-day are either on the battle-line or on their way there. When I say to you, Sir, that, from the farm, the workshop, the office and the cottage throughout all the land the men we represent here have given of their best for this cause, one does not need to apologize in this free Parliament for anything one may say as to the rights of these boys, as to the way in which they are treated, or as to the administration of this Parliament in regard to them. We are here to ask that the greatest intelligence, the keenest attention, the strictest integrity and the highest ideals should characterize the administration of the affairs of this country at this time. Any departure from that high ideal deserves and must receive from us and from this free people the severest condemnation. In order to effect the winning of this war, the marshalling of our resources in men and supplies and the elimination of graft, patronage, and favouritism are the very least that we, on this side of the House, have a right to ask from this Government which has administered matters in this partisan fashion.

During the last thirty months the members of this Government have been very sensitive to criticism. Although they have conducted everything from a party standpoint, they seem to regard any kind of criticism that comes from those who are interested in the successful solution of the great question of the war as a species of lèse majesté. The offender must be arraigned, attached and impeached, the moment he makes any suggestion as to improvement in the administration. I commend to my right hon. friend some criticism which has been made of the English Government in this regard which is so applicable to the conduct of this Government that it will bear repetition in this House, and I am sure the hon. gentlemen will agree with me that it is peculiarly applicable to the gentlemen who at present sit on the treasury benches. A writer in Blackwood's Magazine says:

> Indeed, it is not only in the field of foreign affairs that our present Government shows its incapacity. Whatever it attempts it bungles miserably. If it be true to any one principle, that principle is hostility to Great Britain and British interests. With a false magnanimity our ministers are ready to abandon the fruits of victory to anybody whose lips ask to taste them. They affect a loftiness of spirit which is more nearly allied to laziness than to humanity. They seem, indeed, to suffer, one and all, from an atrophy of purpose, an inability to make up their mind, which are doubtless the proper result of a political training. It may be that the conflicting members of the Cabinet reduce it always by their differences of opinion to an inactive condition of stable equilibrium.

That phrase in which atrophy of purpose is said to exist in the British Government is especially applicable to honourable gentlemen who sit on the treasury benches. There are conflicting opinions amongst the members of the Cabinet. The ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) has told us of two members of the Cabinet who were continually opposing him. The Prime Minister rather avoided coming to close quarters with the ex-Minister of Militia; he rather avoided and side-stepped an encounter and he intimated that he did not care to discuss these serious questions, although charges of the greatest magnitude, involving the lives of our soldiers, the care of the wounded, and the possible loss to this country of millions of dollars had been made by the ex-Minister of Militia. The writer in Blackwood's goes on to say:

> That is to find the kindest explanation for their many futilities. The more probable cause of their failure to govern the country, or to conduct the war with spirit, is a feeling of security. Whatever happens, it sems to them that their offices are safe. They believe that they are the best suited to carry on the war. Why, then, should they bestir themselves? They are indispensable, in their own eyes, and irreplacable, and must on no account be disturbed in the enjoyment of what they believe to be their divine rights.

I am not quite sure that there are not sitting on the treasury benches at this moment certain hon. gentlemen who are actuated by those feelings which the writer of Blackwood's describes, namely, that they are perfectly satisfied that they have a divine right to govern this country, and Sir, because they so believe, we have the inca-

pacity which has characterized the administration of this war from its beginning. In times of peace mistakes may be made which can be readily remedied, but in times of war mistakes cannot be made without their leading to results which are irreparable, and which may mean not only the loss of thousands of dollars to the country, but the loss of hundreds of noble lives that might have been spared.

Last night, the Prime Minister in dealing with questions which arose in this debate seemed to assume to himself very great credit on account of the increase of trade that had come to Canada. My right hon. friend was very profuse in his compliments to his Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White). Whether the Minister of Finance should be placated or not is a matter which the right hon. gentleman knows far better than I do, but the marked distinction between his reference to his colleague the Minister of Finance and his reference to his colleague the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers), of whom the best that he could say was that in the administration of the war he was occasionally assisting the Minister of Labour in doing some things, attracted the attention of the House, and I am quite sure will attract the attention of the country. My right hon. friend chose to assume that the fact that there had been an increase of trade during the past year was something for which the Minister of Finance should be given credit. The Minister of Finance, I think the House will agree with me, had very little to do with it; but if he did have anything to do with it, what a sad reflection he must have. It is only five years ago that we were told we would have no truck nor trade with the Yankees; that it would be a horrible crime, a sin against our loyalty to the Empire, if we bought and sold anything more in the United States than we were then doing. Where does the great increase of trade come from of which my right hon. friend spoke so enthusiastically last night? In 1911 our total trade with the United States was only $378,000,000, but in the past year it amounted to $800,000,000. In other words, if it was disloyal to truck and trade with the Yankees to the extent of $378,000,000 in 1911, what must be the extent of the perfidy of the Minister of Finance, so far as loyalty is concerned, when he permits and enthuses over a trade of $800,000,000?

I think my right hon. friend, on reflection, will agree with me that the Minister of Finance was simply a fly on the wheel in regard to this. I notice that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance occasionally causes pronunciamentos to be given to the country through the Conservative press stating that although our industries were paralysed before the war commenced, he was entitled to some credit because the country has been able to carry on. I am sure every one, on reflection, will see the ridiculous nature of the pretext which the Prime Minister put forth last night.

My right hon. friend had something to say, also, on the question of the extension of the term of Parliament—while deprecating an anticipatory discussion of that question. I agree that this House should postpone consideration of that important question until the Government submits its resolution relating to it. Yet I may be permitted to remark that the right hon. gentleman was not very happy in the reference he made in that connection to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who leads the Opposition. He referred to the fact that my right hon. leader had said, in 1914, that he would at that time refrain from attempting to open the portals of office with a bloody key. But the leader of the Government himself has, on three or four occasions, tried to open the door of an extended term of office with a bloody key. He has actually inserted that key in the lock on at least two occasions, but has felt obliged to withdraw it. Every hon. gentleman knows that we met in the war session of 1914 without any reservation whatever; that Parliament gave this Government almost plenary powers in regard to the war by enacting the provisions of the War Measures Act, and gave them from the treasury of the Canadian people ad libitum. Yet, we had hardly reached our homes after that session, the first contingent of our overseas forces had hardly reached England, when the leader of the Government and his colleagues considered the question of having an election at that time. It is well understood that certain members of the Government at that time opposed going to the country on the ground that the confidence extended to the Government by the splendid action of the Liberal party in connection with the war should not be abused. And what about the session of 1915? The right hon. leader of the Government experienced a change of heart on the question of soldiers' votes. Had he heard from any of the boys in the trenches that they would vote against this Government if they were given the chance? If he did not hear of that there are thou-

sands of people in this country who did. This change of heart on his part is rather suspicious. He caused the press of this country to attack my right hon. leader because that right hon. gentleman ventured to suggest at that time that there might be some difficulty about taking the votes of the soldiers. He caused his own organ in the city of Halifax to charge my leader with disloyalty because he ventured to question—

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That statement is untrue, whether in regard to the newspaper in Halifax or any other.

Mr. MACDONALD: Then who directed it?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I say the statement is untrue.

Mr. MACDONALD: Then, who directed Senator Dennis to do it?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I say the hon. gentleman has no warrant for making such a statement. I never influenced any portion of the press of Canada at any time to make an attack upon any public man.

Mr. MACDONALD: Then the right hon. gentleman should have asked Senator Dennis to withdraw the article. This is the party organ in the right hon. gentleman's own constituency, and the editor, if he did not make this attack at the direction of the right hon. gentleman—and, of course, I am bound to accept my right hon. friend's statement—at least felt that it would not displease the right hon. gentleman if it were made. And in this matter of the soldiers' votes, the right hon. gentleman had the ballots printed and sent out in charge of Mr. Daly, now Secretary of the Pensions Board. We can still hear the echo of the words of his colleague the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers), who declared that the people of Canada were calling in thunder tones for an election to be brought on at once, and we all remember that the Minister of Public Works delivered a speech in Montreal in which he gave notice to the whole country that an election was to take place. But the right hon. gentleman will have no difficulty in remembering that immediately there came by telegraph from all parts of the country protests sent by boards of trade, Conservative organizations and other bodies, against the holding of an election. And so, though he had almost inserted this bloody key in the lock, the key fell from his nerveless hand and he retired to the country for several weeks to rest after the effort he had made in preparation. So I say the right hon. gentleman was not at all happy in his anticipatory references to a discussion which, no doubt, will take place later on.

The Prime Minister referred to the attitude assumed by the Liberal party in connection with the Boer War. Does he forget that his great predecessor in the leadership of the Conservative party and the premiership of this country, Sir John Macdonald, had always taken the position that there should be no interference by Canada in the foreign wars of the Empire? Had he forgotten that other great leaders had gone on record in the same sense? And does he not remember the famous pamphlet No. 6 circulated in the province of Quebec on behalf of his party, in which it was stated that my right hon. leader was too English for them because he wanted Canada to intervene in such wars? He forgets that the leader of the Liberal party, when in attendance in Great Britain at the jubliee of Queen Victoria, of happy memory, pledged Canada to give aid and assistance to the Empire in case of need, and supplemented it by giving the first aid Canada ever gave to the Empire by sending our men to the war in South Africa. Future history, I venture to say, will accord with contemporary history which shows that such a reference as that which the leader of the Government has made might well have been spared. I cannot understand what object he could have had in making such a reference. I recall to-day the situation of the leaders of the Liberal party from the province of Quebec in regard to assistance given to the Empire. I think of my dear friend and colleague, Dr. Beland, incarcerated for weary months in a German prison; there is my friend, Mr. Lemieux, with his boy a volunteer; Sir Lomer Gouin in the same position; and my right hon. friend and leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, with the last scion of his race, his nephew, an enlisted volunteer, but discharged on account of illness. When I think of these things I cannot but feel that this reference made by my right hon. friend, the leader of the Government, might well have been spared.

I think the duty is imperatively laid upon us, when we think of the boys who have gone out and have died for the cause as well as of those who are going out, to consider questions affecting this war with the greatest possible care. We are told that recruiting in this country has stopped. I think I can give the leader of the Government some reasons why it has stopped. In the first place, thirty months have gone by. The right hon. leader of the Government said yes-

terday that the men who are working in the munition factories are giving services as important to the Empire as are those men who went out to fight. He might have said in addition that the men who work in the coal mines do the same thing, because, in eastern Canada at least, wherever you have munition works you must have coal in order that they may operate. Then what about the men who work in the lumber woods? Their product is material which is as essential in connection with warfare as are the shells themselves. They are necessary for trench work. The highest prices that have ever been paid in the history of the lumber trade in eastern Canada are being paid to-day; if you take the men from the lumber woods you impair production and you are unable to get the necessary supplies. The miners of iron, copper, nickle, zinc, gold and silver are rendering potent aid. How could you have the transportation of the country's products if the importance of the work of the railway men was not considered? What about the farmers of this country? My hon. friend the Minister of Finance two years ago urged production and more production. How was Canada to help production if the men who lived on the farms were not to work and till the soil? Long ago the men who worked in the coal mines of Great Britain were exempted from military service; coal miners were called back from the front to work in mines and munition factories. Moreover, men who worked on the farms in Great Britain were exempted from military service. Hon. gentlemen will recall what they read in the papers only two days ago concerning the protests made on behalf of these men against the provision for their exemption being taken from the Enlistment Act, the protest being made solely in the interests of production. What has my right hon. friend done? Why did he not provide long ago that the men who worked in munition factories should be given certificates that they were working for the Empire and were exempt from military service, and that the men who worked in all these other avenues of employment were in the same position? My right hon. friend has gone on without any system, without any organization; and the trades of this country have become demoralized as a result of his inability to deal with this question. Take, for instance, the coal mines of my own county. The coal miners are naturally among the most adventurous of all our people, being accustomed to face danger almost every day of their employment, and they have gone to fight in great numbers. The munition factories there are unable to work on account of shortage of coal; the people who live in the country are unable to get necessary fuel on account of my right hon. friend's having no system in regard to this matter.

Over and above that, the patronage system, unlike the case of Australia, has been rampant throughout this land. This patronage system prevails in respect of appointments, preferments and promotions in the militia. I make the charge right here in the presence of the Prime Minister that in the province of Nova Scotia—it is his own province—the system of patronage was handled directly in regard to these matters. If a few soldiers were billeted anywhere in the country, no man could sell them tea, sugar or meat unless his right to sell was passed upon by the local patronage committee. The same thing applies with regard to clothing, supplies and medical examinations. Only six weeks ago a further appeal for men was made in my constituency by a recruiting officer. He published a list of the only medical men who could examine recruits; all were Conservatives with the exception of one, and there did not happen to be a Tory doctor where that one lived. My right hon. friend must know this. Let us not forget that the democracy of Canada, the plain people of this country—our young men more particularly—are intelligent. There is no use in crying peace, peace, if there is no peace. When you appeal to them from the standpoint of the highest ideals that were ever submitted for the consideration of anyone in this world to go out and fight for the Empire and freedom, and when you find that the local Conservative committee runs this whole business, where do your ideals go? That is the story of my right hon. friend's administration in regard to this matter.

Take another matter. I speak particularly of my own province; other hon. gentlemen will speak of conditions elsewhere. My right hon. friend has heard of the 85th Battalion; he is the hon. colonel of it. My right hon. friend's distinguished relative, Colonel Borden, is the colonel of the 85th; he is not, I believe, of the same political faith as my right hon. friend. We in Nova Scotia all know of the wonderful appeal that Colonel Borden made in the winter months of last year, when he carried the slogan among the highlanders of Nova

Scotia as it was carried in the old Jacobite days. The men rallied to the standard; in one brigade, four battalions, over 4,500 men came together, because they were asked to follow men who would lead them to the fight, men who were known to them, who were qualified to lead them, in whom they had confidence and of whom they could be proud. They went; two brothers here from one family; two chums there from adjoining farms on the countryside, who believed they were not going to be separated; they wanted to go out and win together. They went to Aldershot last year and trained there from May until October. My right hon. friend visited them; his Minister of Militia visited them. The Minister of Militia gave his knightly word that every one of those boys could rely upon their going to the front together; that their brigade was not to be broken up; that Colonel Borden was to be made Brigadier-General. When they sailed away on the 13th of October there was no question whatever about this. I had the pleasure of standing on the platform with the distinguished president of Pine Hill College, of the city of Halifax, Rev. Clarence McKinnon, who is known to my right hon. friend and who was one of the chaplains of this regiment. This gentleman with all the prestige of his position behind him, appealed to the mothers and fathers of the country to let their boys go so that they could be in this regiment with their chums; so that they could fight and win together. He gave them his positive assurance of this, relying, he said, upon the guarantees which had been given by the Government. There were ideals for you; there was spirit for you; there was sentiment for you. They called the boy from the cottage, from the hillside, from the valley; he came and what happened? Under the inscrutable condition of military affairs existing on the other side —I asked the right hon. gentleman last night who really was in charge of these matters; I do not think anybody did know after reading Sir Sam Hughes' letter— about a month after their arrival over there some one came from somewhere, and said: Take 800 men out of the brigade, march them over to France; pay no attention to anything. And from all four regiments they were taken; brothers were separated; chums from boyhood were torn apart. The fathers and mothers of these boys who were separated came to the offices of the men in Nova Scotia who had asked them to go, and asked how this could be.. " Can you have any confidence," they say, " in anything that the Government does? My boy might die and his brother would not be there; it was because they would be together that I let them go." Is it any wonder that recruiting does not go on under such methods? Now the brigade is broken up and nobody knows exactly where its members are. We would like to have an official statement upon this matter. Look at the Irish Rangers of Montreal. In the raising of that regiment there were appeals to the heroic race, the sons of old Ireland and the grandsons of old Ireland over here in this land were called on to rally together and to send to the front a distinctively Irish regiment. I see by to-day's Montreal Gazette that Colonel Trihey makes the statement that if that regiment is going to be broken up he will not return to the front. Why are these things done? Do you mean to tell me it is any answer to say, as the Conservative organs say, that there are not so many chances of the boys getting killed if they are separated as if they are all together? That is what the Halifax Herald, my right hon. friend's organ, says; that is the excuse advanced for this breach of faith. What use is there in saying to the men of Nova Scotia that you are going to do anything about this war in the face of an absolute, unquestionable failure to keep one's word? These are the conditions. Is it any wonder that we point out these things under my right hon. friend's administration and ask the Government to consider what they mean? But, Sir, we have in addition to that a colleague of my right hon. friend, the man whom he last night complimented for his handling of affairs in Valcartier, over his own signature in the public press making nineteen distinct charges in regard to the administration and interference with administration by this Government during this war. There is no precedent in the whole parliamentary history of the British nation for the publication of any such correspondence as that which took place between my right hon. friend and his late Minister of Militia. On one occasion Disraeli wrote a letter to Lord Chelmsford about whose position as a possible leader in the House of Lords as Lord Chancellor he was believed to have some doubt; but the letter written by Disraeli was on a change of administration, on his assumption of the premiership. Other than that instance, there is no parallel in the whole history of the British Empire for a Minister of the Crown, retiring under the circumstances under which Sir Sam Hughes retired, leaving nineteen distinct charges of mal-

administration against the Government of which he was a member. My right hon. friend did not attempt or pretend to answer Sir Sam Hughes last night.

Then where does my right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) stand on the question of conscription? I recall that my right hon. friend, in the debate on the Address last year, stated that he had said at the beginning of the war that he was opposed to conscription, and that he repeated that remark with emphasis. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche) told us that he had gone to Chicago at the Christmas season and had met some immigration agents there, and he gave us the letter which he wrote in regard to the question of conscription at the time. We have had an agitation in this country on that question. The country looks for leadership from my right hon. friend. If this Administration is going to do anything in the war, if it is going to assume the responsibility of dealing with these questions, we have a right to ask: has my right hon. friend changed his mind or has he not? Why have all this discussion upon this question? Why have all this unsettling of the public mind? Either my right hon. friend stands where he did last year or he does not.

4 p.m.

Then take this matter of Dr. Bruce's report. Is there anything—and on this I appeal from the House to the country—is there anything which, in this war time, could bring sadder hearts to the homes of the mothers of the boys who have gone forth to fight than the thought that, having escaped the terrors of war and having been brought to England, they are there to be immured in hospitals and under conditions such as are described in the report of Dr. Bruce? If the statements contained in the report of Dr. Bruce are true—and they have been given publication in the press of this country, although I find on coming to Parliament that I am unable to get, from the Militia Department, on inquiry, a copy of that report for perusal—if there is talk about boys not recruiting, how can the Prime Minister expect them to go out and take the risks of all these conditions? And we are told that Dr. Baptie, whoever he is, and some other men, whoever they are, have examined into these affairs and have made a report, reporting this and that about Dr Carleton Jones and some other men, all of which is very interesting, but not instructive. And when you add to that the various cables that have been printed as coming from Sir George Perley, from which you find that the man who made this report condemnatory of these hospitals is promoted to the posiiton of consulting surgeon to the British army in France, I want to know whether Dr. Bruce's report is true or not. This House wants to know, this country wants to know.

I want to submit to my right hon. friend that this question of Dr. Bruce's report, this question of Dr. Baptie's examination of that report, is of such a serious nature that the whole matter should be submitted to a committee of this House for investigation in order to ascertain what the real conditions are. I know that there are a great many people in this country who talk beautifully about this war—men who have neither chick nor child to go and do not expect to have any—yet they will talk to you in the most learned and beautiful way about how the war should be run. But I talk for the fathers and mothers of the 300,000 boys who have gone, and I want to know whether they are going to be treated that way over in England. Glib words and honeyed talk about winning the war is not going to satisfy this country—either our boys are going to be looked after or they are not, and we expect them to be looked after.

I have referred to the charges made by Lieut.-General Sir Sam Hughes. My right hon. friend dismissed him, to use the short term, from the position of Minister of Militia. He did it in a letter in which he gave two reasons: First, he said because Sir Sam Hughes administered his department as if it were a separate government. The other reason was because Sir Sam told the Premier that he knew that a certain statement which he had made was incorrect, when he said that he had had the same control over affairs in Great Britain in 1914 as in 1916. My right hon. friend gave those two reasons as the grounds for dismissing Sir Sam Hughes. The country have a right to know something about this. Sir Sam Hughes was a conspicuous figure in the administration of this war. My right hon. friend's friends put him forward as a man of great achievements, as a man of whom the country ought to be proud, and my right hon. friend suddenly, not because of anything that Sir Sam Hughes had done in the way of administration, not because there was any reference to any statement that had been made in regard to Sir Sam Hughes being this or that, but simply and solely because, as a matter of departmental arrangement, he had administered his department as if it were a separate govern-

ment he dismissed Sir Sam Hughes. We have a right to know why he did this. General Sir Sam Hughes, according to the correspondence, denies this charge. He says he was never asked to send in orders in council except in regard to one particular thing, that was secret service, and he says the Prime Minister came and asked him to be careful to send these orders in council in because, as the Prime Minister said, the Department of Railways, the Post Office Department and the Department of Public Works were going on spending money without getting any orders in council. That is the answer Sir Sam makes to my right hon. friend. Where was the Finance Minister at that time? Where was this watchdog of the treasury, when, according to his own colleague, the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Railways and the Postmaster General—and, according to the Prime Minister, the Minister of Militia himself—were spending money when there should have been orders in council authorizing such expenditure?

The Minister of Finance must have known that. It is generally conceded in the country that the Minister of Finance was one of the chief objectors to the former Minister of Militia. Evidently it was for that reason, and if so, why did he not stop it if it was going on? Why did he permit departments to spend money without an order in council? Why did he permit other departments to do it after it began in one of them? The Minister of Finance did nothing at all until the Prime Minister had to dismiss Sir Sam Hughes because he would not ask for an order in council. Was that the reason my right hon. friend dismissed Sir Sam Hughes, or was it because of an act of maladministration? I think he should tell the House and the country. My right hon. friend studiously avoided any reference to that last night. There was a phrase of his that I see in Hansard which rather indicated on his part a disposition not to engage in any discussion with Sir Sam Hughes. "I do not propose," he says, "to enter into a discussion as to whether he was right or wrong," referring to a little dispute that occurred between himself and the ex-Minister of Militia in reference to what was being done in France. Does my right hon. friend belong to that class of people who think that they have a divine right to rule? And if a minister chooses to make charges of a very grave character, as Sir Sam Hughes did, does he refuse to discuss them? This is the man whom he, himself, has put forward since 1911 as the beau ideal of what a minister of militia ought to be. Then, he takes a whim and turns him out. My right hon. friend, from his standpoint of divine right and with that germanic tendency that seems to have got into his system, comes and tells the people that he does not propose to discuss this question. We must find out something in regard to this matter. My right hon. friend showered all the honours upon this colleague of his, permitted him to be a Lieutenant General, he was created a K.C.B., and then my right hon. friend dismisses him because he does not get an order in council when he wants him to. That is a very flimsy reason. Why does he not dismiss the Minister of Public Works for the same reason? Why does he not dismiss the Minister of Railways and Canals? The Minister of Railways is very strong on this patronage question.

I notice that my genial friend from Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) is not here but I want to say this for the hon. member for Colchester, that the Minister of Railways and Canals has been getting a tremendous lot of kudos for this supposed high and noble stand which he has been taking on the question of patronage on the Intercolonial railway. I desire to put the House and the country right on this question. There is not a man employed as a brakeman, or a wiper in the shed, or a lamplighter, or a section man, or in any other capacity on the Intercolonial railway unless he has a letter from the man who has the patronage, either a Conservative member or a Conservative candidate. The real issue between the hon. member for Colchester—though I think he has not perhaps conceived this method of putting it—and the Minister of Railways and Canals is as to whether there are not men in the Maritime Provinces who have grown up on the Intercolonial—whether it is these men that the hon. member for Colchester recognizes or not—whether there are not men on the whole Intercolonial Railway from Montreal to Sydney who are competent to be in charge of the terminals in the city of Halifax. That is the question. The Minister of Railways and Canals chose, at the suggestion of Mr. Gutelius, to think differently. Mr. Gutelius was a foreign citizen until after he had given his report on the Transcontinental railway and until after my hon. friend from Carleton, New Brunswick, (Mr. Carvell) had put the question in the House to find out whether Mr. Gutelius had ever been naturalized or not. Not until that day had this gentleman been naturalized and now this gentle-

man comes, and, because he happens to have some friends in other parts of Canada, takes a man down and puts him in charge of the terminals of the railway and says to the railway men of the Maritime Provinces: It is true that you produce premiers occasionally—they have all gone to the Conservative party by accident—it is true you produce men prominent in every walk of life, but you cannot produce any man from the Intercolonial railway who is good enough to look after the terminals at the city of Halifax. My right hon. friend allows the Minister of Railways and Canals to do that and he allows him to go on and spend money without orders in council. He does not ask him for his reasons. Why does he not? The right hon. gentleman would not tell us last night.

Is there any one of his colleagues who would tell us why the Minister of Militia was singled out for this offence—a very grave one—and why it was that the Minister of Finance did not protest against the Minister of Railways spending money without orders in council and against the Minister of Public Works spending money without orders in council; when he protested against Sir Sam Hughes doing it? These are questions upon which the country has a right to get some information.

The difficulty between Sir Sam Hughes and this Government rests upon the very vital question as to who is in control, and who ought to be in control, of the Canadian Forces in Great Britain. That is the question at issue and Sir Sam Hughes made certain charges in regard to it. The first charge which he makes is this: My right hon. friend chose to say that the conditions over there were bad. In October of last year he made up his mind that there should be two changes and he proposed to make these changes and to put Sir George Perley in charge. He wrote the then Minister of Militia a letter to that effect. The then Minister of Militia in replying to that letter makes the first charge in regard to that memorandum as follows:

I entirely agree that the one object to be accomplished is the winning of the war; but I must submit that the proposed order in council of September 22nd ult., with its accompanying regulations, will, to my mind, cripple, impede and again reduce the force overseas, to the chaotic condition to which it had fallen at the end of the first nine months of the war under a system practically what you now propose establishing.

Sir Sam Hughes had been my right hon. friend's constitutional adviser in regard to military matters for five years. My right hon. friend is not a military man and Sir George Perley is not a military man. I think he ought to have told Sir George Perley that as High Commissioner he should not take anything more upon his shoulders than he had. That is the opinion of everybody that I have seen who has been in England. But my right hon. friend cannot get away from this distinct charge of Sir Sam Hughes that by making this change he was inaugurating a system which would cripple, impede and reduce the Canadian Forces to a chaotic condition. That is what he charges and under those circumstances is it any wonder that the Nova Scotia Highland Brigade was broken up, is it any wonder that the Irish Rangers were broken up? What else would you expect? There was nobody to control or protect it. What has the Premier, what has the successor of the Minister of Militia, to say to the charge that the Canadian Forces in England were in a chaotic condition? That is what this responsible minister, the fidus Achates of my right hon. friend for five long years, tells this country?

What else does he say?

From the outset I strongly objected to the fact that practically the entire management of our force, our supplies, our equipment, our transport, etc., had been taken completely out of our hands, and was controlled by the British authorities, we, notwithstanding, paying the bill.

Is that the condition of affairs to-day in Great Britain? Only yesterday in the Montreal Gazette, a paper friendly to my right hon. friend, the following letter was reproduced from the London Times:

London, Jan. 20.—The following letter signed "Civilian" appears in The Times:

The First Canadian Division sailed for France in February, 1915, and has therefore been in the front line two years. It contained Canadian Militia officers serving as brigadier-generals who have exhbited courage, skill and judgment in a marked degree, particularly in that capacity for measuring the unknown, which is the quality of the true soldier. Yet, however rapidly the ladder of promotion has been climbed in the Imperial army, not a single one of these brigadiers has received more than one step in rank as reward for two years of hard, distinguished service.

Let us look at the other side of the picture. There has been from the start in the Canadian corps a sprinkling of Imperial officers, whose services have been of the utmost value, but the moment a vacancy has occurred in any of the high positions they occupied, another regular officer has been appointed to fill the place. The Canadian militia officer feels this state of affairs is both a bar to his career and a reflection upon his capacity. After two years of war, in

succession to his previous service, he must either be fit to hold these posts or be by nature incapable. At the same time it appears to him that to belong to a Canadian corps is a final disqualification for that rapid promotion which he sees falling to contemporaries in the Imperial army. "So far shalt thou go and no farther" seems to him written over the portals of war for all who do not possess the cachet of the staff college. Is there not a good deal of justice in this complaint?

My right hon. friend cannot ignore a statement such as that which is directly corroborative of the charge made by General Sir Sam Hughes. That statement appearing as it did in the London Times and being considered of sufficient importance to be reproduced in the Montreal Gazette, indicates a serious condition of affairs. The Minister of Militia says further:

I do not know whether the Canadian High Commissioner had the authority of the Canadian Government or not; but a day or two later that gentleman, of his own initiative, strongly spoke to me and briefly said: "You do not pretend surely to have anything to do with the Canadian soldiers in Britain." I suggested that he might be well advised to study not alone the Canadian Military Law, but the British Army Act, as well as comprehend the spirit of the Constitution. I felt then, as I feel today. and as I am pleased to say the entire British Government and War Office officers also realize to-day that our officers and men being in the pay of Canada, Canada should absolutely control them in Canada and in Britain, excepting in so far as securing camping grounds is concerned; and at the front for everything excepting the command and general administration under the command.

The charge made in "Civilian's" letter to the Times apparently shows that the state of affairs which Sir Sam Hughes said that he had remedied had been reverted to again. The ex-minister goes on:

For the first ten months our suggestions were practically ignored; our equipment, stores, supplies, armament, everything provided by us, was set aside. The pay department was found to be absolutely chaotic, the medical service, modelled on the British, lacked system, efficiency and comprehensiveness.

He goes on to say to the Prime Minister, that he had in his memorandum, "proving the utter falsity of their bogus excuses regarding our wagons."

My right hon. friend dealt with that to some degree last night, and it was the only matter with which he did deal. He spoke of a muster parade being held, and some inquiry being made into that particular matter, and that was the only point to which he referred. The Minister of Militia goes on to saw that he accepted under protest, for the first year this management of the forces in Great Britain, and further on he said, referring to the very system which my right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) inaugurated, and which is now in effect in Great Britain, that to adopt the Prime Minister's suggestion of a separate member of the Government to look after things in England "would bring about a return of the irregularities in management, in training and in promotions" which the Minister of Militia had been endeavouring to eliminate, and he says that it would, "as was the effect under the cancelled order in council, cause chaos in the administration and destroy the present friendly relationship between the Canadian forces at the front and in Britain on the one hand, and the British Administration on the other." I ask my right hon. friend to let the House and country know whether the chaotic condition indicated by the ex-Minister of Militia has occurred in regard to our forces in Great Britain. The minister goes on to say that by reason of certain changes he had made he had saved Canada upwards of six millions of dollars. Does my hon. friend the Minister of Finance know about that saving? How much more was lost? If Sir Sam Hughes was able to save only six million dollars, how much was lost during the ten months when demoralization existed and supplies were being scrapped, and when the Pay and Records Office was in a chaotic condition? The Minister of Finance is asking the common people of the country, the plain people of this country, to practice thrift. Will he be prepared to tell them how much money he permitted to be lost in England during those ten months of chaos? The ex-Minister of Militia goes on to say:

We have raised a force and managed it in spite of all sorts of intrigue.

Who was intriguing? Was it the colleagues of the hon. gentleman? What use is it for those gentlemen to tell the people of this country that their first duty is to win the war and then for them to go into the Cabinet Council and proceed to intrigue against their colleagues? That is the direct and positive charge which the ex-Minister of Militia makes, and it is on these matters that the country wants enlightenment. Referring to the system which the Prime Minister had inaugurated, Sir Sam Hughes says:—

This whole proposition is based on misconception of the facts, and can but have three motives to inspire it, none of which is the welfare of the officers and men, or the winning of the war.

What are those three motives? My right hon. friend knows and he won't tell us. The

ex-Minister of Militia makes the positive assertion that not one of those motives has to do with the improvement of the welfare of the men or the winning of the war. What right, I ask, has this Administration at this time to be actuated by any other motives than the winning of the war, or the welfare of our men?

My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) yesterday quoted the charge which has not been answered yet, that if the system which the Prime Minister insisted on putting into effect had been in effect in the early days of the war, the first division would never have left Valcartier. He pointed out that the second division was held up by haggling about motor trucks for four months. In other words, this Government, which, according to the Prime Minister, yesterday was doing such strange and wonderful things, lost four months in haggling and fighting among themselves, and delayed for that length of time the outfitting of the second division. The ex-Minister of Militia goes on in the correspondence to take issue with the Premier on the question of truthfulness, and the Prime Minister asks for his resignation.

Then the ex-Minister of Militia declares that the Prime Minister was proposing these changes on account of certain intrigues which for a long time he had had on foot with the High Commissioner. Is that true, or is it not? It may be said that there is no necessity to pay any attention to these charges, but he was a responsible minister of the Crown and my right hon. friend put him forward for five years as the beau ideal of a man who should have charge of this nation in time of war. My right hon. friend cannot ignore those charges, serious as they are. The ex-minister goes on making certain other statements which also cannot be ignored. He declares that in regard to the question of administration with reference to what has been done at Valcartier the right hon. gentleman objected to his going ahead and doing things without orders in council. Then he makes this charge:

> It is difficult for me to recall where you have actively supported me in the passage of any order in council concerning the up-building of the Militia when opposed by two Members of the Cabinet usually antagonistic to anything proposed by me. As you are aware, it took up four months in the midst of this great war to fight through the principles of purchasing, for the Second Division, trucks at the lowest wholesale prices.

The country has a right to know who were those two members of the Cabinet who continually opposed their colleague in the administration of the war. If he was unfit, why was he not removed long ago? But why should this haggling have gone on while boys were dying in the hospitals or being killed at the front? These men, eager to advance their own ambitions, to pursue their own intrigues, were engaged in fighting in the council in regard to such matters as are detailed here by their own colleague. Such is the situation. The ex-Minister of Militia, speaking of another matter, goes on to say:

> I do remember you asking me on one occasion to submit orders in council where possible before incurring large expenditures, but the reason you assigned was not protests from my colleagues over my action, but that it was to set an example so as to assist you to control others. You instanced the Post Office Department, the Railway Department and the Public Works Department where projects had been undertaken without authority by order in council, and I remember distinctly you stated that some boats had been purchased and other large expenditures incurred, without your knowing anything about it, and wthout any order in council.

Does the right hon. gentleman know that boats have been purchased involving large expenditures of money without an order in council being passed? Inta what new arena was my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) proceeding when he made purchases without orders in council? Where was my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) going to spend this money? Was it to buy cars down in the United States when he might have bought them in Canada, or was it to engage in some other enterprise recommended by his superintendent which he did not wish to submit to the scrutiny of all his colleagues? Where was the Minister of Finance? Had such a condition of affairs existed when the minds of the people were not enthralled by the war, it would have resulted in the impeachment of the four ministers who were involved. The only reason the hon. gentlemen have escaped that attention which ought to have been paid to the serious situation has been the dominating influence of the war. Is the country ever to know from the Prime Minister what was the expenditure made by the Minister of Public Works, without authority, illegally, under the law? What was the expenditure made by the Minister of Railways, without authority, illegally, under the law? Or if it was my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who bought the steamers without authority, what was the

expenditure that he made? Suppose that in Great Britain to-day any one of the ministers who had served under Mr. Asquith had, two months ago in a document made public by the Prime Minister, although he need not have done so, charged that three of his colleagues had, not in expenditures for the war, but in purely departmental expenditures, transgressed and broken the law, and that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had permitted the public funds to be diverted illegally and contrary to the law for that purpose, what would public opinion be? That, however, is the position in which we in Canada stand as a result of the charges made by the ex-Minister of Militia.

The ex-minister goes on to charge the Prime Minister with grave errors and with misrepresentations of facts. Surely the good old days of courtesy between public men are gone. Here is a deliberate cold-blooded charge on the part of a colleague against his former Premier of misrepresentation of facts and of grave errors in regard to statements made. I think hereafter hon. gentlemen who do not see eye to eye with the Prime Minister may be pardoned if they question the authenticity of statements made by him, when his colleague, his faithful friend, pillories him before the whole country with the charge of misrepresentation of fact and deliberate errors in regard to statements made.

The ex-Minister of Militia wants to know how the Minister of Finance got loans without coming to Council in regard to them. He makes the statements that the Minister of Finance proceeds to deal with the credit of the country, and to make the loans, without coming to Council. It is a serious matter indeed that we have a government in power which so absolutely disregards the law that, instead of the ex-Minister of Militia being the only one who undertakes to run a separate government, each minister who is strong enough to carry out his own whims does the same thing. And the Minister of Finance seems to have been guilty with the rest.

Then this former colleague of the Prime Minister goes on to say:

> I have known and experienced, for a long time, the meddling and intrigue which has been going on. More than a year ago, I understand, you had it in contemplation to get Sir George Perley in control in England.

He goes on to quote from a letter of the Prime Minister in regard to a cablegram which he sent on July 31, and says:

> It is my belief that had you been actuated by the best interests of the force instead of favoritism that cablegram would not have been despatched.

Then, here is the situation: The former Minister of Militia charges his Prime Minister with being actuated by favoritism in regard to military matters instead of by considerations of the true interest of the force. Either there is some basis for that charge or there is not. And this country wants to know. Is it to be expected that the country, in the face of these charges, will have confidence in this Government and in its management of the war? Is it to be expected that the people will send their sons to the war under these conditions? Consider what the former Minister of Militia said in Toronto:

> Saddles were pulled out of the mud, harness scraped up and article after article, and department after department gone through, and to-day Canadian stuff is used at the front by Canadians, and by British in some parts, and is regarded as better than their own.

In other words, supplies and equipment, for which the hard-earned money of the Canadian people had been spent, were thrown into the mud and the ex-Minister of Militia had to get them out. And he charges that the Prime Minister proposed to bring back the same state of things in this regard that had existed before. The ex-Minister of Militia said further:

> The Canadian soldiers were allowed to come under the knife of first-year medical men in charge of some of the hospitals in England, while qualified doctors from the Dominion were available but not used.

Now, is it a fact that these boys, over whose going we have been so enthusiastic, and whose splendid spirit we have commended because they went out to fight for the right, when they are wounded in battle and sent back to England are not attended by qualified surgeons from the Dominion, but are dealt by first-year medical students? Does the Prime Minister think he can ignore such a charge as that? Do hon. gentlemen who support the Prime Minister think they can ignore it? Let me tell them that the fathers and mothers of the boys, and the boys themselves, will hold them responsible if these statements are true, and the day of reckoning will come sooner or later. We simply call the attention of Parliament to these facts and ask for an investigation. No answer has been given to the charges. The Prime Minister, in his correspondence with the former Minister of Militia, does not answer them in

any way—does not pretend to. In his speech last night he took the course I have intimated. There was a side issue in connection with General Alderson and General Steele which could not be held to be so serious or important as are these charges, especially those in regard to medical matters. This House expects, this country expects, that an investigation will be held in order that the facts may be made known. I speak with no feeling other than this—I want to know whether or not these boys of ours are being looked after? If they are being looked after, then this country can rest with an easy mind on that point; if they are not being looked after, then I beseech the Government, no matter what individuals may stand in the way, no matter what political considerations may intervene, to so deal with this question that the fathers and mothers of our boys may know that when those boys go across the ocean they will be as safe, so far as the Administration is concerned, as they would be in our own country. The facts must be made known, and when made known they can be dealt with.

Mr. BURNHAM: Has the hon. gentleman endeavoured to find out from the officers or men of the Canadian troops in England whether they were or were not satisfied with the treatment they received in hospitals or elsewhere? I can assure him, from meeting hundreds and hundreds, that there never was a complaint—nothing but the greatest possible gratitude.

Mr. MACDONALD: All I have to say is that my hon. friend (Mr. Burnham) should wrestle out that problem with Dr. Bruce and the ex-Minister of Militia. The hon. gentleman may know more about the matter than Dr. Bruce and Sir Sam Hughes, but he can hardly expect us, he can hardly expect the friends of the boys who have gone across the water, to disregard the position taken by a surgeon of the standing of Dr. Bruce or the statements made by the former Minister of Militia, and to accept the hon. gentleman's own ipse dixit as settling the whole problem.

I pass to another question. I notice that the Minister of Finance is going to make an appeal to the people of this country to practice thrift. I have looked at the expenditures made under this Administration this year and last year. We all know that last winter we voted a tremendous sum of money for the use of the great spending departments, Railways and Canals and Public Works—where they spend money without orders in council—and we know that that money was voted on the distinct assurance that only those expenditures should be made which were absolutely and essentially necessary. Later in the session I shall give to the House instances where this assurance has been absolutely disregarded so far as the Maritime Provinces are concerned, in the Department of Public Works, for one. I find that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, in his controllable expenditure down to December 31, 1915, spent $7,127,000 more than he did last year. It is true that there was a decrease of approximately $7,000,000 in the capital expenditure, but under ordinary expenditure my hon. friend spent $7,000,000 more. My hon. friend has spoken of the policy of thrift, which I conceive to be absolutely necessary. Apart from political considerations, we must recognize that as citizens of this country we are, to a certain extent, living financially in a fool's paradise. Tremendous expenditures have been made in this war for munitions and supplies; an enormous amount of money has come into Canada, and our people have been spending money without regard to the consequences. It is absolutely proper that the true financial situation of the country should be placed before the people. When the war is won the responsibilities occasioned by the tremendous debt of the country, the pensions system and other permanent obligations will necessitate the greatest possible economy in private and public life, particularly having regard to the fact that the expenditures which are now being made in Canada shall have come to an end.

My right hon. friend will recall that last winter I pleaded with the House that the extra money being received by the Post Office Department through the sale of war tax stamps should not be spent in unnecessary mail routes, particularly in eastern Canada. There was no necessity for the duplication of routes, and while the extension of rural mail delivery is a splendid and desirable thing under normal conditions, can it be said that in order to give mail facilities to any portion of the community you should spend twice as much this year as you did last? Can it be said that the system should be duplicated all over the country and that enormous increases should be made in the staff of clerks employed in Montreal, Quebec and other offices, resulting in the total absorption in one year of all the money that was col-

lected by way of taxation through the war tax stamps? I know that in my province this duplication of mail routes has been going on wherever political necessity seemed to justify it. Provincial elections were held there during the last year; mail routes were promised and put into effect, and the extra money was spent. The Minister of Finance must not expect the plain people to respond to his appeal for economy and thrift if they see that the Government is disregarding war conditions and spending money liberally without any regard to the economy that ought to be displayed and which must be displayed in this country by the very necessities of the case, no matter what party is in power. We shall await the explanation of the Minister of Finance in this respect. I regret that he was not here earlier to-day, when I said that I thought he had no right to take the credit which was given him by the Prime Minister for the increased revenue of the country.

The situation in Canada to-day from all quarters indicates a peculiar condition of affairs. There is unrest abroad. Why is it that we hear from Conservative sources the demand for a national government? How is it that the departure to England of the Minister of Finance synchronized with the resignation of the former Minister of Militia? How is it that soon after his return it was announced that a prominent public servant, well known as having been identified with the Conservative party in the past, was going to make an announcement that Canada needed a stronger hand at the head of affairs? Why is it that the Conservative press of this country, outside of the party-owned papers, are in many instances urging that as a remedy? The Minister of Finance found it necessary, notwithstanding the adulations of the Prime Minister about the party loyalty of his colleagues, to publish an announcement to the people stating that he was really loyal to the Prime Minister. My experience of life, both public and private, is that where true friendship exists it is not necessary for any man to go to the housetops and announce his loyalty and devotion to his friends. It would be of interest to know whether the Prime Minister of this country was afraid of the Minister of Finance when he beslobbered him with compliments last night, just as he is afraid of the ex-Minister of Militia. The gingerly and pacific way in which the Prime Minister avoided any combat with the ex-Minister of Militia was deliciously amusing to the House. Either that, or the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance are working in common, realizing that all over this land there is a feeling that the Government is not strong enough to cope with the interests of Canada in the war. This talk does not come merely from Liberals; it comes from Conservatives all over this country, and it involves an implied condemnation of the Government. Unquestionably this will be the feeling if the Government goes along in this lackadaisical way; if it proceeds on present lines, disregarding all considerations of higher national interests, making the expenditure of every dollar in connection with the war a matter of party patronage, keeping their party hacks working from one end of the country to the other as the dispensers of money that the people of Canada have to spend in connection with the war.

It seems to me that it is time for the Canadian people as a whole to take stock of their condition. Never before in the history of this Empire or of any of its Dominions was a public document placed before the people making such serious charges as those made by Sir Sam Hughes against his colleagues in the Government. These things cannot be effaced; they are known by the people. The people to whose high ideals you appeal when you ask for recruits have read in the newspapers what the former leader in military matters has said of the Prime minister. Hon. gentlemen may have some secrets in regard to the late minister that we on this side of the House and the people of the country have not. When the boys who have gone out to fight come back they will want to see the administration of this country rid from the complaints that have been made against it. For myself, I leave the question for the consideration of the House and of the people.

I have spoken strongly on this subject, I admit; but I feel that this House and the country must realize that it is our duty in the interests of the Canada that is yet to be to do everything possible to secure the winning of the war. Sacrifice of position, sacrifice of place, must be made by us in order that this end may be attained, just as freely as we give our boys to go out and do and die. If there be any foes without or weaklings within this land who in the supposed distractions and political dissensions of our form of government believe that they have found elements upon which they can calculate that there is a doubt as to the wholeheartedness of our people in their desire to aid in winning this war, I can assure them they mistake the genius and the character of the Canadian people. And if they count on our

dissensions and on the rivalries of our public life, they will count on them to their confusion.

In this hour of national menace, differing as we do and must as to means to be employed and as to weakness shown in administration, a devoted people and a united Parliament stand above all for the winning of this war.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a brief contribution to this debate, I wish to associate myself with those who have preceded me in the remarks that have been made in reference to His Royal Highness the late Governor General and also to Their Excellencies who have just come to us from the Old Land to take that high and honoured position. I also wish to join with all who have spoken in such high terms of the valour, the determination and the achievements of our troops at the front. It is a matter, I think, for pride for every true Canadian and every true Britisher, to know the splendid record made by our men at the front. I shall not therefore go into detail on that subject, but shall simply join with those who have, in eloquent terms, paid tribute to our soldiers. I think, however, that every Britisher would do well to consider this fact, that if, in August 1914, we looked upon the task which then presented itself to us as worthy of our metal, worthy to tax the brain and the brawn of this country, I think we should realize today that the task is even greater in magnitude than it seemed to us at that time, because I well remember that the vast majority of the people of Canada expected that perhaps forty, fifty or at the wildest estimate one hundred thousand men, would be all that would be needed from Canada, and that perhaps six months or a year or eighteen months would be required to settle this great question; but from the appalling figures given us by the

5 p.m.

Prime Minister last night, not only of what Canada has done, but of what the Empire at large has done, we must realize that this task is one which will demand every energy, every effort that it is possible for the people of this Dominion to put forth. Realizing that, it seems to me that it is the duty of this House to concentrate its whole energy, not upon picayune, small topics, not upon the question of whether a certain comparatively trivial matter has been well administered, whether a certain form of this or that is right, but upon the far more important question whether, in the main, the administration of affairs is right, and if the accomplishments of the Government and the troops at the front, of the Empire at large, are commensurate with the honour and the ability of the country as a whole. Some say that we have done enough. Some say that there is a limit to the demands that may be made upon Canada. I do not join in any such sentiment as that. I believe, as I think every true Canadian does, that there is no sacrifice that we should stop at in securing the successful termination of this war; and I have said on the public platform and I will say it here, that if Canada emerges from this crisis with her honour intact and her liberty and her connection with the British Empire as it was before the war, and at the same time bankrupt or losing all material wealth for the time being, she will still be the gainer in the struggle.

I have listened with a great deal of attention to the address of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald). I was tempted to pass by his speech with very few references, in fact, I did not intend to say anything about it at all. He has made sweeping charges against the Administration, charges that have absolutely nothing behind them so far as his statements are concerned. I do not question the right of any hon. member of this House to make a charge against the Government, but I do hold that it is the duty of an hon. member who is prepared to make a charge against the Government to make that charge in a manner which will demand an investigation such as we had last year for instance, so that the question may be settled. Fortunately for the Government, the investigations held as the result of charges made last year left the Government in a position where its honour was not in the slightest degree sullied, and I wish to congratulate the Government on that fact, that in spite of the most bitter attacks last year, the Government can come before this House with not a single charge of those made last year proven against them. No reckless charges should be made. If there is anything wrong, or any member has reason to believe that anything is wrong, then let the hon. member who is in possession of the facts present them before the House, not in a spirit of elation at catching the Government, but in a spirit of sorrow that such a thing should be possible. But no such charge should be made unless the hon. member is willing to back it up.

The hon. member for Pictou says that if the Government has done things it should

not have done, and has left undone things that it should have done, it should be brought to task before the people of Canada and on the basis of that assumption he makes a long series of statements, not charges, not bona fide charges, but a long series of statements, and I propose very briefly to deal with a few of his statements. First, let met say that I rather regret that the hon. member should call particular attention to the question of Liberal or Tory at the front. I do not look upon it in that way. We are not Liberals and we are not Tories, I hope; we are Canadians and Britishers, whether we are at the front or backing up those who are at the front. I would say to him if he were in his seat that some of the dearest friends I have fighting at the front, who have been there ever since the outbreak of war, are members of his party, and I cherish their friendship as much as I do that of my friends who sit on this side and who are members of my own party. There should be no partisanship in the question of loyalty to the Empire. I do not desire to raise it, but my hon. friend has raised it, and I think it is to be regretted that he should do so.

One of the statements made by my hon. Friend, or one of the insinuations, is that the Government is not competent and it has not administered the affairs of the country correctly and rightly; and he said and rightly said: Look at the great mother of Parliaments, look at England. There they have remodelled the Government on two or three occasions. He held that up in one part of his speech as a pattern for this Government and country. And then, forsooth, a little later on, he produced a most scandalous attack on the British Government published in Blackwood's Magazine and read that, on the one hand holding the British Government up as a pattern to this Government, so far as procedure is concerned, and on the other hand bringing forward a malicious attack, in a magazine, upon that Government and reading it here, and then laying all that was said against the British Government on the head of the Government controlling or directing the affairs of this country. I think it ill becomes any member of this House to take up newspaper or magazine attacks upon the Imperial Government and to make it a subject of debate in this House. If we want harmony, we certainly cannot have it by introducing the expressions of individuals who may have personal reasons for giving their opinions about other governments closely associated with us in this great task of carrying on and winning the war.

Then my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) proceeded with all the ingenuity and skill, of which he is so highly possessed, to stir up a little strife between the Prime Minister and one of his late colleagues. I will take second place to no one in my admiration of the ex-Minister of Militia; at the same time I think it is very small politics, and it does not contribute in the slightest degree to the successful carrying on of this war, to introduce a question of personal strife between any two members of this House whether they are in the Government or out of it. These are matters which they can very well afford to settle between themselves. In taking up an hour's time reading statements, enlarging upon them, and introducing into them matters which were not contained in them at all, my hon. friend did not contribute very much to the successful termination of the war or to helping to carry on this great struggle.

But, he says that mistakes have been made which may cost this country thousands of lives. I would like to ask my hon. friend if he associates himself in this statement, because his language very much resembles their's, with those who claim that because the Ross rifle has been used, there have been thousands of lives lost. If I remember rightly, all through the years in which he has been a member of this House, he has stood stolidly behind the Ross rifle. If the Government have been guilty of mistakes which have caused the loss of lives because of the use of the Ross rifle, then my hon. friend is equally responsible with them because he stood solidly behind the Ross rifle from first to last. He will not stand in his place to-day and condemn the Ross rifle, and he knows it. What is the use of bringing forward a statement of that kind? If the Ross rifle has proved unsuccessful or unsatisfactory in its practical use in this war, then the Government has done right in taking the advice of Sir John French, and Sir Douglas Haig and other high officers, and for the time being discarding it for active service at the front. I think that we as sensible men must recognize that in the progress of a war of this kind, when new methods are being used, when machines are being brought into use that were never thought of before, experiments, to a certain degree, must absolutely be made. I remember the case of a cer-

tain member of the Royal Flying Corps who, in defence of England against one of the early raids of the Zeppelins, indulged in an experiment which cost him his life. He charged straight at the Zeppelin with the result that his machine fell to the ground and he was killed. But, that was the forerunner of the method of attack upon the Zeppelins which deprived this Hun method of warfare of its terrors and which enabled British airmen to successfully meet and defeat the Zeppelins. Will my hon. friend say that, because a man lost his life, such an experiment is not to be made? There are thousands of Britishers ready and willing to lay down their lives in any kind of an experiment that is going to improve our chances of winning the war.

My hon. friend from Pictou proceeded to say that in 1914 and 1915 this Government had a notion of going to the country, that they had the key in the lock of the door and that they were about to appeal to the country when a cry went up from the people that we were to have no election, which cry was evidence that the people were satisfied with the way in which the affairs of the country were being administered. Yet, his whole speech to-day, if it meant anything at all, meant that there should be an election, and a change of Government. It was an arraignment of the Government from beginning to end, and yet, in another argument which happened to suit his fancy for the moment, he pointed out that the people were satisfied with the Government and did not want any change at a time, as he says, when they had a notion of appealing to the people.

Recruiting, he says, has been injuriously affected. Is it any wonder, he asks, that there has been any cessation of recruiting in Canada when hundreds of our boys are dying in the hospitals because of lack of treatment. Such a statement is absolutely unfair to the medical staff, to the nurses, to those in charge of the hospitals and to everybody who is carrying on this medical work.

Mr. MACDONALD: I never made any such statement.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend may not have used those words but he made the statement.

Mr. MACDONALD: Not at all. I ask my hon. friend to take that statement back. I decline to be under the imputation of having made any such statement.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. SPEAKER: The rule is very clear that the statement of an hon. member as to what he said must be accepted.

Mr. STEVENS: I accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I wish to say that my hon. friend criticised the Government bitterly and at great length because of the condition of the hospitals in France and England.

Mr. MACDONALD: I said that if the statements made by Dr. Bruce and by the ex-Minister of Militia were correct, a serious condition existed and an investigation should be had.

Mr. STEVENS: Then, my hon. friend does not speak from any knowledge of his own?

Mr. MACDONALD: I have spoken only as my hon. friend has done; I was not over there and did not see the hospitals. I have spoken from Dr. Bruce's report.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend said that he had never seen the report of Dr. Bruce and yet he has the audacity to say to this House that the statements made by Dr. Bruce are true as to the condition which obtains in France.

Mr. MACDONALD: What I stated to the House was that I had seen newspaper reports of Dr. Bruce's statement.

Mr. STEVENS: Oh, he is getting down to newspaper reports now.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend need not be so very fly. He cannot misrepresent me because I will not permit him to and he need not try.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend is very brave. On newspaper reports my hon. friend makes an attack on this Government regarding the hospitals in France and England. My answer to that is this—died of sickness up to date, 494 of the men overseas. I care not a snap of my finger what my hon. friend imagines, or what my hon. friend has read in the papers, where he gets his information; I challenge any country in the world to produce from the medical service of its army a condition equal to that. I challenge my hon. friend to produce statistics which will show such an excellent record elsewhere. As a matter of fact, the general results of the medical service of Canada and Great Britain are unsurpassed by those of any other nation engaged in this war. The mortality o[f] this House—and I speak with reverence on

this subject because some of our colleagues have passed away—has been greater from sickness during the period of the war than the mortality among the Canadian troops overseas. Is that not a record worthy of commendation rather than of the vicious attacks which have fallen from the lips of my hon. friend?

Then my hon. friend asks: Is this the way in which you are going to stimulate recruiting? Will his speech stimulate recruiting? Will charges based upon unsupported statements, mere rumors, fancies gained by the hon. gentleman here and there from newspapers, that he does not and dare not quote, stimulate recruiting? If there is one thing that we in this House and in this country should be at this time it is serious and sincere in everything we state. Before making statements we should see that we have the facts behind them upon which to base sound complaints, if such complaints are to be made.

Then my hon. friend proceeded in his vociferous manner with a most violent attack on the Government for interfering with the military control. "I have heard," says he, "that a man by the name of Gwatkin"—we all know that there is a gentleman by the name of General Gwatkin—"I have heard that there is a man by the name of Gwatkin who has control of affairs." And the hon. member asked: "Will anybody dare say that he has control of affairs?" He then went on with a long tirade of abuse against the Government for not having dared, according to the hon. member, to interfere with the head of the military affairs. He passed on, perhaps thinking we would forget what he had said, and happily we do forget most of it. But a little later on the hon. gentleman who had given expression to these sentiments again attacked the Premier because he had not interfered when the 85th Regiment was broken up. Why, sir, the 85th was not the only regiment that was broken up. The same thing happened to the Irish Rangers and to the 121st Battalion, and a dozen others I could mention. Because the chief of the general staff thought it best to use these men as reinforcements for the regiments at the front, the hon. member for Pictou heaps abuse on the head of the Prime Minister for not interfering with the War Office and having these battalions handled exactly as the friends at home would like to see. I take second place to no man in my desire to see our boys from Vancouver, Pictou, Toronto, or any other centre, kept together. I remember well the 121st Battalion, which, with others, I undertook to raise. In less than five weeks we had raised the battalion to full strength. It went overseas, and we hoped the regiment would not be broken up, as all the boys came from the same locality. But I got word from some of the boys overseas that the battalion was being broken up in just the same way as my hon. friend says the 85th was broken up. But, surely, upon second thoughts, we must realize that we must bow to any decisions that are made in the interests of efficiency at the front, and I must say that I differ from my hon. friend, if I am to judge him by the sentiments he expressed this afternoon. I have confidence in Sir Douglas Haig, confidence in the War Office, in the British authorities and in the Canadian officers. I have confidence in the men who are running this war. I am not so foolish as to think they do not make mistakes, but I am confident they are doing their best to discharge the responsibilities resting upon them, and it ill becomes the hon. member for Pictou to urge the Government to interfere in these important matters overseas. I am sure he would be the first man to stand up in the House and condemn the Government for such interference. As a matter of fact, he has done it in his speech to-day. The hon. member for Pictou claims to have an honoured military record himself; so he ought to know the King's regulations and all about the proper procedure in military affairs. He knows perfectly well that the statements he made this afternoon and the charges and innuendos he heaped upon this Government were unjustified and unfair, and certainly not in the interest of recruiting in this country. He says he would like to know what the Prime Minister thinks of conscription. Why does not my hon. friend tell us what he thinks of conscription himself?

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: He is waiting to see what will happen on Saturday next.

Mr. STEVENS: The Prime Minister has taken the stand before the people of this country that if it is humanly possible the troops that go overseas from Canada shall be volunteers. He has stated that he has seen no occasion for bringing in conscription so far as our present needs are concerned.

I would draw my hon. friend's attention to another effort on the part of the Government, on which he might also have given us his opinion, and that is the National Service scheme. Some of his friends are saying that National Service is but a step

to conscription. I would point out to him, and others who think like him—and there are a few—that the National Service propaganda which has been endorsed by the right hon. leader of the Opposition is a propaganda by which it is expected to get the last possible effort out of the people of Canada; that is the basis of it. Let my hon. friend and his leader, and his colleagues support the National Service propaganda, and then perhaps conscription will never be necessary. I hope it never will be necessary in Canada. I hope we shall be able to fill the bill without having anything in the nature of conscription. If my hon. friend did that he would be doing a much better service to the country than by standing up here and twitting the Prime Minister. The hon. gentleman said that if the Prime Minister spoke he could still the uneasiness of the country at once. Surely my hon. friend is not going to take second place to the Prime Minister. Why does he not still the uneasiness himself by giving the country his views on conscription? The hon. gentleman then proceeded to review at very great length the correspondence between the Prime Minister and the ex-Minister of Militia. One of his chief arguments, over which he laboured very long, was this: that other ministers of the Crown had expended money without Order in Council. Now my hon. friend takes second place to no one in the House in astuteness as a parliamentarian; he claims to be a lawyer of the first rank. As such, the hon. member must know that when he and the rest of us sitting in this House vote an appropriation bill, every item of that bill is appropriated without requiring any Order in Council. He also knows, if he has given it a moment's thought—and I am afraid he has not—that the $250,000,000 voted for war purposes was voted to the Government without any particular allotment. The result is that every dollar of that $250,000,000 must be expended by Order in Council; whereas the appropriations in the estimates require no Order in Council. That is clear to those of us who are mere novices, and it certainly must be clear to my hon. friend, if he gives it a moment's thought. I question very much, indeed, his sincerity in the long and laboured argument he made in regard to the $250,000,000. I think he knows perfectly well that there was nothing in that argument at all except the desire to stir up a little internal trouble in this party and in the Government. In fact, his whole speech, except the part which he read at the end, was an endeavour to make trouble and cause ill-feeling. I do not propose to deal at any further length with his remarks. He said a great deal more, but there was very little in it.

I wish to make two suggestions to the Government, for I believe it is the duty of hon. gentlemen of this House, coming as they do from all parts of this country, over 4,000 miles in length, to make suggestions to the Government, because the Government, of course, cannot be intimately in touch with affairs in all parts of the country. I think one of the most important questions in the carrying on of the war is that of the supply of lead, zinc, copper, molybdenite, and other minerals of that kind. Those four in particular that I have mentioned are produced in large quantities in British Columbia, and I wish to draw the attention of the Government to this fact. The owners of minerals in British Columbia experience a great deal of difficulty in having their minerals smelted. There is one smelter up the coast at Anyox, belonging to the British Columbia Copper Company, I think, or to the Granby Company. That company has recently stopped accepting custom ores; that is, they do not do any smelting for outside concerns. There is also a smelter at Ladysmith, the Tyie smelter, which has been idle for a great many years; and a month or so ago they decided to again start this smelter.

But as near as I can learn from careful inquiry there is some sinister influence preventing the Tyie smelter from opening up, and also preventing the Granby smelter from taking custom ores. I want, in a very serious manner, to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that steps should immediately be taken to see that every facility for smelting ores is placed at the disposal of the mine owners of British Columbia. I am not speaking about the large mines; I am speaking about the smaller ones. There are millions of tons of copper ore blocked out, ready for taking out of the mine and for smelting if the facilities were accorded. I lay that upon the Government, and may I lay this upon the Government also? Two years ago I spoke in regard to the matter and some results have been obtained, but I am going to draw the matter to their attention again. The Government should establish adequate refining facilities for the product of the smelting of these ores. It is true that the Trail smelter has in the last two years added refining facilities, but those facilities are not sufficient and we want a refinery on the coast. One mine on

the coast employing about two thousand men produces every week thousands upon thousands of tons of the richest copper ore, and all of this is shipped to Tacoma and finds a market on the other side of the line. That copper should be smelted and refined in Canada and the product shipped to the old country, where there is a great demand for it. There is no reason in the world that I can discover, after looking carefully into the matter, why that should not be done. I ask the Government to give consideration to these facts. I have here a great deal of correspondence on the subject, some of which I have received to-day, but I shall not weary the House with it.

We have recently been receiving in Canada a number of returned soldiers. I think about six hundred have returned to Vancouver alone, and corresponding numbers to other places. A great many of these boys are wounded, some of them incapacitated for life, and every effort is being made to look after them. I want to congratulate the Government on what they have done up to the present time; but as time goes on the number of returning soldiers will increase to such an extent that the task that will face us is appalling. I believe this House could well spend considerable time in studying out the problem of taking care of the soldiers returning from the front. There are many ways in which this could be done, but I have one suggestion to make to the Government at the present time, and I believe they will act upon it favourably. The British Columbia University is prepared to give free tuition and instruction to men in a thorough course of agriculture. It is absolutely useless to take men who have not been accustomed to farming and put them on the land, although we hear a great deal of putting men on the land, as if you can pick up a man like a pawn and put him on the land and expect him to make a successful farmer. For a man to make a success of farming he must have some agricultural training, and a thorough course in a university of agriculture would give him a start and also confidence in his new life. Hon. members from British Columbia know that there are millions of acres of splendid land in that province; but if we simply give a hundred or a hundred and sixty acres to a returned soldier and then trust to luck whether he makes good or not. We are not going to solve the problem of the returned soldier successfully. I make this suggestion, not in a critical spirit, that this Parliament should combine its energies in an effort to solve these after-the-war problems which are to-day commencing to face us. We are getting only a small number of returned soldiers at present, but in a very few months the number will increase and the problem will grow accordingly. The Military Hospitals Commission is doing splendid work, but I do not think it will be capable of meeting the demands that will be made upon it in a few months. I lay upon this Government and upon every member of the House the responsibility of joining together and endeavouring to solve these problems.

My remarks have been made in the latter part with the idea of bringing forward one or two suggestions which I know to be important. There are many other suggestions which may fall from the lips of other members who know local conditions better, but I believe that our efforts as Canadians and as Britishers should be combined with the one object of making Canada more efficient and more capable of carrying on this great war. I am as proud as any man of what we have accomplished, but there is a greater task before us and I hope and believe that the people of Canada, especially the members of this House, will measure up to the demands made upon them.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): Mr. Speaker, it is hardly necessary for me to add my congratulations to you on your elevation to your present position. I will only say that I think the House is as fortunate as yourself.

In regard to the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Stevens), it strikes me that the Government has not been altogether fortunate in its selection of an apologist on this occasion. While my hon. friend is prepared to endorse everything that the Government has done or everything that it has left undone in connection with the war, he is not prepared to endorse what it has done or left undone in regard to the smelting and refining industry of British Columbia. The Government, which cannot be trusted in what is not as important a matter as the war—which my hon. friend cannot trust to its own guidance in this so much less important matter—he is prepared to defend with all the ability, and, if I may say, the vociferation, of which he is capable in regard to that greater matter in reference to which even he might think that the Government which he supports might some-

times or somehow or on some occasion fall short of the ideal.

My hon. friend criticises certain phases of the speech of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) on the ground that they might have an injurious effect upon recruiting; but when my hon. friend himself began to touch on the questions that are arising to-day in connection with our returned soldiers, I am not so sure that, judged by the same standard as he set up for my hon. friend from Pictou, his speech was not just as detrimental to recruiting, because the suggestion was contained in it that there is something lacking, something that needs his suggestion in this House, in regard to the betterment of the conditions of those men who have rendered service and who have suffered in the cause. Not only does he make that suggestion himself, but he calls on all the members of this House to aid him in bringing the matter to the attention of the Government and of the country to see that it is properly adjusted. I do not think that any one is entitled to criticise, nor should any one be afraid of criticism, because we in this Parliament discuss matters relating to the administration of the war.

I may be permitted, perhaps, to traverse to some degree the positions that have already been taken in this debate in regard to the war at large, and to say that, for my part, I am not able to agree with the views of the Prime Minister as to the successful progress of the war, any more than I am able to agree with his views as to the means taken to secure its successful termination. I am afraid that if, to-day, the allied arms are not in a better position than they are, it is largely because we, the people of the allied nations, have not been willing to look the facts in the face. We have tried to win the war on paper, by argument and demonstration and proof, while the war can only be won by blood and sacrifice. The more fully and the more quickly we face that condition and prepare ourselves to meet it, the sooner and the more certainly shall we win success. I do not think there can be any exaggeration of the gravity of the position as it is to-day. When I read that the beautiful parks of England are being ploughed up to raise food because of the exigencies of the war; when I hear that the people of England, of rich England, have to eat black bread because of the war; when I read that the Premier of England calls on the people of the Empire to offer sacrifice of men and means uncounted and uncountable,—I say we are not doing ourselves justice, we are not doing justice to the cause, if we do not look the facts squarely in the face and recognize that our part is to do everything we can, to do it well, and to do it now.

There seems to me to be a certain measure of confusion of mind as to the value of the respective services rendered in the war. I have read, I have heard it suggested, that the services of raising food, of making munitions, of transportation, are on an equality with the service of the men who stand in the battle line. I cannot agree with that view. Not only do I think that view mistaken, but I think it is bound to be terribly injurious to the effective prosecution of our share in the war. I do not minimize in any degree the importance of the labour of any man in any of these callings. Perhaps I shall be unable to place before this House lucidly the case, as it strikes my mind, of the difference between the man who leaves his home, his friends, his property, and his prospects—leaves everything behind—and takes upon himself the terrible hardship of the battle-front, and who risks from day to day and from moment to moment his life and limb for the cause in which he fights; I say I cannot make a comparison of equality between the services rendered by that man and those rendered by the man, let him be as able as he may, who works in a munitions plant, or on a farm, or in transportation, or in any other necessary service, for which service he is well paid, and through which he enjoys every comfort of life as though there were no war—as a matter of fact, in many cases, draws better wages and lives under conditions immeasurably better than would be the case if there were no war. I think it is a mistake to place these two classes of service on an equality. If I do not weary the House with this form of discussion, let me say it strikes me in this way. The man who is to render service in the battle line, in the first place, must be the pick of our country in the matter of physical perfection. It is not every man, indeed it is a comparatively small percentage of the men of our country, who are physically fit to take upon themselves the hardships and risks of the battle front. A man who is not fit for the battle front may well be fit for these other occupations in which he may render excellent service, necessary service. But the number of men you can put in the battle front are the pick of our manhood, and they are only a com-

paratively small proportion of that manhood. Therefore, the first essential is the man in the battle line, and unless we have enough of them, and unless they are of the right quality, both physically and spiritually, of what account is it that we have munition factories, or that we have farms producing food, or that we have transportation facilities? The man in the battle line is the man who wins the war, and it is with the question of putting the right kind of men into the battle line, putting them there at the right time and under proper leadership, that we have to deal. First things first; let us recognize that to get our men into the battle line is the first duty of those who have the direction of our affairs.

We must assume that that principle was recognized when, on New Year's Day, 1916, the Premier of Canada issued a call to the people of Canada for half a million men. That call was received by the people with every consideration, with the recognition of its propriety and justice, and there was not, from any part of the country, so far as I am aware, any protest or objection against that call being made. Such a call, made by the Premier of Canada and received without objection by the people of Canada, was a pledge of the honour of Canada to herself, to the Empire to which she belongs and to the Allied powers that she would make good her promise. Since that time there have been heavy enlistments of men, as the Premier said yesterday when he told us of the number of enlistments that had been made. It would be impossible to exaggerate the magnificence of the response made by our people to that call under the circumstances as they stand. We boasted that we were a peace-loving people; that for a hundred years we had been in a condition of peace. Peace was preached from our pulpits and spoken from every platform. Our whole education was an education of peacefulness; and that our men should have responded as they did to the call that was made, certainly showed in large measure a realization of the terrible character of the conflict and of the necessity of Canada's participation in it.

May I say on that point, as I wish to voice the idea that I believe to be in the minds of our people, that this war was not Britain's war or the war of the Allied powers; it was the war of humanity to preserve liberty, to preserve in this world a free civilization against the attack of military autocracy. It is in my mind, and I am sure it is in the mind of many others, that the success of the Central Powers of Europe, as allied to-day, would mean the re-establishment not only on the continent of Europe, but throughout the world, of a condition of militarist authority and of military tyranny as existed throughout the world in the dark ages when feudalism ruled. Who, I ask, would question the word of the Kaiser as the highest law if the German armies should overrun France and break the power of Britain? No other power in the world could stand against it: free civilization would cease as surely as civilization itself ceased when the Turks overran a part of Europe. We are not fighting for Britain; we are not fighting for Canada; we are fighting for liberty in the world. It is the fight of every individual who realizes that he is sacrificing himself for the liberty of the world and not for any smaller or lesser cause.

I have said that we have responded to a wonderful extent to this call for half a million men; but that call has not yet been met. The honour of our country is committed to its being met, and it is for us to consider ways and means as to how it may be met and to consider causes as to why it has not yet been met. First of all, may I suggest to the House that the figures read yesterday by the Premier are to some extent misleading. I regret to have to say that, but the statement that the enlistments amount to 390 odd thousand men does not mean that the number of effectives is 390 odd thousand men. We are not doing ourselves credit when we include enlistments of ineffectives in the number of men which has been our contribution towards winning the war. During last session the Prime Minister gave to the House and the country figures showing the number of enlistments at that date, the number of casualties and the number that was covered by the term "wastage." At that time the wastage, that is to say, the men who had joined and had been discharged as being inefficient for one reason and another, amounted, if my memory serves me correctly, to something like 20,000.

Mr. HAZEN: That would include men who were wounded. would it not?

Mr. OLIVER: No; if I remember correctly, the casualties mentioned by the Prime Minister were in the neighbourhood of 20,000 and the wastage was something like another 20,000. I questioned him as to

the meaning of the word wastage, and he explained that it included discharges, rejections or desertions—losses that occurred otherwise than through casualties. If that was the fact last year, I am afraid that it is still the fact; and when we pride ourselves on having enlisted such a large number of men we are not honest with ourselves if we do not deduct the wastage and count only those enlisted who were effective. We are breaking faith; we are discrediting ourselves with the Empire and with the Allies when we claim to have given to the cause so many men when a very considerable proportion of that number were not of the class that were able to render the service that they were called upon to render. So that I am compelled to believe that we are very considerably short of the number of 390,000 effective men.

It is now more than a year since that call was issued. The events that have taken place since that time, that are taking place now and that are impending, indicate that there is need for men now as there never was before.

Not to dwell upon that point, I think it is agreed on all hands that this coming season must see the Allies on the aggressive, if ever we expect to win. We must be on the aggressive. That is a simple word, but its meaning is tremendous, because the aggressive mean losses, and losses, and more losses, and we must have the men to meet those losses or we cannot prosecute the aggressive and we do not win the war—and let us not forget that the war is not yet won. So I say that while we have surprised ourselves with what we have done, we are not yet in a position to claim that we have made good our pledges, our promises, or that we are going to take our place in the battle in the coming spring as we promised more than a year ago that we would take it—and it is possible that our failure to take it in that strength and with that vigour may possibly be enough to turn the scale against the Allies.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. Mr. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, shortly before six o'clock, speaking of the relations of our country to the present war, I mentioned the obligation felt by the individual to support the cause of the world's liberty. In case the suggestion may be made that if this is a battle for the world's liberty then all the countries of the world which love liberty should be engaged in that battle, I would only say that as world conditions are at present the lot happens to fall upon us. It is the Empire with which we are associated that stands as the exponent and the leader of human liberty in the world, and it is only right and reasonable that when conditions so fall that right and liberty are endangered, the Empire and all who have part in it should feel that their turn has come to vindicate and support liberty and right in the world and for the world.

The suggestion has been made that our neighbours to the south, the people of the great republic, lovers of liberty as we are, should have a part in this war, as we have, if they love liberty, as we do. I think it is only fair to say that as the lot fell 50 years ago their's was the task of maintaining human liberty, and it was not then ours. At that time that great people made many and tremendous sacrifices for the cause of human liberty while we stood by, as we had a right to stand by, and they fought their battle alone. To-day the lot has fallen on us. Let us be as good men as our neighbours and stand when it comes to us in our turn as they stood when it came to them in their turn.

I was speaking at six o'clock of the call for 500,000 men issued by the Premier a little over a year ago, and of the fact that must be faced that, however great the credit our country is entitled to for what it has done, it has still fallen short of the pledge given, of the promise made and the recognized need of the occasion. How far we are short is a question which may be in dispute. I was considering the account given by the Prime Minister yesterday of the number of enlistments. He credits Canada with enlisting 392,000 men. If we have enlisted 392,000 effectives we are entitled to credit for doing so, but if we have not, if wastage by rejections for unfitness from that number has been counted into it, and if we claim something that we have not made good, we are not doing justice to ourselves, or to our Allies, or to the cause in which we are all engaged. I do not know how much this wastage may be; I do not know how many rejections may have been made, but I am credibly informed that a short time ago Mr. Godfrey, President of the National Service League of Toronto, made the statement that the wastage up to the date at which he spoke had amounted to 60,000. If that figure is correct our effective enlistments are reduced from 392,000 to 332,000, or, say, in round numbers, to 330,000, leav-

ing still to be made up 170,000 effective enlistments before our promises to ourselves and to our Allies have been made good.

This is a matter for very serious consideration, and in dealing with the question, while I must necessarily speak of those in authority, that is, of the Government of our country, and of their action or their inaction, I do not wish to be understood as speaking of the Government as separate from the people; but as speaking of the country, rather than of the action of the Government of the day. Because, while the Government is directly responsible for whatever is done or is not done, inasmuch as the Government is endorsed by the country, the country at large must share the responsibility, and I wish to be understood as speaking in that sense. The fact that the promise made on January 1, 1916, was not being made good became apparent about the middle of the year, and I take it that what are now called the National Service proposals was the answer of the Government to the question, what are you going to do about the failure of the country to implement the promise of 500,000 men? The Premier and the Director of National Service made a tour throughout the country some months ago, for the purpose of placing this scheme of National Service before the people, presumably with a view to working it out, with the result already suggested by me. I was somewhat surprised yesterday, when the right hon. Premier was discussing the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne, that he did not see fit even distantly to allude to the subject of National Service. It struck me that if it was desirable—and it surely was desirable—that the Premier and the Director of National Service should tour Canada for the purpose of placing the National Service proposals clearly before the people, surely here on the floor of Parliament was the place, and the debate on the Address the time, for a statement in regard to this question, explaining what it meant and what was being done under it.

May I make a personal reference in this connection? When the Premier and the Director of National Service were going through the West, I received a telegram from the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett), asking me to take part in a meeting at Edmonton to be addressed by him and by the Premier. I replied that as a member of the Parliamentary Opposition, whose duty was the criticism of Government measures, I would wait to hear the proposals explained before I undertook to endorse them or explain them to other people. For that reply, which was made public, I was subjected to criticism in the columns of many newspapers supporting my friends on the other side of the House. I will say that it was by no means non-partisan criticism, but of a very directly personal character, and in most instances the criticism took the form of questioning my loyalty to King and Empire. I have only this to say in that connection. At this time, and under the circumstances in which this country finds itself, loyalty is not expressed by words: it is only expressed by service. There is a great difference between the service rendered by the individual citizen, and the service rendered by those charged with the direction of affairs of state. There is a responsibility resting upon those who are charged with the direction of affairs of state that does not rest upon the private citizen. He is responsible for his actions, but they are responsible not only for their own private actions, but for the direction of the affairs of the country. I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that at this present time, and under these conditions, when the future of the world depends upon the success of the Allied armies, inefficiency is treason, the talk that leads to inefficiency is treason, and the Government that is in power in this or in any other of the countries that are at war to-day must stand and be judged of its loyalty by the character of the service that it gives.

The proposals for National Service have been explained on numerous occasions and at numerous times. I regret, I say, that the Premier did not take the opportunity of making an explanation here yesterday because failing such explanation, I am compelled in addressing the House to-night to give such interpretation to the terms and conditions surrounding and contained in these National Service proposals as appeals to my mind. I shall be very sorry if I am wrong, but if I am wrong, the fault is rather with those who have the direction of our affairs, and who, as yet, have failed to place before the country these proposals in a light in which they could be thoroughly understood. They have had National Service proposals and a National Service policy in Great Britain. But National Service in Great Britain means, first, military service and, secondly, industrial service. Unless National Service means first, military service

and afterwards industrial service, it is not, in time of war, National Service at all. A so-called National Service which ignores the military necessities of this country at the present time is not National Service; it is not loyal service, if I may be permitted to say so; it is not service that is going to win this war.

So far as I have been able to gather from a perusal of the National Service cards that have been issued, and from statements that have been made both by the Prime Minister and by the Director of National Service, this National Service proposal is one for the conscription of labour for industrial purposes. There is no proposal contained within it, either nearly or remotely, of conscription for military purposes; no suggestion either present or future. I will admit that there is no very clear suggestion of any kind; but whatever suggestion there is relates solely to industrial purposes. This at a time when military necessity is so pressing, when the future of the world depends on military success. The Government of Canada comes forward, at a time when its promise of half a million of fighting men has failed to be fulfilled, with a proposal that it calls National Service, which does not propose, either directly or indirectly, either nearly or remotely, to add one man to the number of those fighting men. I will admit that other suggestions have been made. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) gave voice to the idea that in some way, which he did not explain, the National Service proposal meant compulsory military service. I find that that idea has been circulated through the press; it has been preached to some degree from the platform, but it has never at any time been backed up by definite authority or by definite statement. Following the tour of the Prime Minister and the Director of National Service through the country, I gather that the idea ran something like this: In the West where the response to military demands had been, we shall say, if not ample, at any rate, more full and free than anywhere else in the Dominion, where the people were rather more inspired with the idea of military service, there the idea was conveyed that National Service meant military service in some indirect way or at some future time; but when the party were in other parts of the Dominion the idea was very definitely exprcssed that it did not mean military service; that it meant on'y industrial service, and did not even mean industrial conscription but meant only voluntary industrial service.

[Mr Oliver]

At the present time a member of the Government is standing for election in a county in the province of Quebec, and the question of National Service is under discussion in the campaign. The Government is surely bound by the declarations of its minister made on such an occasion. According to constitutional practice time-honoured through many years, he appeals to the electors for re-election on certain grounds of policy, and in the discussions that have taken place he must be considered to have expressed the policy of the Government in regard to National Service; he must be considered to have pledged the Government of which he has recently become a member to their policy in regard to National Service. The Hon. Mr. Sevigny, speaking at St. Zacharie, Dorchester County, Quebec, on Friday, January 19, is reported in the Montreal Gazette as follows. He is speaking of the war:—

> It is necessary to bring victory because of civilization, justice and liberty. Put aside matters of politics, for it is a question of life and death for you and for me. You live here at St. Zacharie in peace; you enjoy much. It is your duty to produce harvests, to do all possible to have munitions and bread for our soldiers.

You will observe that the minister does not suggest to the people of St. Zacharie that it is any part of their duty to become soldiers themselves. This fight for civilization, justice and liberty, this battle of life and death for you and for me is to be fought, apparently, by somebody other than the prospective constituents of the new Minister of Inland Revenue. Their duties are the duties of peace. It is not suggested to them that they have any duties of war. But the Minister of Inland Revenue goes further:—

> In this war no one says we must go.

He makes it thoroughly binding between himself and his prospective constituents:—

> No one was forced and no one will be forced to go.

That is the statement of the Government of Canada, though the mouth of their latest-appointed minister to his electors, as to the Government's policy on national service. That policy cannot be construed to mean any accession to the military strength of ourselves or our Allies. At this time the promise made on the first of January, 1916, stands unfulfilled, it stands short of fulfilment by 170,000 men; and we have the authority of the Minister of Inland Revenue that the Government has no proposition to place before the people of this

country for the fulfilment of that promise. It is not my loyalty that is in question, but the loyalty of the gentlemen who are charged with the responsibility of directing this country's affairs.

Mr. ROGERS: I trust and hope that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) wants to be fair. He heard the Prime Minister give a detailed statement of enlistments in one form or another in Canada showing a total enlistment of 434,000. I am sure he accepts the statement of the Prime Minister as being accurate, it having been prepared with the greatest possible care to present to this House and to the country. I am sorry, therefore that he should make the statement that we are still 170,000 short of the 500,000 pledged a year ago. I do not think he desires to give out information which is not in accordance with the facts, especially the facts as presented to this House by the Prime Minister.

Mr. OLIVER: I think my hon. friend (Mr. Rogers) can hardly have followed my argument. Perhaps he was not in his place when I was making my statement. I did not dispute the number of enlistments, but I stated that there is a consideration in connection with these figures known as wastage, which was not taken into account in the number of enlistments given by the Prime Minister. We are not fair to ourselves or to the country when we do not take that wastage into account in estimating the number of our men. We have only the right to count our effectives. Good intentions do not count in war unless they are backed up. However good the intentions of a man may be, if they are not backed by military service they are of no use to stop the Germans. My point is that the Prime Minister should not take credit to us for having enlisted so many men but only for having enlisted so many effectives. As to that number I gave the authority of the gentleman at the head of the National Service League of Toronto for the statement that the wastage—that is, rejects—from that number of enlistments was 60,000. I have every reason to believe that that is measurably correct. I hope the hon. gentleman will not think that there is any question of veracity as between the Prime Minister and me.

Mr. ROGERS: But that would not account for anything like the difference that the hon. gentleman has given.

Mr. OLIVER: The Prime Minister has not suggested that the British reservists, the French reservists, and the reservists of other allied nations, the munition workers, and some others that he counted in his gross total, were to be included as helping to implement his promise of 500,000 men. These had nothing to do with the promise made by the Prime Minister a year ago last January.

Mr. ROGERS: The promise made had to do with the total number that should represent Canada in the conflict, and the figures given last night show that enlistments, including all classes, numbered, up to last night, 434,000.

Mr. OLIVER: If the statement made by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) is warranted by the Prime Minister, I am perfectly satisfied to accept it. If the Prime Minister, in promising to the Allies 500,000 men from Canada, included or intended to include all these classes to which I have referred, I am perfectly willing to accept the statement in that sense. But that was not the understanding we had at that time; that was not the boast we made when we said we were going to recruit 500,000 men for the fighting line of the Allies. But, even if we are to count those rejected as not qualified for the service, and those who went forward because they were called by their several countries and without jurisdiction of ours, we are still short something over 50,000 men. So, there still is required some measure to implement the promise made, even if we accept the figures as referred to by my hon. friend.

Mr. HAZEN: I think my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) is in error. The figures of enlistment given are of men who have enlisted, passed the medical examination, and been enrolled. I think the hon. gentleman is wrong—I say it with all respect for him—in the effect he gives to the term "wastage." That term refers to men who have gone to the front and have afterwards been incapacitated for service, and their places taken by those held in reserve. It refers to men who were fit for service and have been rendered unfit, and not merely those who were physically unfit at the time they were enlisted. The man who passes the medical examination and is accepted must be assumed to be fit; he has been accepted as a fighting man.

Mr. OLIVER: My argument does not rest on the question whether rejections were many or few. I am willing to accept the figures that are given. But I must

take some figures. I quite agree with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the figures given by the Prime Minister show the number of men who passed the medical examination and were enrolled. But of these men some have been found to be unfit before they reached the firing line. My judgment would be that we are not entitled to count these men as our contribution toward the winning of the war. No matter how good the intentions of these men may have been, they have not helped to win the war, on the contrary, they have been, in proportion to their numbers, an enormous charge upon the treasury and to that extent have prevented the winning of the war. But it is not for me to argue that point; my point is that the Government's promise—or I would rather say the country's promise—of 500,000 men has not yet been implemented and the Government has not come forward with any proposal looking either directly or indirectly to the fulfilling of that promise. Whether the number needed be many or few, that fact remains without argument, and I still maintain that the men who have not been qualified to go into the fighting line should not, in honesty and fairness, be counted by us as a contribution to the fighting forces of the Allies. Moreover, they have been a burden upon our resources instead of being a strength to our Allies.

It may be said that this inaction of the Government in regard to the fulfilment of our promise is not a serious matter. It is true that National Service cards have been sent out. There has been a great deal of discussion about them; some of them have been answered and some have not. It has been said that, in any case, no harm has been done. Unfortunately, that is not the fact; the discussion that has arisen and that has circulated, so to speak, around this National Service proposal has done a great deal of harm. Instead of the National Service proposal being a measure in aid even of industrial conscription, if you like, or compulsory industrial service, the effect of it has been to decrease in large measure the industrial power of the country Our friends, if I may be permitted to make this suggestion—I cannot come to any other conclusion—talking of compulsion in one part of the country and talking no compulsion in the other part, have unfortunately convinced the people in one part of the country that compulsion is impending, with the result that those who do not desire to submit to compulsion, either industrial or military, have, by simply exercising their powers of locomotion and stepping across the line, put themselves out of the reach of compulsion either industrial or military. I will not dwell on this subject at any great length, but it has reached such a point that the Government itself saw fit to publish in the newspapers of Canada on the opening day of Parliament a declaration to reassure the people that National Service did not mean compulsory service either for industrial or military purposes. The idea that was first given out that National Service meant fulfilling our promise of 500,000 fighting men gradually dwindled, until now it does not mean any kind of service at all; and the Prime Minister when he discusses the reply to the Address does not even allude to what at one time was considered to be a most important and vital question, and one that, to quote the ex-Minister of Militia, might fairly be considered to be his baby.

The question may reasonably be asked: we have not fulfilled our promise; what is proposed to be done about it? I am not charged with the responsibility of directing the affairs of this country, or with the responsibility of having originated this National Service proposal, which has done no good, has done so much harm, and has finally died in the hands of those who brought it forth. But I will say this: when the war begun we undertook to play our part in that war by voluntary service. My contention is that under voluntary service we have done wonders, and the greatest wonder of all is that we have done so much under the adverse conditions. Voluntary service has never had a chance in this country under the administration of our friends. For my own part I have said in this House before, and I am prepared to say it again, that in the case of such a world struggle as we are now engaged in National Service is the only logical service; National Service, I say, that will call up the manhood of the nation for military service. But it must be recognized that there are many things that are right in theory that it is not possible to put into practice. I do not challenge the Government because they have not put conscription in force, although they talked it, hinted at it, and tried to get credit for it without doing it. The fault I have to find is that, depending on voluntary service, we never gave voluntary service a fair chance. It would take too long to cover the different features of the system of enlistment that has prevailed to show in how many ways the

enthusiasm of our people has been slapped in the face by the method of administration of our military affairs. We have heard to-day something of the position in which our forces find themselves in England or in France. Nothing has been said in regard to what has occurred in England or in France that compares in any degree with what has occurred right here in Canada under our own administration of our own military affairs amongst our own people. If there is any other way in which enlistment could be discouraged at the hands of our military administration, I have not yet heard of it and I am unable to conceive of it. Such enlistment as has taken place—speaking of experience within my own knowledge—has taken place because of the sense of duty that has arisen in the minds of the men who have given themselves for the service. Men have travelled hundreds of miles on foot in the country in which I live to offer themselves as soldiers of the Empire.

They have come into the city of Edmonton—this was in the early days of the war—responding to the call which was sent out, expecting that their services were needed. They have come in without money; they have been told that they were not needed; they have been unable to secure employment, and have had to accept charity, these men who had offered their lives to serve the country. Times changed, and where in those days men travelled hundreds of miles and offered themselves and were refused—and I may say were refused with insult in many cases—last winter there were established in the city of Edmonton recruiting headquarters for, I think, six separate battalions—this number of battalions to be recruited all at once in a small place. What was the result? Competition amongst the officers to secure the filling up of their contingents; men who were not physically fit were, in many cases, taken on for the purpose of filling up the ranks. Instead of the service being kept at a high level, it was allowed to deteriorate, and the difficulty of filling the regiments became greater as time went on. Not only so, but while these battalions were recruiting in Edmonton, other units from all over the Dominion of Canada were authorized to go in there and set up recruiting offices and call for men. At the present time there is a battalion recruiting in Edmonton, with headquarters some place in New Brunswick—the Macleans, I think it is. Then recently I saw that the Camerons had a recruiting office in Edmonton. While officers were authorized to recruit these six battalions in Edmonton, their efforts were made more difficult by every conceivable branch of the service being authorized to establish recruiting offices in that city. On top of that there comes the policy that these battalions, which have been gathered under the direction and control of certain officers, are to be broken up, that the recruiting of a battalion is only a matter of form; that the recruiting of the battalions is only in name, that it is only the gathering up of so many men, and when they are gathered up and taken across they cease to have any identity or any relation to the locality from which they come. Why such a policy was ever introduced it is impossible to say, but surely it would strike anyone

9 p.m.

that the idea of locality and of personal associations would be the strongest element in securing the enlistment of men who were going out to risk their lives, and whose lives would depend in large measure upon the faithfulness of the comrades who were with them—surely above everything else an effective recruiting policy would consider the idea of gathering men together from the same locality, men of mutual relationship, men who would have confidence and faith in each other under extreme circumstances. Under such circumstances, if they were serving under trusted officers we might expect to get the benefit of the idea of locality and the idea of family relationship—of every idea that produces enthusiasm and willingness to serve. Everybody knows, it is historic, that over one hundred years ago the British Government raised regiments in the highlands of Scotland, at that time none too loyal to the then reigning house. Absolutely on that idea and with that ideal, regiments were raised whose names and whose fame have come down through more than one hundred years, until to-day they are names to conjure with. Surely what was good policy in those days is good policy down to this very day, because we read in the accounts of the fighting that is going on descriptions of the work of this regiment and that regiment and the other regiment, the work of the Sussex, of the Middlesex, of the Suffolks, of the Norfolks, men whose name means something to the localities from which they came. Surely the principle that is so sound and good in the British Islands might have been found of some use in Canada. But it was not. It was not only ignored, but it seemed that the authorities absolutely went out of their way to discredit it in every form, shape and manner.

Just one word with regard to the position of the officers who have been authorized to raise battalions. It may be that some may have been authorized as officers to raise battalions who did not have military experience and whose appointment was not warranted by the circumstances. I shall say nothing of that. I assume that the man who was appointed to raise a battalion was the right man to appoint for the purpose, and the fact that he did raise the battalion is evidence that in that respect at any rate he was the right man for the purpose. I have in mind a man who has served for many years, first in the British Army, and afterwards in the Northwest Mounted Police and then in the South African war. Finally he was authorized to raise a battalion at Edmonton. On the strength of his military experience and on the strength of his personal standing, he did raise a battalion without any serious difficulty. Surely such a man with such a battalion, raised under such circumstances—surely it would be right and proper that that battalion should go to the front intact under such leadership.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does the hon. gentleman not know why battalions were broken up?

Mr. OLIVER: I do not know why that one was.

Mr. BURNHAM: I can give a little information. When word would come in from the front that ten thousand or fifteen thousand or twenty thousand men were needed as reinforcements, the brigade officer would come to the battalion officer commanding and say: How many men have you? And he would say, I have two hundred and fifty. How many have you? I have two hundred and fifty. How many have you? I have five hundred. He takes the men. What would you do? Would you say because the whole battalion could not go that nobody could go at all, and that the men at the front should not be reinforced?

Mr. OLIVER: I am not a military man like my hon. friend, and I cannot give him an answer in that respect. But I think if his suggestion is well founded and that out of a whole battalion in training in England only two hundred and fifty men would be available, it is rather an unfortunate situation.

Mr. BURNHAM: Some men had joined perhaps six months before and some three. The men who had been drilling for six months might be fit, but the other might not have had training in bayonet drill or bombing. What would you do with them? Would you send them into the trenches and murder them?

Mr. OLIVER: I am afraid that my hon. friend and I cannot come to an understanding on this point. I do not know whether he ever heard of the definition of metaphysics. Metaphysics was defined by one Scotchman to another in this way: when you hear two men arguing together, if the one that is listening does not know what the other is talking about, and if the other does not know either, that is metaphysics. My hon. friend will forgive me if we do not pursue this discussion. I was not arguing at the moment at all on the merits of the policy; I was arguing as to the consequences to the officers who were placed in that position, who, having been authorized to raise a battalion, having raised that battalion, having taken it to England expecting to render service in the capacity in which they were authorized by this Government, find themselves with the battalion taken away from them, find themselves in Great Britain without occupation, find themselves there, discredited, with or without reason. I ask this House what is the position of other officers recruiting other regiments when this is recognized as their probable fate. I have in mind men who gave up good business in Edmonton in order to, as they believed, serve their country; who were authorized to raise battalions, did raise them, went to England, had their battalions taken away from them. These men had some ambition, I suppose, to serve their country, had some ambition possibly to do credit to their families, their relatives and their friends, but as long as they live, as long as their children live after them, they will never get over the disgrace that has been placed upon them by the action of this Government. How can they say whether the battalion was taken from them because of their inefficiency or because of other reasons? There is no way that these men can justify themselves to the people from amongst whom they come. A more unmerciful, a more outrageous, exercise of authority never was perpetrated.

How could there be success in recruiting if the men upon whom the country depended for success were dealt with in the manner in which they have been dealt with by the Administration of my hon. friend?

You wonder that there has not been more recruiting? It is a miracle that there has been as much recruiting as there

has. Sentiment has a great deal to do with enlistment. Enthusiasm must be aroused or men will not make the sacrifice. It has been the policy in the conduct of this war to in every way prevent the arousing of enthusiasm. I do not speak of the action of this Government; I speak of the action of the Government across the seas, coincided in by our friends here. I speak of the censorship. If there is one thing that people are entitled to know, it is the truth. If there is one thing that people are entitled to know in regard to military operations, in regard to military sacrifices, it is the truth; and it has been the policy, since the opening of this war, on that side of the Atlantic and on this side, to use the power of government to not only conceal the truth, to not only prevent the truth from being expressed, but, worse than that; instead of the censorship being used for its legitimate purpose of preventing military information from reaching the enemy, the censorship has been used for the purpose of protecting those in authority from the consequence of their incompetence and inefficiency at the hands of an informed and outraged public. I do not hold our friends here responsible for that except that they are co-partners in an iniquity that has done more harm to the military enthusiasm of this Dominion than all other causes put together.

It is a serious matter to speak of these questions, but we are in serious circumstances and if we are to meet the conditions that still face us, we must learn from what has taken place in the past and those of us who stand on the floor of Parliament will be doing less than our duty if we do not declare in what way there have been shortcomings on our part or on the part of those who are even higher up than we are. It is our right to know the truth and not have the authority of the Government of Canada or of the Empire used to suppress the truth or to distort the truth or try to conceal the iniquitous incompetence of those in authority.

I will not weary the House by going into further reasons why voluntary enlistment has not succeeded to the extent that it was hoped it would. Enough has been said to prove that the voluntary system has not had a fair trial in this country and that if we are to implement our promise of 500,000 men we must change our methods in regard to voluntary enlistment, bring ourselves more into line with the sentiment of the people, deal honestly and fairly by the people, give everybody concerned a square deal and then we may expect, if we can ever expect, to meet the conditions that we have to face.

I said a little while ago that I did not wish to be considered as criticising the Government, simply as the Government. I speak of the Government as the directors of the affairs of the people. I consider the people of Canada as partners with the Government in so far as the administration of war affairs has gone and in so far as the Government has not been criticised for the administration of those affairs. The time has come, it seems to me, when we must criticise if we are going to improve. We must talk plainly and frankly; and the Government, being the Government, must of course take the brunt of criticism. But I do not wish to absolve the people of Canada at large, nor ourselves on this side of the House in so far as we may be responsible for conditions as they are.

The question arises, what is best to be done to bring about an improvement, and first of all, what is the reason that things are as they are? As I said, I hold the Government responsible only as I hold the people responsible. The Government has failed in many respects because the people have not been awake to the exigencies and urgencies of the case. Had the people of Canada been more alive to the conditions as they exist, had they criticised the Government more freely in time of war, there is no doubt that we should have had more efficient and more energetic action at the hands of the Government. The Government of to-day is the mind of the Parliament of to-day, and the Parliament of to-day is the mind of the people as it was over five years ago. We have a parliament elected under peace conditions, when there was no thought of war; we have in power a Government representing the mind of that Parliament, and carrying on the affairs of this country and administering its share of the war in the year 1917 on the ideas of 1911. It is not reasonable to expect that this Parliament elected as it was at that time, and this Government, representing the mind of Parliament as it was at that time, could by any possibility have the point of view of the people of this country at the present time. We have a peace Administration in office, when above everything else we ought to have a war Administration in office. We should have a Parliament elected by the people who have learned, in this last year above all others,

what war means, who know the sacrifices that war calls for, and who know that those sacrifices are the only means whereby wars can be won. If we are to have an effective war administration of our affairs we must go back to the people and get their mandate as their mind is to-day. What has occurred in Great Britain has occurred in Canada. The Parliament of Great Britain, as it was, was elected under conditions of peace, and the Government of Great Britain, as it was, came to power under conditions of peace. When war broke out, that Government and that Parliament dealt with the war conditions from a peace standpoint. It is not possible to win wars by peace methods. Wars must be won by war, and the people of Great Britain have had occasion twice since the war began to take such measures as to bring those in authority more in line with the idea of winning the war by war; until in Great Britain .today, in free Britain, Britain which has laid the foundation of the world's liberty and given the example of constitutional government to the world, to-day in Great Britain, under the stress of war, we have, with the consent of the people, a dictatorship as absolute as it was in the days of Cromwell, for the purpose of winning the war, and as the only means of winning the war.

They have not appealed to the people in Great Britain. It is not for me to say whether they should or should not. But I say this: that in Canada we do not want a dictatorship. We want to continue as a free democracy, and in order to do that we must rest our Parliament upon the mandate of the people; we must bring our Parliament and our Government in line with the mind of the people of to-day. With 70,000 casualties, spread over Canada from ocean to ocean, which is a pretty thick sprinkling in the homes of our country, and with nearly 20,000 of the pick of our manhood having passed out of our lives, there is no doubt that the people of Canada to-day are not the people they were a year ago. They do not look at the war to-day as they did a year ago; they have different ideas, and it is right that they should have an expression of those ideas through a new Parliament. We do not want a dictatorship in this country, no matter how great the man may be. We want free government, and the only free government is government by the people; government by the people as expressed at the polls. I am at a loss to know for what reason the people of Canada are not considered to be the best judges of the welfare of Canada. Canada is made up of its people. It is the people of Canada who are paying for the war in money and in blood. There is no authority higher than the people to whom we can go for guidance or direction in this case. It is only reasonable, then, that, when we have come to a point where we have found ourselves unable to fulfil the promise solemnly made by us to ourselves and to our Allies as to the part that we should take in this war, we should go to the people and get their mandate as to winning the war.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): Mr. Speaker, as I feel a little hoarse to-night, if it would be agreeable to the leader of the Government, I would like to move the adjournment of the debate, although, of course it is my duty to go on.

Hon. Mr. ROGERS: I am sure I would be very pleased to oblige my hon. friend, but it is very early, and as we adjourned last night at a very early hour, we would like to get on. If my hon. friend would go on for a while, we would consider adjournment later on.

Mr. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have to address you for the first time under more or less physical disability on account of a cold, and I also regret that the leader of the House does not think it advisable to consider the physical condition in which I find myself. I will, however, deal briefly with the question which is before the House; but before entering upon any discussion of the subject more particularly before us, let me follow the precedent of the right hon. leader of the Government and the right hon. leader of the Opposition in congratulating yourself, Sir, upon the high office to which you have been elevated as the first Commoner of this great country of ours. Let me hope, Sir, in following in the path of the great and learned men who have occupied the position which you now occupy, that for the sake of our beloved province by the sea, the precedents which you establish shall do honour and justice to that fair province of which you and I and all other Nova Scotians are so justly proud. The province of Nova Scotia has given great men to the service of this nation. She has given three premiers to the Dominion of Canada and she has given great, capable, and efficient men to the heads of the various important departments of the administration of this country. But, Sir, this is the first time within my memory

that the province of Nova Scotia has furnished a Speaker to this House.

It has been my good fortune to live under three sovereigns, eight prime ministers of the Dominion of Canada, and to have occupied a seat in this House under five Speakers. My experience is that Speakers are more autocratic in their ways and manners than even sovereigns or prime ministers. That is no doubt attributable to the fact that they have a more lively and clear appreciation of their own importance and responsibilities. I am sure, Sir, from the knowledge that I have of you as a young man of education and ability, that you will, although not I hope in an autocratic manner or in any domineering way, carry forward in your career as a Speaker of this House the traditions of those who have gone before. I am glad even at this late hour—I will not call it the eleventh hour of the life of this Government; I think it is nearer the twelfth hour of the life of this Government—that they are beginning to realize that we have some men of prominence in the province of Nova Scotia. So far the right hon. leader of the Government has not been willing to give us any great recognition; but now, even at this late hour, I am pleased that he is beginning to recognize that we have such men. It is not the long bow of the leader of the Government to have a high appreciation of the men we have in Nova Scotia, and indeed it is rather his weakness that he has not a proper appreciation of the men that we have in Canada, for it is not so very long ago since he put himself on record as telling us that there were a few things we could do in a quiet, domestic way, but that when it came to breaking out into new industries, such as the building of ships, and the preparing of warships and getting ourselves into a proper state of defence, it would be at least fifty years, when the present generation and the present Parliament would all be dead, before we could begin. That was rather discouraging news for the people of Nova Scotia, who have not been accustomed to that sort of thing. In Nova Scotia, we have been accustomed to very much like the idea of the Irishman who was put into competition as to how well he could take a man's measure. The Englishman had one way and the Scotchman had another, and then the Irishman said: "Why, sir, if you could show me the corner around which a man went I could take his measure and make him a suit of clothes." It has been our habit in Nova Scotia to adapt ourselves quickly to circumstances and get along with any new enterprise, and it would be almost as easy for you to keep a duck from swimming as to keep a Nova Scotian from building ships and manning them if the opportunity were at all presented.

The speech from the Throne is not very wealthy, nor very fat in materials for the purpose of discussion. There is nothing very new in it and nothing which is of any striking importance to the people of this country. There are, of course, references to the war, which is the all-absorbing topic, not only to the people of this country, but to the people of the whole Empire, and after such eloquent addresses as have been made by the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), and the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), without mentioning the address of the Prime Minister himself, the question of the war, its requirements and our duty in respect to it have been very well threshed out, and there is not the same fresh flavour about discussing it now that there was at the commencement of this discussion, although the debate is not very old.

I come, Sir, from a country which has done much for the purpose of enforcing and enabling the people of this country to do themselves proud on the question of the war and the question of the defence of this country. We hear on some occasions that we are participating in this war only as a sort of side-show, and that we are not obliged to put forth very much effort in a direct way because the fighting is not so much ours as it is of the countries on the other side that are directly engaged in it. The Canadian people have not taken that view of the war. We have taken it to be our particular case and we take it to be the war of our country.

In the province of Nova Scotia from which I come, as I say we have done ourselves proud in the number of good men and true whom we have sent for service of the country. And there is no limit at which we can stop except the final one of the establishment of peace upon the ground upon which we had peace, happiness and security before the war broke out. That is the only mandate we have from the people of Nova Scotia in rendering aid either to the Government of the day or to any other Government which may have to deal with the war. I say we are proud of our soldiers and of what they have done for our country.

We are proud of those soldiers whether French Canadians, English Canadians, Irish Canadians or Scotch Canadians, who have sprung forward to fight in this common cause for our country and its destiny. We are proud in our perfect confidence that they will continue to maintain the traditions of their forefathers and will secure for us a continuation of that freedom which we enjoy.

As to what the duties of the Canadian people are in this regard, I do not think I can set them forth in any language of my own that will be half so appropriate as that used in a message addressed to the Canadian people by my beloved leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) as published in the Canadian Liberal monthly of the current month. I do not propose to read the whole of that highly-valued message, but will give only that portion of it that bears particularly upon the special point I am making, the duties of the Canadian people in this war:

> Canadian fathers, mothers, and wives sacrificed their dear ones, when their dear ones donned the King's uniform; of these, many have given to the cause the last full measure of devotion and now sleep and will forever sleep in the soil of Old France. The rest of us owe it to them that we also make sacrifice, sacrifice of feelings, of prejudice, of comfort, of leisure, of gains. Such sacrifice is a better monument to the fallen and wounded than either bronze or marble, and the best monument of all is the stern determination that their lives and limbs were not given in vain.
>
> While we claim, and with just cause claim to have done much, our efforts pale almost to nothing when compared with the exertions the almost inconceivable exertions of Great Britain, of France, of Russia and of Italy.
>
> In those countries there has been a constant effort towards concentration in the one object of bringing the war to a triumphant conclusion. This has produced in France especially not only a growing union of all the forces of the nation, but also a union of souls. Antagonisms which before the war seemed irreconcilable have now well high disappeared, and opinions, even the most heterogeneous are now embraced in the sacred union.
>
> Let us imitate this noble example. Let us here and now sink passions, prejudices, vain and idle recriminations. Let us when criticism is needed, criticise without bitterness, only by appeals to reason, and above all let us bend all our energies towards making Canada an effective factor in the struggle.
>
> The heart of the nation must beat with one accord and one desire. Thus and thus only can Canada attain the full standard of what she owes to herself and her future and with such an inspiration, the people will rise to a consciousness of national power and national character which will be enduring and permanent for the welfare and grandeur of our Dominion.
>
> Whether victory and peace be near or distant, our resolve will not falter. We will continue to the end, calmly, firmly and grimly determined to do our share so that this terrible scourge of war may forever pass away from us. And there is hope—hope not founded merely on desires and aspirations but on appreciable facts—that victory will bring us measurably near to an era when war will have become so odious, that the nation which would attempt it, would have to face the majesty and combined strength of the whole civilized world.

I am glad the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition thought it proper to put his views in this shape so that the people of Canada might know clearly and distinctly where he stands on this question of what we should do for the prosecution of the war—the establishment of peace and the continued unity and strength of the great Empire to which we belong. I do not know how it strikes other hon. gentlemen, but to me it is a sad thing to see small, I might almost say contemptible, people in this country trying to make capital out of the fact that the great man who leads the Opposition happens to be of French ancestry and to speak the French language, trying to give the impression that this must make him disloyal to his King and country trying to "play politics" with this contemptible idea, even at a time when we are in the midst of this great struggle and when every man should bend his thoughts and energies to the one purpose of winning the war. But let me assure my great leader that, so far as Nova Scotia is concerned and so far as the Maritime Provinces are concerned, we have known him too long and too well, we have too much faith in him, for such ideas to have any hold upon us; that he stands with us as our leader our beloved leader, a leader in whom the people have always had confidence that he would be loyal and devoted in the performance of his public duties. It would be a strange thing indeed if a man did not show signs of the nationality to which he belonged. I can tell this House that while I profess to be as loyal to my King and country as a man can possibly be, I should think less of myself than I do if my heart did not respond to the memory of the hills and vales of old Scotland. No man can rise to his full manhood unless he has behind him the ideal of his nationality and of his people and of the principles for which they stand. It does not make me less a Canadian or less a Britisher if I have a lingering love and regard for the dear old hills of Scotland; nor does it make a French Canadian less a Britisher or less capable of being true to the Crown of Great Britain, and to everything that that Crown and the British flag represents, because, forsooth, he happens to speak

French, or because his ancestors were born in that great country which stands by our side to-day so loyally and so effectively in support of that which is right and true and in the service of the best interests of civilization and humanity.

I have pointed out where the people I have the honour to represent stand in connection with the war and what we purpose doing in connection with it. Criticism is not always pleasant, but, after all, is it not the duty of men who are sent here as representatives of the people to say what they think should be brought to the notice of the Government if there are defects in the administration of affairs at Ottawa. If things are not going as we think they ought to go, does it not seem reasonable that we should give our opinion in a fair and reasonable manner as to what we think ought to be done? Ancient sacred history tells us that certain men may be regarded as watchmen on the watch-towers of their country. The watchman of a constituency is the man who is sent to this House by the free people of that county to represent it. This particularly refers to members of the Opposition, who sit here as watchmen on the tower; and the pronouncement is: Woe unto the watchman if he does not prepare when danger is approaching. It is therefore our duty to point out to the Government their shortcomings and wherein they could do better. If they take our advice, well and good; if not, their blood be on their own head—the responsibility is entirely theirs.

The results that I speak of as having been brought about by our people in connection with this war have been achieved, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) practically in the teeth of the worst kind of maladministration, whether the Government of to-day and the officers who are particularly appointed by it are responsible or not. This is a country in which we have responsible government, and we hold the heads of departments responsible for these things; it is the only source which we can really get at. We have to look to them for the proper administration of affairs; if they fall short of what we expect them to do, we have to bring it to their notice, and if they do not comply with our fair and reasonable requests, we can only do like Paul of old: we shall appeal to Caesar and to Caesar we shall go. The people of this country will be the Caesar; the people of this country will judge them upon their merits. If, as I have said, we do not point out these things, the fault will be ours. We do not object to proper expenditures of money, but we must have parliamentary responsibility for these expenditures. I must point out to the parties responsible for the administration of the Militia Department that this has not been the case. We have already pointed out to you, Mr. Speaker, that in the province of Nova Scotia we had some transactions in connection with military matters in which no business ability was shown. We have in this House and in committee dealt with such an important matter as the purchase of horses in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, particularly in Nova Scotia. We have had the spectacle in the province of Nova Scotia of a man having been entrusted with the expenditure of something like $100,000 for the purchase of horses for military purposes, and it was acknowledged in this House by no less a person than the Prime Minister that nobody was responsible for this man's appointment. The Prime Minister, speaking in this House, said that he should never have been appointed; that he had not the age, experience or ability to perform the services for which he had been appointed, and that as a member of the House he should not have accepted the position. The Prime Minister did not know who appointed him; the ex-Minister of Militia, who was sitting in the House, did not know who had appointed him. Nobody knew anything about his fitness or qualifications. The question was asked: who gave him the money? If there is a place around Ottawa where a man can get $100,000 without anybody appointing him or giving him authority, I think some of us would like to know where that place is. Here was a man who got $100,000 which he checked out in Nova Scotia for such horses as you have heard about so often that it would weary you to hear anything further about them. The responsibility is brought home to the Minister of Militia of that day for the expenditure of this money, whether he wants it or not. The people of Nova Scotia and of all Canada will want to know what sort of Government we have when a man can get $100,000 to expend in this way without anybody knowing where he got it, how he got it, who gave him the authority, or, as an hon. gentleman suggests, what he did with the money. The elementary principles of business teach us that it would be a simple thing to have

this man bonded for the expenditure of $100,000, and that there should be some proper record of how he got the $100,000 and of what he did with it. The only record, however, we have about it is that there was considerable activity around a glue factory for a few days somewhere in the province of Quebec and that a certain unfortunate man was read out of the House and, to some extent, out of the Tory party. That is all that the people of Nova Scotia and the people of Canada have for their $100,000. And that, sir, is a very small fraction of the mal-administration in matters of this kind connected with the war. I have simply taken this as an illustration, an incident that shows how this thing was done, and the recklessness and carelessness with which the money of the people was expended for no purpose. We hear of certain enterprises, industrial and otherwise, being conducted, not for their own intrinsic value, and not for what they are really producing, but for the purpose of playing the stock markets with their stocks and bonds. That would appear to be to some extent the scheme of the Government in connection with military matters in this country. You may well say that that is an extraordinary statement to make, that the Government was simply going in for the making of money in connection with military affairs in this country. The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) read a quotation yesterday which is the basis of the statement which I now make. That is a statement made by the late Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) in the correspondence between him and the Prime Minister, in which the late minister says that on one occasion he was held up for four long months in carrying on what he had to do in connection with certain contingents, because, forsooth, certain parties wanted to make money out of the business of buying trucks, so that for these four months that contingent was held up. The language of the Minister of Militia is to be found on page 26 of the Hansard of yesterday, and is there quoted from the minister's letter, so that if it is not correctly given there has been ample opportunity of correcting it in this House, as the right hon. Prime Minister spoke after the conclusion of the speech of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This is what was said by the ex-Minister of Militia, as quoted in this House yesterday:—

> It is difficult for me to recall where you have actively supported me in the passage of any Order in Council concerning the upbuilding of the militia when opposed by two Members of the Cabinet usually antagonistic to anything proposed by me. As you are aware, it took up four months in the midst of this great war to fight through the principles of purchasing, for the Second Division, trucks at the lowest wholesale prices instead of allowing large commissions to local agents who would have nothing whatever to do with securing the order.

That, sir, is the charge, that is the indictment. It is an indictment with, perhaps, only one count, but is one on which, if it were placed before the people of this country, with the evidence that supports it, only one verdict could be returned, and that verdict condemnatory of any government that would sit down wrangling and fighting for four long months over a matter of this kind. It would be bad enough to do so for one week. It would be horrifying to see this done for one day. But here, for four long months, the regiments were held up because there were two men in the Cabinet, two men leading some other factions, I suppose, who wanted to filch money out of the treasury of this country and took contemptible means of getting it, by holding up these contracts for trucks. It was nothing that the sons of Canada were being knocked down like nine pins at the front, that they were killed and torn and slaughtered, with no support to come back up behind them of their own Canadian friends. That was nothing at all. Although we had the men and the means and the ability to support them, four months had to go by while these men stood with a revolver at the head of this minister, saying: You must give us toll; we stand at the toll gate and you must give us money, otherwise your men cannot get across, we care not what may happen. That is proven to the hilt in the evidence of the minister who was in charge and who wanted to get the business put through. He does not give the names of the members of the Cabinet who did this, but it was evidently done, that is shown beyond peradventure. If I wanted to condemn this Government I should not want any stronger indictment than that they, a war government, the war being the principal thing, would delay over this matter for four months, would stand by and see their brethren shot like rabbits in the trenches in France, with no support going to them, all held back for the miserable and contemptible purpose of making a few dollars out of the trucks and wagons that would have to be taken over with this contingent.

I think I have fulfilled my contract with the leader of the House, and possibly he will

allow me to move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion of Mr. McKenzie, the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at ten o'clock p.m.

Wednesday, January 24, 1917.

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

COAL SHORTAGE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MICHAEL STEELE (South Perth): I wish to inquire of the Minister of Railways regarding the coal situation throughout Ontario. Speaking more particularly for the western portion of the province, the people there are face to face with the most serious coal famine they have ever experienced. Of the factories depending upon steam power, some are already closed, and many of them will be compelled to close within a very short time. Householders, too, in both town and country are very short of the necessary fuel, and in many homes the coal bin is empty. I know that the minister has had this matter before him, because through his exertions and the efforts of the Railway Commission some relief was afforded to certain sections a few weeks ago. The situation, however, is becoming so serious again that I know the people of the provinces will be glad to be assured that every effort is being made to relieve what is a most distressing situation. I should like to inquire of the minister what prospects there are for relief in the near future.

Hon. Mr. COCHRANE (Minister of Railways): I will bring my hon. friend's remarks before the Railway Commission and ask them to proceed as they did before, and try and relieve the situation. I know from my experience with the Intercolonial that cars are exceedingly short on the American side, and the American railways are very loath to allow them to come off their lines into Canada; and of course we have no jurisdiction to compel them. If the roads can get the coal and bring it into Canada, we will see that it is delivered.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. G. C. Wilson (Wentworth) for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Tuesday, January 23.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton) (Resuming): Mr. Speaker, before the debate was adjourned last night I was calling the attention of the House to a portion of the very important correspondence which had taken place between the Prime Minister and the ex-Minister of Militia, and in order that it may be plain to you, Sir, and to hon. gentlemen, I will take the liberty of again reading that short paragraph so as to connect up my remarks, with what I was saying at the hour of adjournment last night. This is a quotation from the letter of the ex-Minister of Militia to the right hon. the Prime Minister. As I stated last night, this quotation must be accepted as true because it has passed muster, in the sense of not having been replied to or contradicted by the Prime Minister during the course of the correspondence, and it has passed the further test of having been quoted by the right hon. leader of the Opposition in his speech on Monday last, which was delivered before the right hon. the Prime Minister spoke, and the Prime Minister in the course of his address did not think it proper to make any reference by way of contradiction to this paragraph from the letter of the ex-Minister of Militia. I think, therefore, I have a right to believe that this is a proper statement of the facts as they existed between the Prime Minister and his late colleague. The paragraph I shall quote is but a mere scrap of the rather extended correspondence that took place between them. But it struck me at the time I read the correspondence, and I still so regard it, as a very serious matter, a matter that should receive careful consideration by the Canadian people, and a matter which I think should be brought clearly to their notice. The paragraph reads:

> It is difficult for me to recall where you have actively supported me in the passage of any Order in Council concerning the up-building of the Militia when opposed by two members of the Cabinet usually antagonistic to anything proposed by me. As you are aware, it took up four months in the midst of this great war to fight through the principles of purchasing, for the Second Division, trucks at the lowest wholesale prices, instead of allowing large commissions to local agents who would have nothing whatever to do with securing the order.

That, Sir, is a situation which if stated by any ordinary man in this country would not be believed for a moment. If that statement appeared in any partisan news-

paper in the Dominion of Canada, I venture to say that, partisan as I am, I would not believe it at all; but coming as it does from the Minister of Militia, and having, as it has, the silent endorsement of the Prime Minister, there is nothing left for me but to believe that that was really the condition of affairs that existed at the time when the equipment for the Second Division was under consideration by the Cabinet. I submit that some satisfactory explanation should come from the Prime Minister as to why he should permit any such conditions as those here indicated to exist in his Cabinet. He may have unruly members in his Cabinet, members who will not always do as he would have them do; but as to their conduct, and the way in which they administer the departments over which they preside, the Canadian people hold the Prime Minister responsible, and will call him to account for the manner in which they respectively conduct the public affairs which are committed to them.

The Minister of Militia charges two members of the Cabinet in particular with having fought more vigorously than the others against him when he was trying to get this Order in Council through. It must be clear to this House and the country that those things could not be done behind the door, as far as the Prime Minister is concerned. The meetings of Council, of course, are always under his supervision, and he presides over them. I take it for granted that that is the case, particularly when he is here and able to preside over the meetings. It is not put forward as an excuse or in extenuation of the circumstances, that he did not preside over Cabinet meetings during the four months when this particular matter was under consideration. I have therefore a right to assume that he was aware who these two ministers were who were particularly fighting this vote, and who the gentlemen in the Cabinet were who were generally obstructing the progress of the country in connection with these very important matters. One would suppose that, instead of the Minister of Militia being driven out of the Council, those two ministers, whoever they were that were trying to obstruct him and to obstruct the business of the country, would be driven out of the Cabinet and other men brought into their places who would comply with the necessities of the country and see that proper speed was provided for the grave requirements of the war. Now that the Prime Minister has thought proper to put out of the Cabinet the man who was urging for speed and who stood firmly for the principle of business along business lines, and that he has kept in his Cabinet those two men, whoever they are, who were obstructing the business and who were wanting to do business, not along business lines, but along the line of improper methods—this correspondence clearly shows that graft was intended, as the commissions, according to this letter, were to go to people who were not to raise a finger in procuring the trucks—the Prime Minister before the great jury of the people of Canada must be held responsible for the conduct of those who were opposing their colleague and obstructing the business and wanting to get this commission for men who had no right at all to receive it. It is, therefore, a matter of proper criticism, and one that should be brought to the attention of the Canadian people at a stage when we are all anxious that the best should be done in connection with the war, and that every dollar of money and every moment of time should be properly utilized so that Canada may take her proper position in regard to the war. It is, therefore, important for us to know what position the Cabinet is taking, and if we find that the Prime Minister and the other members of the Cabinet are willing to stand pat for four months on a simple question of business, what can they expect of the large masses of the people who are not so directly responsible as themselves?

I am not so sure that the true reason has been given in regard to putting the ex-Minister of Militia out of office. We had from the beginning a most extraordinary kind of Cabinet: a Tory Cabinet, a Tory Government, a highly loyal Government and a highly loyal support, bearing with it at every stage the brand of loyalty and boasting of its great loyalty; but, after all, when one comes to examine into the personnel of that Government at its inception and throughout its progress from stage to stage; when one comes to its true inwardness, one finds that its personnel is not compatible with the great protestations of loyalty made in regard to it. There were two conflicting elements in the Cabinet from the beginning. There were the superloyalists, the extraordinarily loyal, represented by the former Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) and others on the one hand, and the extreme Nationalists on the other, who fought the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden and the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Lau-

rier to the death during the last campaign, and who would have nothing to do with either of them, but who, by some wonderful light which they saw on the way to Ottawa—instead of to Damascus—underwent a marvellous change, and we had this wonderful combination forming the highly loyal Cabinet presided over by my right hon. friend. I am sorry, however, to think that they were not long together in that happy combination when the Premier found it necessary to erect stalls in the council chamber and to put the members of his Cabinet into different compartments in the hope of keeping them apart, but the partition walls were evidently broken down and he could not have peace or contentment with them at all. It is no reflection upon the Prime Minister, nor upon the Government, that it was well understood in the country that a very important loyal body in Canada was recognized in the Cabinet by the selection of Sir Sam Hughes as Minister of Militia. I have reference to the great loyal Orange body in this country. In newspaper publications it has been reported that it was because he was recognized as one of the leading men of that body that he was taken into the Cabinet as representing their wishes and will, and that the distinguished gentleman who occupied the chair which you, Sir, now occupy was taken into office and given a place of promise and high position for the same reason. You can readily understand the incompatibility of the two elements, the great Nationalist crowd represented in the Cabinet by men who would have nothing to do with, and who owed nothing to, England, who had no use for the British flag except to puncture it for the purpose of ventilation—you can readily understand what sort of a happy family they would be sitting down with my good friend the ex-Minister of Militia and incidentally with the gentleman who was at one time Speaker of this House, representing the high class of loyalty exhibited by the Orange body of this country. The Government can say what they like as to why Sir Sam Hughes was driven out of the Cabinet and why the Speaker at that time, the Hon. Mr. Sproule, now the Hon. Senator Sproule, was driven out of the Chair, but the real reason was because their views were absolutely incompatible with the contentions and spirit of the Nationalist wing, and the latter prevailed, and they ate up the others and put them out of sight. That is the true reason why Sir Sam Hughes went out of the Government and why the Hon. Mr. Sproule went out of the Chair, and it is only right that the great Orange body should understand why those plays are going on and that they should look behind the curtain and see the true reason and not be fooled by supposing that it was because the musical ear of the ex-Minister of Militia was not properly tuned and that he wrote a letter which did not quite please the highly technical ear of the Prime Minister. It was not, the Prime Minister says, because of anything that was in the letter; it was not because there was anything particularly offensive in it; but it was pitched in a tone that grated so harshly on the highly sensitive nerves of the Prime Minister that the tone could not be tolerated any longer because he had enough lack of harmony in the Cabinet without allowing a voice which grated so much upon his sensibilities to remain. The real cause was a sort of house-cleaning for the purpose of pleasing the Nationalists and driving the Orange element out of the Cabinet, so far as they could be driven out.

I hope, that having been done, there will be some harmony for a little while, and it will remain to be seen whether the further expansion and extension of Nationalism in the Government or the new addition to it will receive the approval of the country. It is not for me to say, and I am not going to say anything about it. I will say this for the late Speaker, that, as the Prime Minister felt that he had to select from among the Nationalists, he made the best selection possible.

Before leaving this correspondence and dropping the subject, I wish to point out to the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) who, I am sorry, is not in his place, that he should have had some supervision over the financing of this second contingent when they were being held here. I am not sure of the number of men in that contingent. Let us take it at 50,000. With wages and expenses, it is not at all unreasonable to say that the expense of keeping this contingent would be $3 per day per man, and it would probably be more. At that rate, this country has had to pay out $18,000,000 to keep this contingent at a standstill for four months. And for what purpose? We would like to be able to give a reason for our doings at every turn in this crisis, and the people naturally want to know why this sum of $18,000,000 was expended. The reason is that a fight was going on in the Cabinet over commissions on trucks, and until that was decided the second contin-

gent of this magnificent army had to be held up. The Canadian people are expected to say to those who are responsible: Well done, good and faithful servants, continue to waste the money of the country as you have wasted it in holding over this contingent. It is well that the people should know the facts of the case, and it will be for them to pass judgment.

General Hughes was got out of the Cabinet. He was made the scapegoat. We are familiar with the ritual of the scapegoat. The sins of the people were loaded upon the goat and the goat was sent out into the wilderness. The poor goat in this case was to bear the sins of the Cabinet, so you can understand how great was his burden. No doubt he was led out by two ministers. I do not know which ministers they were, but I can imagine they may have been the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers), and the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White). They went into the wilderness with the goat, but apparently they did not go far enough; no doubt they had to hurry back for fear someone would get an advantage in the Cabinet while they were away. The result is that the goat is back; he appears at times in this House. One can almost hear the horrified murmurs of the Minister of Finance on seeing that goat here, "Angels and ministers of grace defend us!" They did not take the goat far enough, and so the old time ritual is "busted." Moses' goats did not come back; but the Borden goat has come back, and some other scheme will have to be found to get clear of it, for it is a menace to the progress of the Government. The more they beat the goat the bigger it gets. The Prime Minister seems to realise this, for in his speech the other day he indicated a desire to gently pat the goat's head and to avoid doing anything that would stir it to anger.

Throughout the whole country—or at least, certainly, in the province of Nova Scotia—matters of recruiting, encamping, training and transportation in connection with the military are run strictly on lines of political patronage. There is only one patronage committee; the same committee which deals with railway matters, public works, and marine and fisheries, deals also with everything pertaining to the military. What, think you, Sir, of such a case as this? There is a rule, I understand, that when a man is discharged from the force for some good reason, and is called upon to hand in his uniform, he is given a suit of clothes. An officer went into a certain store with a number of men so discharged, for the purpose of getting them the clothing called for under this rule. The goods were there and were found to fit the boys. A selection was made, the goods were packed, and nothing remained but to sign the bill. The officer asked the merchant, "By the way, what are your politics"? The merchant said, "It is well known what my politics are, I am a Liberal and always have been a Liberal." Whereupon the officer remarked, "I regret it very much, but I have no authority to buy anything except in a Tory store." That actually took place in one of our leading towns of Nova Scotia, and it is only a sample of how everything else is done, which shows how far this Government and its officials will go in trying to make political capital in the province of Nova Scotia and no doubt throughout the whole country. The marvel is that the Liberal boys are going to the front in the service of their country but they do go in spite of the slaps in the face they have received from officers appointed and maintained by this Tory Government.

I say that I believe that the same thing is carried on in other provinces besides Nova Scotia. I have here a clipping taken from the Toronto Globe of a few days ago. I have not heard of any contradiction or denial of the statements it makes. I have no means of knowing whether it is true or not, but quote it for what it is worth. There are hon. gentlemen here from Toronto and its neighbourhood who will know whether it is true or not; and if true, it is a fine commentary upon the conduct of the men who are entrusted with office and responsible for the state of affairs here shown:

Soldiers, Get in Line!

Is it necessary for a returned soldier in Toronto to join a Conservative ward association before he has any chance of securing a government position? Is the spoils system still in operation? Can no Liberal who has fought for his country hope to serve it in time of peace without renouncing his political creed? These questions are forced to the front by the uncontradicted statement that Sergeant Soloman, a returned soldier wounded in France, was told by Sergeant-Major Creighton at the city hall, when he applied for a position, to "go and join the Second Ward Conservative Association and get in line for a government job." The sergeant-major says he told the returned soldier to see the Conservative Patronage Committee, not to join the association, but that is a very lame excuse.

The statement made by Soloman is all the more significant when it is remembered that the Second Ward is a part of the constituency of Hon. A. E. Kemp, Minister of Militia. Does Mr. Kemp take the view of the Government's

obligations to returned soldiers taken by Sergeant-Major Creighton of the city hall staff? Does he propose to confine openings in the service of the people of Canada to soldiers who can show cards of membership in Conservative associations? Having stood in line in the trenches against the enemies of the Empire, must Liberals who desire places in the public service now stand in line behind some stay-at-home ward heeler? Mr. Kemp cannot afford to ignore the issue raised by Sergeant-Major Creighton's remark to Sergeant Soloman.

I have stated what has been and is being done in Nova Scotia before the soldiers go away, but if this clipping be true—and it bears some evidence of truth—it would appear that in Ontario the patronage system in operation is such that not only before the soldiers go, but after they have placed their lives in jeopardy for their country and have come back wounded, bruised or crippled, they must bear the badge of their only saviour and salvation, showing that they are Tories, or they cannot be recognized at all. This is a sad condition of things, and I really hope that the Prime Minister and those who have to do with matters of this kind will see that such things shall not any longer be perpetrated in this great country of ours. I said last night that I was not fond of making criticisms.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am pleased, Sir, that I receive sanction and approval of this not only from my own side of the House, but clearly from the other side as well. We appeal to hon. gentlemen on the other side in respect to these matters, because the Government will not listen to us. Hon. gentlemen, will, I suppose, listen to their own friends, and so we bring these matters to their notice. I see sitting opposite me honest business men who in every walk of life outside of politics would scorn to do anything but that which was clean cut, honest and straightforward. I am sorry, however, that the bane of politics blindfolds them; they follow their leaders recklessly and carelessly, which they will do until there comes a tumbledown and they all disappear forever from view. I see opposite me to-day a gentleman for whom this country has the greatest regard and in whom it has the greatest confidence, a gentleman who has shown some independence in public life. I refer to the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle). I was thinking about him yesterday and last night when I was reading about the hold-up for four months which cost $18,000,000 of the people's money, the reason being that some Tories were fighting and strangling each other to get pelf and graft out of the blood of the people of this country. I was thinking how he would stand before the highly-cultured people of Kingston and defend the lenten season of four months which was kept for the purpose of allowing friends of his to get a slice from these truck wagons that were being slowly produced for the purposes of the war. I remind my hon. friend of these things, so that when he has not much else to do he may carefully think over the explanation that he wlil make to his people regarding them. He has taken a firm stand on other things where the evidence was not half so clear; the evidence here is unquestioned, coming from the Cabinet itself, and I am sure that whether or not he tells us anything about it, it will not receive his sanction or approval. On one occasion the hon. gentleman did take his life in his hand; he did break away, though only for a season, I am sorry to say, from the rank and file, and kicked over the traces for a little while. He found the chafing of the traces, however, so hurtful that he was glad to get back. Having had the experience of getting his legs curled up and scratched by these traces, I am afraid that it will not be so easy to get him to kick over again. However, I remind him of this as he is a sample of the many excellent gentlemen whom I see before me who would like to cut down business of this kind, but who may be afraid to do it. I warn hon. gentlemen that the great province of Ontario is an honest province—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McKENZIE: —and that the Ontario farmer will not stand for this thing. It would be better for them to cast out an eye or cut off a right hand before the day of reckoning than to stay by the crowd and suffer the fate of the man who does not cast out the eye or cut off the hand. Possibly that is enough said about this correspondence; I assume that it will be dealt with by other gentlemen who know more about it than I do.

Another matter to which I wish to refer will show how the friends of the Government and the Government itself expected to use the soldiers, not only in the way of patronage, but in the elections. It was refreshing to me to hear the Prime Minister speaking in the House on the opening day of this debate with regard to the soldiers' vote. He has made a roundabout face on

that question; but as he has made certain other evolutions of that kind, I assume that it is an exercise which he does not find very difficult. I shall quote what I said about this Act when it was passed in 1915 and what the Prime Minister said the other day. I am sure that if hon. gentlemen did not know the contrary they would think that the remarks were those of two men speaking on the same subject and in entire accord. What I said when this Enfranchising Bill was under discussion, as it appears on page 2273 of Hansard of 1915, volume 3, was as follows:

I do not hesitate to put myself on record here—I did not speak on the second reading of the Bill—as being opposed to the measure. I believe that it is not workable and that it will only add to the difficulties already existing at the front.

The soldiers when they go to the front take upon themselves certain responsibilities, and we repose certain trusts in them. They are to do the fighting for us, and we are to provide for them in every way that we can. Their minds are not to be bothered about political or municipal affairs; they must have a free hand to deal with the very arduous and important matters they have before them. On the other hand, the soldier has to trust to the friends whom he leaves behind and to the people of the country that in his absence political matters shall be kept on an even keel. As we trust them at the front, they have to trust us here.

Then a little further on I said:—

We are called upon to give the right to vote to men who are far away from home, who are out of touch with the issues that will be threshed out in an election, and who have no knowledge of the qualifications of the candidates. Without taking shelter behind the assertion that I am not opposed to voting by soldiers, or behind any other shelter, I say that I am absolutely opposed to this Bill.

That, Sir, was the position I took upon that Bill when it was before the House. At that time the right hon. Prime Minister took a directly contrary view, and he was backed up by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), and particularly backed up by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett). We were told, myself and others on this side of the House, particularly the right hon. leader of the Opposition, that we were, of course, disloyal because we ventured to say that this Act was not workable. Here, now, after thinking over this matter for two years or more, the Prime Minister himself comes back to this House and says, on page 41 of Hansard of the 22nd of this month:—

I know something of the conditions at the front, and I venture to put this thought before the House and the country: the men at the front will be not only practically, but actually, disfranchised if an election does take place in this country while they are in the trenches. That is my conviction. I say they would be actually disfranchised because, although I render every tribute to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and the committee which had in hand the preparation of the Soldiers Voting Act of 1915, I am not disposed to think that the arrangements made in that Act or in any other Act that could be devised are such as to enable those men to vote, or at least any considerable number of them. You cannot predict what conditions may exist. Supposing an election came on in this country when the fiercest drive of the war was taking place. Do you imagine that the paymasters of those regiments and their commanding officers could busy themselves with handing out ballots to men whose souls were engrossed and whose lives were at stake in the enterprise in which they were engaged? There is something more than that. These men at the front have it not in their disposition, have it not in their heart or their soul to consider matters of party controversy under the conditions with which they are there confronted.

That, Sir, is the position taken by the Prime Minister to-day. It is the position that was particularly taken by myself two years ago, and I feel very proud to find that the Prime Minister has come to my way of thinking in this matter, and that we are not to have the spectacle of an endeavour to have the soldiers cast their votes in the trenches, if an election should come on. I fear, Sir, that the change of view of the Prime Minister is not altogether attributable to his mature consideration of the views which I then advanced; I believe that his statement the other day was the expression of a conviction not of the soul and of the mind arrived at by logical sequence; that is not the reason for this change of heart. The Conservative party had an experience in the taking of soldiers' votes in the province of British Columbia last summer, and the plan did not pan out as splendidly as they expected it would. The cancer of vote-losing started in the British Columbia election and seemed likely to develop more and more, and so they feared that if they afforded an opportunity to those men in the trenches to vote the same thing that happened in British Columbia would be repeated in an even greater degree, and that the end would be worse than the beginning. I am afraid that that is the reason of the change of heart of the Prime Minister, and that is why we are not to be troubled with the vote of the soldier if an election takes place now, as was intended at the time the Act was passed.

I shall be told, I suppose, that I should not criticise this Government, and that they are doing the best they can. Well, I

will admit they are doing the best they can with their present personnel. But if they are doing the best they can, I do not want any better reason for turning them out, for the best they can, is not good enough for the people of this country; and we must have men whose best is equal to the occasion, and will give this country such a government as we had under the regime of my right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) during the long period when the duties of government devolved upon him.

As I have stated, their best is not good enough, and we must, therefore, hope that the day is not far distant when they will realize that themselves, and do something like their brethren did in Manitoba, when they themselves discovered that the judgment of God was upon them and they moved out, bag and baggage, without waiting for any mandate from the people. We do not expect that here, but that will be the result, and that is what is going to happen as soon as the Canadian people have an opportunity of passing judgment upon these honourable gentlemen.

I was going to say that, after all, the only thing to the credit of this Government has been the war operations. They have not shown one iota of practical or constructive statesmanship from the time they took office down to the present moment. There are many able men on the other side of the House, and if any acts of constructive statesmanship have been performed by the Government, these able men will be able to tell us what they were. We are told that the Minister of Finance is entitled to great credit because of the manner in which he financed the affairs of the country. I do not think, Sir, that anybody would have given a great deal of credit to a man who would have come after Joseph in the old days. If after Joseph had filled the barns and the treasuries with gold and silver and grain and everything that was necessary, he had gone out of business and somebody had come along who had nothing to do but to measure out lavishly what was in the treasury, in the stores, in the barns, I do not think we would give such a man a great deal of credit. That was the position of the Minister of Finance. He came in here and found that he had come after seven fat years, fifteen fat years indeed, and he found the treasury full, he found the credit of the country at the highest possible pitch. In fact he found everything at his hand, in as great abundance as the heart of man could wish for or conceive. He started out to squander at a great rate, as fast as possible, and when all of the stored treasure was gone, when he had scraped the bottom of the flour barrel, he started after the people to take from them what they had gathered up during the fifteen years of plenty whilst Sir Wilfrid Laurier was in power. Does anybody say that that was a great act of statesmanship, because after squandering $40,000,000 which we left to the credit of the country he now goes after the people to take from them what they had gathered up with frugality and care under the prosperous regime of Sir Wilfrid Laurier? That, Sir, is the only thing that stands to the credit of the Minister of Finance so far as constructive statesmanship or financing is concerned.

I submit that in the section of the country from which I come we have reason to complain of the conduct and management of this Government. I submit, Sir, that if proper care had been taken, if proper economy had been practised, if the moneys that we left had not been squandered as they were, public works and development in this country would not have been abandoned to the extent that they were. I submit that the programme laid down at that time in regard to railways and other matters in the province of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Quebec, should have been carried out, but I regret to say that everything has been dropped, and nothing has been done in that part of the country. We have not had the opportunities of developing that we should have had to put us in proper touch with the commercial growth of this country. For these opportunities we must look forward to the time when the same right hon. gentleman who was ready to give us them will again be in charge of affairs in this country. I am sorry to say that we have nothing to hope for from the present Administration along these lines, and we have reason to fear that unless there is a change soon, and a stop is put to their mal-administration, it will be many years before we get back to that equilibrium between receipts and expenditures in this country that is necessary to carry on the business of the country as it ought to be carried on.

Before sitting down, Sir, I wish to refer to a matter which particularly affects the Prime Minister himself, and which, perhaps, is not of general interest to the House. I am sorry that my county of Cape Breton has not been treated so well in connection with its representation in another place in this building as it ought to have been. I wish to point out that at Confederation the great

county of Cape Breton which I in part represent, had two senators. Ever since that time it has been represented by two and sometimes three senators. I am sorry to say that the Prime Minister and the Government have thought it proper to disregard the old time practice, and to-day the island of Cape Breton is not represented in the Senate at all. The only senator for Cape Breton is not a native of the county, and is not even a native of the province of Nova Scotia. He has no interest in the province of Nova Scotia, so far as I know, except a palatial residence which he occupies once in a while in the summer time. He has no interest, so far as I know, in the development of the island of Cape Breton where you get your coal, and your steel, and where everything is big and broad and prosperous in the sphere of commercial and industrial development. I submit, Sir, that if representation in the Senate means anything at all, and it certainly means something, the great island of Cape Breton, with all its industries, should have a representative who has an interest in the county and is in direct touch with the people. I wish to protest against the course taken by the Prime Minister in connection with the recent appointments, in ignoring entirely gentlemen of ability who had claims upon the Government, and in ignoring the people of that island who have a claim to be properly represented in the Senate. We have some excellent men who have sacrificed time, money, and energy, in support of the Conservative party in the county of Cape Breton; and I am sorry that the Prime Minister and the Government have seen fit to ignore them in appointing representives of that part of the country to the great body which forms a branch of the Parliament of this country. I am deeply obliged to you, Mr. Speaker, and to honourable gentlemen, for the quiet and respectful hearing which I have received in presenting my views to the House. I have presented these views in the hope that there shall be reforms in the Government, that they will cut out patronage in handling war matters for the few short months that they may have to handle them, and that they will devote their energies to one purpose and regard us as one people, so far as these questions are concerned, so that better things may prevail during the short time that they will have anything to do with the affairs of this country.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Mr. WILLIAM ALVES BOYS (South Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, in craving the indulgence of the House for a few moments while I discuss some of the questions before it, I should like first to join with those who have preceded me in extending to you my sincere congratulations upon your elevation to the high position of Speaker of the Canadian House of Commons. It has not been my pleasure to know you so long as some of those who have already referred to the matter. I think the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) claimed the pleasure of a life-long acquaintance with you. I have been in this House now for some four years, however, and during that time I have learned something of your ability, of your earnestness, of your sense of justice and fair play; and with these qualities, I feel confident that you will discharge the important duties of your office in accordance with the highest traditions of the past.

I would like to say a word or two in regard to the most helpful and patriotic work that is being done by the ladies of Canada in this crisis of our history. Much has already been said in that regard, but in my opinion too much cannot be said. The work of the women of Canada has been an inspiration to the men of Canada. I can speak with some knowledge of the noble services rendered by the women in the part of the country from which I come. In the county of Simcoe the ladies have taken part in Red Cross work, in field comfort work, in aiding the returned soldiers; and, apart from the societies which abound throughout the county, there is work being done in an endless number of homes by the ladies who are constantly knitting socks and preparing medical supplies for the soldiers. I feel that we cannot be too grateful to the women of Canada for their self-sacrificing devotion to the furtherance of the cause of freedom and justice.

I also desire to say a word or two respecting what my own county is doing in a military sense. So far, I have not placed this on Hansard, but I think it is a contribution worthy of being recorded. The county of Simcoe is a fairly large county, and I am glad to say that the County Council at its last meeting decided to devote the sum of $120,000 to the Patriotic Fund, this being the second contribution. I say this in no boastful way, because, as I have said, it is a large county. I believe that Simcoe was the first county to organize a purely rural battalion. Just about a year ago word was sent to the Prime Minister that the 157th Regi-

ment, composed of the sons of Simcoe, had been mobilized. To-day we have a second regiment, the 177th, with some eight hundred odd men; and it is our belief that ere two or three months go by, notwithstanding the difficulty in recruiting now, the regiment will be recruited up to strength. In addition to that, and before the decision was reached to recuit a purely rural battalion, Simcoe had sent many of her sons to the city of Toronto, where they enlisted. Many of them enlisted in the 76th Regiment and are now overseas. I think, Sir, that these facts are worthy of being stated in this Parliament.

I desire to join with what has been said in regard to the work of the Prime Minister and his colleagues. I do not wish to repeat all that has been said, but it does seem to me that some of us do not fully realize the burdens that these men are bearing, the great responsibilities that fall upon them, and the time they have devoted during the past thirty months to the problems of the war I am glad to say that so far the criticisms that have been made of the ministry in this debate are not very serious. Until the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) took the floor, there was not even a ripple upon the placid waters. He was the first to offer anything in the nature of vigorous criticism, but I think we may say that it was harmless. The hon. gentleman in his criticisms reminded me a little of an individual named Bowman, who represents one of the constituencies of Bruce in the local House. He recently came to West Simcoe, and he thought he had a tale to tell there of the misappropriation of funds in connection with Lewis machine guns. I am glad to say he did not make very much headway in West Simcoe. We were able to show the people of that riding that the Lewis machine guns, instead of being scrapped, as was suggested by Mr. Bowman, were doing excellent work in the trenches. We were able to place side by side with the word of Mr. Bowman the signed letters of wounded soldiers who had returned from the front, and, needless to say, the people of West Simcoe did not hesitate in choosing between the two. I think the statements and sentiments of my hon. friend from Pictou, if they were made to the electorate, would not receive very much more favour at their hands than the sentiments of Mr. Bowman received from the electorate of West Simcoe.

The hon. member also referred to patronage, as did the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie). Both these gentlemen confined their remarks in that respect to the province from which they come, and as I am not in a position to know what is going on in Nova Scotia, I will leave other hon. gentlemen who may follow me to answer them. So far as my section of the country is concerned I want to say that such remarks are unwarranted, and entirely incorrect. In my own riding, patronage, so far as military matters are concerned, is absolutely unknown. My own letters are upon record in the Militia Department to show that whenever I was called upon for the names of any merchants in my town or in the surrounding country who might be in a position to furnish supplies, I gave the names of every merchant, regardless of his politics. I make that statement with regard to military matters only; I do not for a moment pretend to do any such thing in regard to other matters. But so far as military matters are concerned, I do not think there should be any patronage, and so far as the province of Ontario is concerned, I am sure there is no such system of military patronage as the hon. gentlemen have described as prevailing in Nova Scotia.

Reference has been made by my hon. friend from North Cape Breton to the Loyal Orange Order. I had no thought of introducing the record of the Loyal Orange Order into this debate, notwithstanding some very slighting references to it that have been made by Mr. Lucien Cannon in the campaign now being waged in Dorchester. I do not know whether my hon. friend from North Cape Breton intended his remarks to be scathing or not; but I want to say to him, and to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House and the country that I am an Orangeman myself. I am proud of what the Orange Order has done in connection with the present conflict. When the first Canadian contingent went overseas no less than 6,000 of the 30,000 odd were Orangemen. It is true that that society has boasted in the past of its loyalty. Perhaps it never had an opportunity of showing its loyalty in the truest sense until this war broke out, but when that opportunity came they responded in no uncertain way, and to-day out of 400,000 enlisted men who are in uniform and fighting for the cause of liberty, over 60,000 are members of the various Orange lodges throughout the Dominion of Canada. As an Orangeman I feel proud of their response in the fight for freedom and honour.

About the only matter that I particularly desire to discuss at the moment is in connection with the existing campaign in Dorchester, Quebec. It does not seem to me, Sir, that this is a time when we should waste the time of the House in labouring matters which have already been mentioned or which will be discussed later on. Speaking in the House a year ago, I expressed the view, and it is still my sincere opinion, that every member of this House could do more effective work in his own home town in connection with recruiting and patriotic and Red Cross work, than he could in prolonging these endless discussions, which I do not think are contributing very much to the cause of the Allies. I had the pleasure a few days ago of reading a despatch which appeared in the Toronto Globe in its issue of January 19, under date January 18. I think it was taken from a letter written by the right hon. leader of the Opposition, as a sort of message to the Canadian people, and I want to contrast some of the statements therein made with what is being said by his apostle in Dorchester county. In that despatch Sir Wilfrid Laurier said:

The determination was general that Canada must stand behind Britain, and assist with all the strength at her command. Nor is this all. We have heard it alleged that Canada should have remained outside a conflict in which she was not immediately interested, since her territory was not actually invaded. This is the meanest and most selfish view to take of the question. . . . Yet there is every probability that we are still far from the end, and so long as more has to be done they have not done enough. Only the all-possible will suffice.

I want to give the right hon. gentleman credit for sincerity when he wrote those words. But what have we to say about Mr. Lucien Cannon, who is endorsed by the right hon. leader of the Opposition? On the very same day this despatch appeared in the Globe, under date January 18, the right hon. gentleman wrote his apostle as follows:

My dear Lucien:—

How sweetly euphonious "dear Lucien" sounds. No wonder Lucien lost his head. It does not fall to many of us to receive such an endearing epistle from one occupying so high a position in the country as that of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition.

My dear Lucien:—You have done a good act in renouncing your provincial mandate to revindicate and affirm in Dorchester the rights of outraged conscience. I trust the electors will respond to your noble appeal. I wish you all success.

Your devoted friend,

WILFRID LAURIER.

It is only fair to say that when that letter was written the right hon. leader of the Opposition had not, as I understand it, heard of the utterances of "dear Lucien" in Dorchester on the very night when this despatch was published. Let me quote one of "dear Lucien's" remarks:

Are we to ruin our country from the point of view of men, wealth and everything else for England? I say No, without hesitation. If you elect Sevigny there will be no limits to the sacrifices Canada will have to make.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition sends a message to the people of Canada, and the despatch was published in Toronto, where I might say there is not much occasion for it, for in the city of Toronto and in the province of Ontario and most of the other provinces of Canada the people have risen to the occasion, both in regard to recruits and contributions of money in connection with this war. I suppose in this message the right hon. gentleman intended to reach the province of Quebec as well. He says: "Only the all-possible will suffice." And his apostle, Lucien Cannon, who has been endorsed both by the right hon. gentleman and by Sir Lomer Gouin, his leader in the province of Quebec, utters the sentiments which I have just quoted. I wish the right hon. gentleman was now in his place. I would ask him whether or not he approves of these utterances. If he does, he will have to swallow what he said in his despatch to the Globe of January 18. Is there a man in the House of Commons to-day who has the courage, even if he has the conviction—and I do not think there is any such man—is there a man in the House who will stand up to-day and venture to utter before the people of this country the words I have just quoted of Mr. Lucien Cannon?

Mr. GAUVREAU: He never said it.

Mr. BOYS: He did say it.

Mr. GAUVREAU: You have no proof of it at all.

Mr. BOYS: Yes, I have.

Mr. GAUVREAU: You cannot give any.

Mr. BOYS: He has not denied it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I wish to remind the hon. gentlemen that there is only one method of addressing this House, and that is through the Chair.

Mr. BOYS: It is quite evident from the interruption that the hon. gentleman does not like what Mr. Cannon is reported to have said, and well may every man in this House and in Canada blush with shame that any man seeking a seat in the House of Commons should give utterance to any such sentiments. Such a man should rather be seeking an internment camp than the House of Commons. My hon. friend says that Mr. Cannon never made any such statements. Those statements appeared in the Montreal papers, and at the meeting following the St. Prosper meeting the same gentleman stated that he stood by what he had said and would repeat those statements, and he has never yet contradicted them. Why are they made? I say they are made because he believes the utterance of such sentiments is the most likely way of securing his election. It remains to be seen what will happen next Saturday. From the standpoint of the interest of the country, it would be unfortunate that any such man should be elected to the House of Commons, but from the standpoint of the Conservative party it would be the very best thing that could happen. The right hon. gentleman who started off the campaign with that endearing letter of his has not repudiated those statements. Let me read more of the noble sentiments put forth by the right hon. gentleman, as reported in the Toronto Globe:—

> Let the young and healthy enlist and those who cannot enlist will serve the country by work in the field, in the forest, in the mines, on the sea and in the shop. Every individual in the nation can work.

Noble and encouraging sentiment. As I said before, I want to give the right hon. gentleman credit for sincerity, but I must say that my views in that regard will be somewhat shaken if, before this debate is over, he does not give some intimation to the House that he disapproves of what his apostle is saying in Dorchester. Possibly my hon. friend from Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau) will suggest that Mr. Cannon never said what I am about to quote, although it has been said three or four times. It is true that the other utterance was hushed up because it was not doing any good, even in Dorchester.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Speak to the Chair.

Mr. BOYS: This is what Mr. Lucien Cannon said:—

> My attitude to National Service is this. Laurier did not approve because he refused to join the Commission, but as a good citizen he advised the people to sign the cards. I signed my card, but I say I am opposed to conscription, whether industrial or military.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Hear, hear. Are you in favour of conscription yourself?

Mr. BOYS: I am certainly in favour of National Service.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BOYS: My hon. friend wants to hear from me on the subject, and I am quite prepared to let him have my opinion. As far as I am concerned, if the effort in connection with National Service fails and if it becomes necessary to fill the places of the boys who are fighting in Flanders, I am prepared, when that time comes—and it may not be far distant—to support conscription in this country. I do not know whether my hon. friend suggests that this last paragraph quoted was not uttered by the gentleman seeking election in Dorchester. What does he mean? He also stated National Service meant either nothing or conscription. If it means nothing, does he want to suggest that his right hon. leader is supporting nothing? The other alternative is: If it is not nothing, it is conscription. Does he contend that the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition approves or advocates conscription?

> Let the young and healthy enlist and those who cannot enlist will serve the country by work in the field, in the forest, in the mines, on the sea and in the shops.

What does that mean? Does not that mean industrial conscription? National Service surely means serving the country in the trenches and in the various other ways that have been referred to. I say again that I do not believe there is a member in this House, either on the other side or on this side, who will venture to make the assertions that Lucien Cannon has made even in connection with National Service.

The right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition went on further and said:

> Let us here and now sink passions, prejudices, vain and idle recriminations, and above all, let us bend all our energies towards making Canada an effective factor in the struggle.

And he closes with this sentence:

> The heart of the nation must beat with one accord and one desire.

When I place his utterances beside those of his apostle Cannon, I wonder where the harmony, the one accord and the one desire are to be found. I do sincerely hope

that the right hon. leader of the Opposition will, before this debate is over, at all events go this far and say that if Lucien Cannon did utter those statements and sentiments he is no party to them. If he will do that before the election next Saturday Lucien Cannon will not have an opportunity of taking a seat in this House.

If the right hon. gentleman wants to play a part, in keeping, in harmony and full accord with the despatch of the 18th of January as it appeared in the Globe, I think he should say to the Premier of this Dominion: Go overseas and take part in the Imperial Conference where you will have the right, not only to speak but to vote. Go with a mandate from the people of this country such as has already been referred to in this debate, but with no such mandate as will come from Dorchester if Lucien Cannon is elected. Let him further say: You go with the full assurance that when you return, the life of this Parliament will be extended and we will give you an opportunity of placing upon the statute-book measures that may be necessary to carry out the determinations of the Imperial Conference, and while you are doing this, I will proceed to my native province of Quebec and from one end of it to the other will, with the eloquence which I possess and which is well known to that province and to this Dominion, do all in my power to stir up that province to furnish the recruits that it is entitled to furnish and to furnish the wealth that Lucien Cannon denies. If the right hon. gentleman will do that, much as he has done in the past, he will do more than he has ever done to immortalize himself in the hearts of the people of Canada.

Is there room for the work of the right hon. gentleman in the province of Quebec? Is it unfair that these things should be referred to? Recruiting is more or less, it is true, at a standstill now in many of the provinces, and the promised 500,000 have not been secured, but not very many more are necessary. I say that if the province of Quebec will rise to the occasion and will furnish the men that she should furnish according to her population in comparison with that of the other provinces, there will be no trouble in raising the 500,000 men promised by the Premier of Canada. I am not blaming the people of the province of Quebec; I blame rather the leaders. I believe that, if men in this House of Commons, whose ability is well known, would go into that province and would do the work which they are capable of doing, regardless of whether it pleases or whether it does not, or whether it will produce good political results or not, the recruits from Quebec would rapidly increase. In military district No. 5, Quebec, the total number of recruits from the beginning of the war to the present time is 7,729.

Mr. MARCIL: That is, in one district in Quebec.

Mr. BOYS: Yes, there are two districts—Montreal or No. 4; and Quebec, or No. 5. I have given the figures for Quebec district. If the hon. gentleman wants the figures for No. 4—

Mr. MARCIL: Does the hon. gentleman mean the district of Quebec or the province of Quebec?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. gentleman is apt to give a wrong impression, as "Quebec" is the name of the province as well as of a military district.

Mr. BOYS: I think I made it plain. I have no desire to misrepresent what the province of Quebec has done; and when I have finished I do not think there will be any room for doubt as to the figures. In No. 4 district, in which is the great city of Montreal with 700,000 people, the recruits number only 34,000. This, with the number from district No. 5, which I have already given, would make a total of 41,729 for the whole province of Quebec. The district of Toronto alone produced 85,364 recruits. I say in all sincerity to the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who leads the Opposition, and to other members who come from the province of Quebec that, instead of wasting time in the House of Commons, they should return to their several constituencies and explain to their people the call to duty and the need that exists for recruits. If they do so, I believe the figures for recruiting in Quebec, in the course of a few months, will be more commensurate with the importance of that province and more in proportion to the number of men it should furnish.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with those in this debate who have congratulated the mover and seconder upon the very loyal and excellent speeches they have made. And especially I desire to congratulate you, Sir, upon your elevation to the highest official position in the land. From personal knowledge, I have no hesi-

tation in believing that you will fill that position not only with credit to the House but with honour to yourself.

Though I follow my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) I do no intend to discuss the Dorchester election. I do not know anything about it; I have not been there, and I am sorry to say I have not any too much faith in the newspaper reports, as one side represents the case one way and the other represents it the other way —I do not blame the newspapers, but that is a habit they have. I have only to say that Mr. Cannon did contradict that portion of the report of his speech which was read by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Boys). I am aware of that, for I saw the contradiction in several of the newspapers. It is only fair to say that that contradiction was made. I leave the discussion of the matter to my hon. friends from Quebec, should they wish to take it up.

I have no personal feeling against Mr. Sevigny. On the contrary I rather admired the way he filled the Chair, and personally I was always very friendly to him. Therefore, I have nothing to say against him, except that we know what he said.

My hon. friend from South Simcoe says that my right hon. leader and the members from Quebec on this side of the House should go to Quebec and help recruiting. There are three or four ministers from Quebec in the Government and a number of members on that side of the House who might do the same thing. I have never seen much use in throwing these taunts across the floor of the House.

I do not propose to say very much with reference to our men who are fighting at the front. Their bravery has been spoken of by men much more capable of doing it justice than I am. As a native born Canadian, I am not surprised at the bravery of our men. It is born in us to think that we are just as good as anybody else, and sometimes a little better. It has not surprised me to learn that our people are capable of competing with the German Guard or any other German, against whom they may be pitted. We naturally congratulate them that they have proven so successful in the field of battle though they were but citizen soldiers but a few days before they were sent to the front. At the same time, I am not surprised at what has taken place, because, after all, our men are Canadians, to whichever stock they may belong. And by the way, I read in the London Times a description of the work of that French Canadian battalion that distinguished itself at the battle of Courcelette. The Times apologized for drawing comparisons, but told some wonderful tales of what these men had done in the battle. It made my blood tingle to my finger tips to read of our brave French Canadian boys in that struggle. I felt as proud as if I had been reading of English speaking Canadians. The Times declared that there were no braver men on the field, that there had been no braver men in any of the battles since the war started.

My hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) said the other day that, while there was criticism from this side of the actions of the Government since the war began, it was the main result we should consider and not the details. May I say to my hon. friend that main results, both with armies and in business, are made up of details. The manager of a great business concern must take a wide view, he requires as complete a horoscope of his business as he can get. At the same time, if he did not organize and systematize details, he would come a cropper before going very far. With armies, in the same way, the details count. It was attention to details that made the German army the greatest army, until recently, in the world; that made it the terrible enemy we have had to face since this war began. While I do not believe in harsh criticism yet it is our duty to criticise and the people of the country expect us to perform that duty. Any criticism I may make of the actions of the Government, however, will be made with a view to assisting in perfecting the machine, not in destroying it; in other words, I shall try to make my criticism constructive and not destructive.

The Government generally, and the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) in particular, both in the House and out of it, have preached economy since this war began. That is quite proper. But preaching economy is not enough; it is absolutely necessary to practice it in every branch of the public service, not only for the money that can be saved, but as an example to the people. The people in my section of the country are very much dissatisfied with some of the things that the Government has done. The people from one end of the country to the other have, so far as I know, responded loyally and magnificently to the calls for money, and, I think, for men. We are a population of less than 8,000,000 people, spread over a territory 3,000 miles long and 1,000 miles wide; we have the various businesses of the country to maintain, in-

cluding that of agriculture. Do you not think that, after all, we have done remarkably well to recruit even 400,000 men? Then look at the tremendous calls that have been made for funds. The people have done wonderfully in their response to the various calls both in the way of taxes and in the form of voluntary contributions to patriotic and other funds.

I was going on to say that the people in the section of the country from which I come condemn very strongly the expenditure at Camp Borden. They say that the two military camps at Niagara and London were quite sufficient for the purposes of training, at least to a certain stage, 10,000 or 12,000 men. Valcartier Camp had been established at large expense, and it was absolutely unnecessary to acquire the sand waste at Borden and at great expense to fit up these lands for military purposes—for how long? Two or three months last year. We are fighting for the purpose of doing away with militarism. I may tell hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House that this camp at Borden did a great deal to delay recruiting in our section of the country. No one thing that I know of did more harm to recruiting than Camp Borden, to which the men were sent absolutely against their wills. Let me remind the House that these men were citizen soldiers, who volunteered of their own free will to go and fight in the defence of the Empire, and they thought that they should be used as decently as they could be used while they were in this country. They were properly situated at the camps at London and Niagara, but they were sent to Camp Borden. The pinery and shrubbery there had been burned off not long before; the surface was full of ashes and black dust from the burnings, and if a sand storm came up while the soldiers were eating everything would be covered with dirt, so that the men could not possibly eat their food—the dust would grind in their teeth. Their beds were filled with this stuff; they could not sleep in them for dirt. The young men who volunteered to go to the front complained very bitterly about these things and their fathers, who are paying the taxes, complained even more bitterly, contending that the expenditure on that camp was not necessary. That is what they complain of, and, I think, justly. It was said that the camp was established in order that men might be drilled in large numbers. It is quite proper that they should be so drilled, but that could have been done, at least to a certain stage, at the other two camps, after which the troops could proceed to Valcartier and finish their training there before going to England.

I should like to say a word or two about the National Service cards. It was impossible to tell from the cards what object there was in issuing them. The answers that were required would not give a good business knowledge if the cards had been designed for peace purposes—that of getting men to work on the farms, for instance, or to engage in various callings at home. If the intention was to get enlistments, nothing on the card, so far as I remember, required any statement as to whether the person signing it would enlist or not. It could not be any benefit to the farmer, because the questions were not such as to obtain sufficient information. If you ask a farmer whether he is willing to take up some other occupation, he will say, if he is the owner of a farm, that he will not go to any other occupation, because he is not going to leave his farm unless he thinks it his duty to enlist. If the farmer had been asked how large his farm was and how many men were employed on it, information would have been obtained as to whether the farmer could spare men from that farm or not. Nothing of the kind, however, was done. If the man were employed on the farm as a workman, I do not know whether he would be willing to enlist or not; I am quite sure that he would be willing to change his occupation if he got more pay, but not likely at the same pay.

One thing about that campaign that struck our people very forcibly was the large advertisements that appeared in the various newspapers. I do not know whether they were published here or not, but the Toronto papers contained half-page and full-page advertisements signed by Mr. Irish, of Toronto, calling for munition workers. That campaign is said to have cost $60,000, but, no matter what it cost, it was absurd. No persons are more capable of finding men for this work than the very men who are engaged in making munitions. They do not want anybody from the outside to find men for them. They have the knowledge and the ability to get men if they require them, and that money, whatever it amounted to, was an absurd waste.

I would like to find out from the Minister of Finance how much of the material that went to England was discarded. I understand that he went over there for the purpose of looking into financial matters, and I have no doubt that he can enlighten us very materially on this subject. Men coming

from there tell me that the Oliver equipments, which cost $5 each, were discarded after the men landed in England. They tell me also that many other things were discarded; that many other things, as the hon. member for Pictou said yesterday, were scrapped. I would like to know also from the Minister of Finance in what condition he found the financial affairs of the Militia Department when he was in England. The report is that the finances were in a very mixed condition; in fact that officers there ran bills that were absolutely unnecessary and charged those bills to the account of the Government. I do not know whether that is true or not, but it would be a great satisfaction to me to have the Finance Minister, who, I have no doubt, does know, tell the House just how much truth there is in this report.

In my own section of the country I am asked frequently whether the members of this House who have volunteered and who are attending the session draw both their sessional allowance and pay from the Militia Department. I am unable to answer those who ask me this, because I do not know myself, and I have told them so; but a great many people have great curiosity on that subject, and there is much rumour around the House upon it. It is only proper that these members should have an opportunity of explaining this matter so that they would not be placed in a false position. Then I think that the country should know this, because we are all called upon to pay equally for the expenses of the war; we are equally called upon for voluntary subscriptions of various kinds, and if we have anything to tax we have had our taxes enormously increased in the last few years.

Mr. NEELY: If my hon. friend will permit me, I can answer him at once, so far as I am concerned. The extension of leave which was granted to me to attend the session was accompanied by the intimation that all military pay and allowances would be stopped during the session.

Mr. BRADBURY: Hear, hear; that applies to all the rest too.

Mr. NESBITT: I am sure that is very satisfactory; that will stop any jarring on that head. I asked the question because other people asked me, and I was unable to answer them.

Now what about the expenditure for public works during the last season? We were told last year when the House met and we passed the Estimates, that the public works expenditures would be cut down. I understand that a great many public works have gone forward that were unnecessary. The Parliament buildings is a case in point. When we left last year we were told that it was not necessary to tear down the old walls, and that it would cost only about one and one-half millions to repair the buildings. On that understanding we all agreed that the work should go on. But since that time the walls have been ordered to be pulled down, and this must increase the cost of reconstruction by several millions at least. I for one think it would have been quite in order to stop the re-erection of the buildings when it was found necessary to rebuild throughout, and to have kept that work over until the conclusion of the war, when we all anticipate that there will be a great number of men looking for work and not sufficient work to keep them employed. I think that is one of the public works that the Government could quite properly have postponed without injuring anybody. We are quite comfortable in this building, so far as our meetings are concerned; and I have yet to find that the articles that were removed from the museum are suffering during our occupancy of this building. This is one way in which the Government could very well have saved money during the war, and that money could have been used to greater advantage after the conclusion of the war.

That brings me to the question of patronage that was mentioned by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) yesterday. If there could be any time when patronage or political favouritism should not have been indulged in, it was during this war. We are all equally taxed, we are all equally called upon for voluntary subscription, and we are all equally called upon to send our sons to the front or to go there ourselves. Therefore, while I have no fault to find with Government patronage to a limited extent as a rule, I have a great deal of fault to find with political favouritism during this war; I do not think it should have been indulged in. My hon. friend from Simcoe—and let me congratulate him on the splendid efforts of his county in their contributions throughout the war—says that, so far as he was personally concerned, there has been no political favouritism since the war started; and that when he was asked who should be given the privilege of furnishing supplies, he gave the names of all the merchants in the town. Now, why was he

asked? That is what I should like to know. We were told that either the sitting member for the locality where troops were located, or the man who had the patronage, who was sometimes the defeated candidate, was always asked from whom the supplies should be purchased. Why? These supplies were for the soldiers. Just as many of those soldiers were Liberals as were Conservatives. Why did not the military authorities advertise in the local paper—there is always a local paper—and not leave it to the honour of men like my friend from Simcoe to say from whom the supply should be purchased? It cannot be said that all members were as straight in this matter as my hon. friend from Simcoe, by any manner of means. They did not all give all the merchants' names. There are very few places where supplies were provided by anybody but followers of the Government.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: I do not know whether the hon. member referred to me as the hon. member for Simcoe—

Mr. NESBITT: No, it was Mr. Boys.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: —because in Orillia the mayor gave the names.

Mr. NESBITT: I referred to the hon. member who spoke before me (Mr. Boys). He said, that when he was asked he gave the names of all the merchants. I think he deserves great credit for that, but at the same time I do not know why he was asked.

Another thing I should like to say to the Government—and any suggestions I make are made with a view to improvement. A great many of the young men who have enlisted complain that officers are put over their heads who should not be put over their heads, and that seniority does not count. In a great many instances they say that very young men are put over the heads of men who are much more experienced. When I say more experienced, I do not mean more experienced in war, because all the officers of this citizen soldiery of ours have had little experience in war, but are more experienced in the ways of the world, and more experienced in business. They say that this has gone so far that in some cases officers, when their commands were taken over, were immediately shifted to other commands. In one or two instances, a shift took place three or four times, but some of the men were kept here, and were not sent to the front. They were in the way of some men here who were ambitious to get to the front and who had enlisted in order to get to the front. I have no complaint to make on this head against the late Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes). While he may have made mistakes, in my judgment, favouritism was not one of them. In fact it is rumoured that it was because he was not willing to display political favouritism that disputes arose between him and other members of the Government. I have been told by men who have returned from England that political favouritism under the present regime is rampant there, and that the boys are not getting a fair show. I have been told that by men who have been there to see, and I bring the matter to the attention of the Government because, if there is any truth in the statement—and there must be some, for they say that where there is smoke there is fire—steps should be taken to correct the evil. My informants are men I have known for years, men in whose word I have every faith. They told me that not only is political favouritism rampant in England at the present time, so far as our troops are concerned, but that the wastage is large, and that the expenses are out of all reason. No doubt my honourable friends on the other side of the House may not believe these statements, but they are not in a position to know.

Mr. BRADBURY: It is not so.

Mr. NESBITT: I can bring the men to my honourable friend. I believe them, and if they appeared before my honourable friend, face to face, they would tell him in his teeth that it was so.

Mr. BRADBURY: Permit me just a word. The honourable gentleman is not speaking by the book. If he knew the men who are in authority in England, he would not make that statement.

Mr. MACDONALD: Who are they?

Mr. BRADBURY: The men in authority to-day are Liberals.

Mr. MACDONALD: Who are the men in authority?

Mr. BRADBURY: General Turner was one of the strongest Liberals in Quebec.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is Sir George Perley not running affairs?

Mr. BRADBURY: Sir George Perley is the minister. If I understand the situation, and I think I do, the commanding officers make their recommendations to Sir George Perley, and I understand, and know, that,

so far as the political end of the question is concerned, the Liberal gets the best of it over in England every time.

Mr. NESBITT: I have the greatest possible respect for Sir George Perley's business ability, but I think he is a very strong partisan. What I stated a moment ago came from men who have been there, and they said that it was positively a fact, otherwise I would not bring it to the attention of the Government. I do not bring it forward for the purpose of censuring the Government; I bring it to their notice so that, if the statements are true, the matter may be corrected. I repeat that I have every faith in Sir George Perley's business ability, but I do not have sufficient faith in him to think that he would not show partisanship. I do not know anything about General Turner. I never heard of him until this war started.

Mr. HAZEN: Surely my hon. friend heard of him in the South African war. He won the Victoria Cross in that war.

Mr. NESBITT: Well, I am glad of that. No doubt I did hear of him, but I have a short memory for some things. Speaking of political influence why should the chief of the general staff here not have the say as to who the officers shall be? I understand that we have a very efficient chief of the general staff here, General Gwatkin, I am told by men who ought to know that he is a most capable officer, and I do not see why he should not have some say in the selection of officers going to the front. Another thing, if they are going to break up battalions when they go to England the recruiting should not be done by battalions. It is not fair to the men who go over there as colonels and majors; it casts a slur upon them. They are left stranded in England and we are put to the expense of keeping them there. If they are discharged and sent back, a slur is put upon them. I say that it is not fair. The Government should not enlist men and appoint colonels and majors here and send them over there to be left stranded in England. It is not fair, because nine out of ten of these colonels and majors enlisted in good faith, believing that they would go to the front to fight for their country's cause, and a slur is put upon them when they are not sent to the front. I know that to be a fact also, and I do not think it is a practice that should be continued. The reason why I speak of these things is that they affect recruiting unfavourably.

My honourable friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) pointed out yesterday that some men were taken overseas through the personal influence of their officers, and I know that this happened in other cases. Again, there are complaints that officers can get furlough and are allowed to stay in this country for a long time while the privates cannot get furlough; that, if wounded, they are put into hospitals until they are comparatively sound again and then immediately sent back to the front. That is a very general complaint; I have had several letters from privates convalescing in England to that effect.

4 p.m.

I bring these matters to the attention of the Government so that they may be looked into. If the statements are true, something should be done to correct the evil.

Let me say again that there should be no political favouritism in the matter of recruiting. The men have enlisted not because they are Conservatives or Liberals, but because they are patriotic, and I believe that recruiting will go on until we get the number required. I advised my constituents to sign the National Service cards because I believe they represented the beginning of a systematic organization. I advised them, both privately and publicly, to fill up their cards truthfully and return them to headquarters. Whether anything will come of the National Service scheme or not, I do not know. The Government have not been very explicit in stating what was intended, but it seemed to me that it would do no harm to fill up the cards as they seemed to indicate some intention to organize the manhood of the country.

I regret that these complaints should be made, but it is right that the people should know what is going on and what is to be done. The expenditure in connection with the war is certainly enormous; not that we are not willing to pay, for I do not believe that there is a man or woman in Canada who regrets the expenditure of one dollar of the money that has been contributed for war purposes as long as it is understood that the money has been properly spent.

My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Boys) has spoken of the noble work done by the women. The women of this country have been organized from the start of the war, and in my judgment have shown a business ability that the men of this country have not shown, whether as individuals, or as comprising the Government. The women certainly have done wonderful work; they are

willing to continue their good work, and no doubt they will.

But the Government of this country are called upon above all others to see that the moneys that have been taken in are properly expended. The Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) has devised means for providing enormous sums of money. Now, it is just as necessary for a Minister of Finance to watch the expenditure of the money he raises, as it is to raise the money, and I am sorry to say that, in my judgment, he has not been as careful in watching the expenditure in certain directions, some of which I have mentioned this afternoon, as he has been effective in collecting the money

Let me again emphasise to my hon. friends opposite, whether they believe the things I have been telling them this afternoon or not, there are a good many people in the country who do believe them, and it has hurt recruiting very materially and is still hurting it. Nothing could have hurt recruiting more in our section of the country than the establishment of Camp Borden. It sickened all the fellows who went there, and sickened them badly. They said they were perfectly willing to stand all sorts of things in the trenches, but before getting there they did not wish to be subjected to all the discomforts they had to put up with at Camp Borden. That camp must have cost a lot of money; I do not know how much, but I suppose we shall hear later on. At all events, it must have cost an enormous sum, and I regret that it hurt recruiting in the way it did. It is up to the Government to rectify all these matters I have spoken of, if my statements are correct.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a few observations upon the speech from the Throne, which is now before the House, but before doing so I presume I may be allowed to concur in all the flattering expressions of hon. gentlemen with regard to the Speaker, to the mover and the seconder of the Address, and to our distinguished Governor General. I will not take up the time of the House elaborating in that regard.

After another year of war we find ourselves confronted with a situation, perhaps, as serious as any that has confronted this Empire in modern times. I do not desire to be either a pessimist or an optimist in the few remarks I shall make in regard to the war. I look upon the war as the supreme question that is before the country, just as it was a year ago, and the winning of the war should be the first duty of all

Canadian citizens. The men who are out to win the war are the men that ought to be esteemed for their works' sake, and any Government that leaves anything undone that could be done to win the war will not commend itself to the people of Canada, or of the Empire.

In reviewing the operations of the past year we find that comparatively little progress has been made on either land or sea. That, we must confess; and where progress has been made it has been made more in the wrong direction than in the right. The losses of the various belligerents are staggering, simply astounding. I have not heard any gentleman who has spoken so far attempt to tell the House how many the total casualties have been. We have heard the Dominion casualties placed at about 70,000, but the casualties of the two great contending parties have not been mentioned so far as I know. I made a rough estimate a few weeks ago and tried to be conservative in my figures. I figured that up to that time the casualties on both sides amounted to sixteen and a half millions. That seemed an astounding number, and I was afraid I had over-estimated it. A few days later, however, General Von Hindenburg, who has been heard of considerably during the war, gave an interview to the press in which he stated that the losses to the Allies alone amounted to fifteen millions. When I saw that statement, I began to think I had been fairly conservative in putting the figure at 16,500,000. The casualties on the German side, which are all published, amounted to upwards of 4,000,000 at the beginning of the year, according to their own lists. The French casualties are not reported, and therefore we cannot very well tell what their figures are. The Russian casualties have run into several millions, probably 6,000,000 to 8,000,000; for it must be remembered that Russia is holding almost entirely alone about 1,000 miles of battle front with the assistance of only a small country, Rumania. The recent entry of Rumania into the war has not brought that advantage to the Allies that we perhaps at first expected, and I very much regret that her entry into the war should have been signalized by such severe losses as they sustained almost immediately, and which they apparently have continued to sustain up to the present time. Evidently they were not prepared for the encounter. Who was their advisor, and why they entered before they were ready, will be revealed later on, and I think it will appear as it has appeared on many other occas-

ions, that some one has blundered.

Our hon. friends on the other side of the House, who have pointed out a good many of what they consider blunders on the part of this Government, must admit that those blunders are very small in comparison with the blunders that have been committed across the water by almost all the countries engaged in the war. But that is to be expected; it is only natural. All men are human, and all err more or less, and it is to be expected that in so great a matter as this mistakes will be made. My hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) who has just spoken—and I give him credit for making a speech that was fair; he has not tried to be unfair, I am sure—has told us of a few blunders that he thinks the Government have made, and among others he mentioned Camp Borden. I do not know whether he ever visited that camp or not. I hardly think he did, or he would not have made the sweeping statements he did. Personally, I spent two days at the camp and they were two of the worst days of the summer when the temperature was between 90 and 100 in the shade, and from my experience I can tell my hon. friend that he vastly over-estimates the damage which he thinks was done to recruiting by reason of the existence of Camp Borden. As camps go, it is an excellent piece of ground, and those who put in the winter at Salisbury Plains could tell my hon. friend, if he had not heard from them already, that it would be like an oasis in the desert as compared with the mud that they endured for about six months at Salisbury Plain, and that even at the camp near Quebec, Valcartier, that he has referred to as being very adequate and efficient, the mud conditions were just as bad as were the dust conditions at Camp Borden.

We all regret that stumbling blocks have come in the way of recruiting, and it is only just that a good deal of attention should be paid to it. The matter of recruiting should cause us all a good deal of thought at the present time. The figures that were presented by my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) a few minutes ago and which I now hold in my hand, are worthy of the study of hon. gentlemen, and I can scarcely see, when we are enlisting under the voluntary system, why any member from any particular part of the Dominion should feel sensitive when the figures of his constituency or his province are mentioned, unless he himself feels guilty that he has not done what he should have done with regard to his own community and has not taken the leadership of the men in his community to enlist in this great struggle. That the figures speak for themselves is evident, and they tell this lesson, that while a voluntary system may be all right for a small war, there are a great many citizens in every country who do not realize the value of freedom, who are not prepared to make the necessary sacrifices for freedom, but who would rather stay at home and pile up wealth at their ease and let the other people do the fighting. I do not wish to speak about anything I may or may not have done in the war; I have tried to do my duty; but I am proud to say that I belong to the only division in that list, Division No. 2, of the province of Ontario, that has furnished its full quota of the 500,000 promised.

Mr. BRODER: I think No. 3 has done so, also.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Unless No. 3 has caught up very recently, No. 2 is the only one that has completed its full quota. Toronto, of course, is a big town and is capable of taking all the bouquets that may be thrown to it, but Brantford is also in No. 2 Division, and it has helped Toronto a little, and so has Hamilton, which is not a small town, and so has St. Catharines. The result is that from that district we are credited with 81,537 up to the end of the year. No. 1 Division, in which London is the centre, and No. 3 Division, of which Kingston is the centre, have both made an excellent showing, and the figures are such that they can be read with satisfaction by any member from any part of the province. The figures for the whole province are 148,914. Since the end of the year, of course, there have been further additions, and I think the total is now nearly 180,000. Six per cent of the population of 2,500,000 would make 150,000, so in the whole of Canada, if we are to raise the whole of the 500,000 promised, the proportion should be not less than six per cent. The county of Brant, from which I have the honour to come, is named after the great chief who led the forces under the British over a hundred years ago and maintained the British flag in the western part of the province of Ontario and saved a great part of Canada to the Empire at that time. The first man from the county of Brant who fell in the present war was also named Brant, and was an Indian from the Six Nation reserve, showing that there are some people in the Dominion of Canada who, although they do not have British blood in their veins, know a good Government when

they see it, who know good institutions when they see them, and who are able to appreciate what British justice and British honour means, not only in this country, but wherever the British flag floats. I mention that simply as a tribute to an Indian tribe that has lived in the county for the last 100 years, forfeiting their rights in the States when they moved from the Mohawk valley. This should be mentioned in order that other citizens who have come in from other countries may realize that they have a duty and should be called upon to discharge their share the same as the aborigines of this country. We have a population of about eight millions in round figures, of which probably five million are of British stock and the rest speaking anywhere from fifty to seventy-five different languages, not including the Indian languages of the various tribes scattered throughout our North country. Therefore, we have plenty of languages that we can speak in, but very few of these people who have come into the Dominion of Canada have taken up their part as citizens of the Empire and have entered this war on the side of liberty, justice and civilization. That we regret. I do not want to be harsh in anything that I shall say. I think I may say that I have in my heart the one desire, and that is that the best shall be done that Canada can do, and that we shall sustain our part and finally win the war, but I do not think there is any use in blinking at facts, and the facts of those figures are that there are certain parts of the Dominion of Canada that, under the voluntary system, are not doing their duty. I am sorry to say that, but those of us who have made the sacrifice —and I come from a community that has done so both in men and money—and have filled up the full quota, think it is up to other parts of Canada, if recruiting is slack, to be getting busy and doing something.

I have had the privilege of being in close communication with many men from the front ever since the war began, not only members of my own family and immediate circle, but many officers who have gone from the city of Brantford and the county of Brant. I have had from them accounts of everything that is going on, but I have yet to meet the first man or to receive the first letter that has not spoken in the highest terms of commendation of our valorous ally, the French, as they are found in old France. The feeling that is in the hearts of the boys who have gone over from Canada is that, although Britain has done well and although Russia has done well, the honours of the war, so far as the Allies are concerned, must so far be yielded to the glorious land of France. Some of our boys too, very fond of our own flag, very fond of the flag that waves now, are just as ready to fight under the tri-colour of France in this war as they are under the Union Jack, and will give just as good an account of themselves. But when I say that, Sir, I want you to understand that it is the tri-colour as it is unfurled by such men as Briand, Joffre and Nivelle at the front, and not the tri-colour as it is waved by such men as Bourassa, Lavergne or Cannon. That is the tri-colour that our Canadian boys are ready to fight under; it is the tri-colour as it is waved in the land of France, the land of chivalry, the garden of romance, as we are told by the poet, which in this war has laid on the altar of her race every man, woman and child that can do a useful service.

When this war broke out I said: At last Canada will be a united country; nothing can keep Canada from doing her full duty to the Empire in this great war. Fancy my chagrin, fancy my surprise, when I read the figures that show what our neighboring province is doing in recruiting when the land from which their forefathers came is bleeding to death and is calling for help from her sons on this side of the water. Surely they have not forgotten the hole of the pit from whence they were digged. Surely, a call such as this should resound throughout the province of Quebec. I call upon the leaders of that province, while it is yet time—I only regret that I cannot speak French or I should be glad to go there and speak—to give their help that the dear old land of France may be brought from under the foot of the enemy. I think this call should come to them as strongly as it has come to the British province of Ontario or to the plains of the West. I believe it does, but that it has not been carried into that Province as it has been carried throughout Ontario. In our province, every schoolhouse, every cross-roads, every platform, every pulpit, has been made use of for recruiting meetings. In the county from which I come we have recruited almost ten per cent of the total population, and most of these men are at the front or across the water. If this were done everywhere there would be no call for more men to-day. The Prime Minister has given us the figures, and for my part, I think they are optimistic,

yet they show that we are nearly 100,000 men short, and I think even that does not fully allow for wastage. So, there is still more to do. Men of Canada, everywhere, of every race and creed, let us get together to win this war. For hon. gentlemen opposite will not be in power, nor shall we be in power, if you let the Germans win the war, you can bet on that,—there will be no government of this kind in Canada in that case. The appeal comes to us now, while the war is yet in the winning, to see to it that the boys at the front are supported, and that the necessary recruits shall go across steadily and freely.

I have spoken of the valour of France. It is written on Verdun. Verdun is the proudest spot in the whole history of the Allies in this war. I do not know whether we fully realize what the French did there, but I will occupy a few moments—and I do not often trouble the House—to read something of what Verdun has meant:

> The execution of the new coup was entrusted to General Mangin in charge of four divisions respectively commanded by Generals Muteau, Guyot de Salins, Garnier du Plessis, and Passaga. The opposing German forces consisted of five divisions, the attack being timed for 10 a.m. on December 15. The French went through the Germans like butter, despite their inferior numbers, and simply shattered the enemy. They took between 11,000 and 12,000 prisoners, including nearly 300 officers, capturing several seemingly impregnable positions, of which Pepper Hill was the centre, and regaining all the ground they had lost since February 24. In addition the German killed and wounded amounted to over 30,000, no fewer than 160 guns were taken or destroyed, while the most marvellous part of this great feat of arms were the French losses, which, all told, did not exceed 1,500.

There is a piece of work, there is something to be proud of. I would like to have that story told at every cross-roads in the province of Quebec, to show that the old race from which the people of Quebec have sprung is more than a match for the Germans to-day. And are the French of this country any less able to meet the enemy in the gate than are the French of old France?

I am glad to see that my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) nods to me. I am sure he knows that the French race are as valourous as any race in the world, and as valourous as they have proven themselves on many a battlefield of the past. This quarrel is more France's quarrel than Great Britain's; France has more to lose in the war to-day than has Great Britain. Britain has been immune, not one enemy has set foot upon her soil except as a spy or a prisoner; France, at this moment, finds her most valuable territory in the hands of the enemy. Nine millions of her people have been barred from their homes and driven to find other places in which to rest their heads. Their coal and other mines, requisite for a great industrial people, are in the hands of the Germans. Is it a time yet to talk of peace? I like the style of our good old friend, Colonel Denison, in a crisis such as this. I believe he sent a cable across the Atlantic to this effect: Tell Emperor William we will not discuss peace until every soldier is withdrawn from Belgium, and France, and Serbia, and all the resources of these countries given back to those to whom they belong.

It seems a big proposition to make this war; it is going to be a bigger proposition, or at least quite as big, to make peace. When you consider the confusion into which the world has fallen, you cannot but wonder how this turmoil can be brought to an end. I believe that our Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) is going to England to attend a conference in which, possibly, peace may be discussed. Though I am not a believer in the immediate advent of peace, we cannot forget that some day the peace that we hope for will arrive. I desire to say a word on the making of peace. I was brought up in the old school; I was brought up largely on oatmeal porridge and the Scriptures and I have not forgotten some of the things that were put into me in both respects in my early days. I was taught that the man who will not work shall not eat. And recently, in discussing the position of our neighbours to the South and the stand taken by President Wilson, I thought a parallel might be made to those Scripture terms and that as we say that he who will not work shall not eat, so we might say: He who will not fight shall not say. In other words, I believe that the entry of President Wilson into the war at the present time with his pen is not opportune. That is my opinion; it may be wrong. I have some press clippings here, and I am going to read two or three of them. It appears to me that the idea that President Wilson has launched is most inopportune and most inapplicable to the situation as we find it. He told us in the document that was issued in December that he could see no difference between the aims and objects of the two sides. Well, I am rather sorry for a man who cannot see the difference, and I think that if we should point out the difference to him it would be a blessing.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is claimed in the United States that what he said was: "as claimed by their respective governments, and as announced to their own people." That is the qualification that is put upon it there.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Unless my hon. friend is an emissary from the President, I do not think I can quite accept his interpretation.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I happened to be in the United States when the note was sent, and when it was quoted in the newspapers. That is the interpretation that was put upon it.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: My hon. friend was probably reading it in the apology for the first remarks. It is very clear to my mind, though it may not be clear to the hon. member for St. John city, that the President sees very little difference between the aims of the respective sides. That, I think, he has made clear. He sees very little difference in the objects for which we are striving, and he thinks it is a good time now to call it off. He says that there can be no peace with victory; that neither side will get the victory. I do not want to misrepresent the President of the United States; he is very high up and I am very low down. My hon. friend thinks that I misquoted him. I am not the only one who misquoted him, or misunderstood him, if that is the case. I do not care to put very much of these clippings on Hansard, but I wish to read expression of opinions held by others with regard to the utterance of the President. The following appeared yesterday in the local press, copied from the London Globe—not the Toronto Globe:—

> Continuing, the newspaper says:
> "And then you wrote a second note, and then a third, because you were seeking the suffrage of electors in whose ears the last cries of their drowning countrymen were smothered beneath the tinkle of piling dollars."
> "You did not dare resent the piracy and murder and now, forsooth, we who have given our best and bravest by the hundred thousand and treasure by the thousand million to save the world, we must at your bidding lay down our arms and dream with you your foolish dream of peace.
> "You and the great nation whose chief magistrate you are, stirred no finger to save public law from being violated. You may say, and say truly, that the United States had not the power. How, then, can you ask us to trust our lives and liberties, the future of our race, the safety of our Empire and the destinies of all mankind to the flimsy guarantees with which you would buckler the peace of the world?
> "The men who tore up the scrap of paper; the men who laughed at your notes and sunk fresh ships while you were thinking of fresh phrases, will respect force and nothing else."
> [Mr. Cockshutt.]

That is one view of a British paper. Here is a view from the land of France:—

> A peace which has for its beginning the greatest crime in history will not be a just nor solid peace. First we wish 'sanctions and reparations'—if President Wilson accepts these indispensible guarantees, the future is easy.

This French paper thinks that we would be building a peace on the greatest crime in history. I have only one other expression of opinion here; it is that of a man who has occupied the same position as President Wilson and is, therefore, entitled to some consideration. I refer to Colonel Theodore Roosevelt, who should know something about what the attitude of a president of the United States should be. The article says::—

> The colonel bitterly announced that until an emphatic stand is taken by the American Government on the Belgian deportations any statement about our "stand for righteousness in the nebulous future is both ridiculous and insincere."
> "It is well, however, unless the words of our Government in this matter are to be accepted as the most empty of all idle and empty words, to remember two or three plain bits of homely fact.
> "The first is that it is worthless to make promises about the future unless in the present we keep those we have already made.

That is a truism.

> Unless this Government is prepared at this moment to take emphatic position as regards such a hideous outrage as the deportation of the men and women of northern France and Belgium, it is both ridiculous and insincere for us to mouth about standing for righteousness in the nebulous future.
> "Moreover, unless this Government can bring the peace of justice to Mexico it had better not talk about securing the peace of justice throughout the world.
> "As regards freedom of the seas, the most important element in it is freedom from murder, and until this Government has taken an effective stand to prevent the murder of its citizens by submarines on the high seas, it makes itself an object of derision by speaking for the freedom of the seas, Interfering with life is worse than interfering with property.

That is part of what ex-President Theodore Roosevelt has to say about it. It seems particularly unfortunate, therefore, that our esteemed fellow-citizen to the south, President Wilson, should have felt called upon to interfere in the battle that is going on among pretty nearly all the nations of Europe. One of the proverbs of Solomon comes to my mind just at the moment; it is this: "He that passeth by, and meddleth with strife belonging not to him, is like a man that taketh a dog by the ears." He will get bitten on the right and he will get

bitten on the left—and behind, an hon. gentleman says.

We would have been delighted to see President Wilson and the great nation that he represents get into the water while the swimming was good. In other words, we would have been delighted to have them cast their lot with the Allied nations who are fighting for civilization, for humanity and for the right of the smaller nations of Europe to live. He had a good chance to do it. He now has a Utopian idea that he wants to introduce and that he wants incorporated in the peace which is to come. Well, although I believe that this war will terminate within the next two or three years, I believe that if we have to incorporate President Wilson's Utopian idea in the peace arrangements, we won't have peace in a hundred years. I do not believe that it will be accomplished. It is not for this world; it is for the millennium. It belongs to the next world entirely, and will never be found here. The views of President Wilson are entitled to our consideration, but, as we are reminded by Theodore Roosevelt, he has a think coming as to these guarantees he purposes giving us with regard to a future peace forevermore. I like the sound of that; it is a great and glorious phrase: glorious peace forevermore, and no more great wars.

Mr. BURNHAM: Is that the peace that passeth all understanding?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The hon. gentleman is getting up into the seventh heaven; I was dealing with the present war. I say that the peace which has been proposed is a Utopian idea that has never been yet established in the world, and I think that President Wilson will have been long forgotten before it is established. Theodore Roosevelt reminds him of one fact, in this article that I have read, when he talks about guarantees for the future. He says he is ready to join every one of the nations in a guarantee for future peace for all time. That sounds mighty big and mighty good; but unfortunately Theodore Roosevelt calls his attention to the fact that the United States is one of the signatories to the Treaty of the Hague and to the neutrality of Belgium; and if their guarantees for the future do not prove to be more valuable than their guarantees of the past, I would not advise anybody to put much faith in them.

My friend beside me (Mr. Middlebro) says that theirs is the first signature with regard to the neutrality of Belgium—the very first signature. Have they now, after two years of war, raised one single protest against anything that Germany has done either in Belgium or in northern France? Outrages that are unspeakable have been committed by the enemy, but I have yet to learn that President Wilson, from his high seat, has ever raised his voice or made one protest to Germany with regard to the outrages which have been inflicted on these people in Europe—and they guarantors of the neutrality of Belgium! They appear to think that pen and ink is all that it is necessary to use. President Wilson is evidently a thorough believer in the idea that the pen is mightier than the sword; but I think that in a war like this he will find, if he gets on the battlefields of Europe, that the sword is still supreme, and that the pen which may be very mighty in the office of the President of the United States will not cut much of a figure on the battlefield. This is a war of iron and blood; there are more men engaged in this war than have been engaged in war since the world began. Our Finance Minister made some time ago an estimate that if all the wars of all the ages were added together they would not make a war of the size of this war. I have shown you that the casualties have run up to nearly 20,000,000, and there are perhaps 20,000,000 of men in the field at present. I tell you that in my judgment all this talk about peace, and all this talk about the enemy being starved to death, is, at the present time, simply moonshine, and is calculated to stop us in the enterprise of getting our recruits in line and continuing the war. We should not pay any attention to such talk, but should prepare to go on with the work and to fill up the ranks. We are a long way from the finish yet, if we may judge from the present position, and we cannot afford to take any chances with regard to this war. All we have is at stake.

I have been asked many times what I thought we should do after the war. I have been asked by newspapers to give my opinion as a business man as to what I think is going to happen. In every case I have been obliged to say that in my judgment there is only one question for me to be thinking about at this time, and that is the winning of this war and the relieving of the world from the terrible load that it is carrying of the tyrant's heel that is simply pressing on the neck of every nation, big and little, that he can put his foot upon, and grinding out their life, their liberty and all that stands for right. I say there

is but the one question. To talk to-day of peace and what will be done after the conclusion of the war, is simply to ignore the conditions with which we are confronted at this moment. If I may for a moment, for illustration, place myself in the position of the nation, it is as if my wife, my children, all my possessions, including the heirlooms that I have inherited from a long line of ancestors, were in my house, and my house were on fire, while I and all my friends were straining every nerve and using every means at our disposal to extinguish the fire, some foolish man from the street rushed in and said to me: I have a plan for a new house for you, what do you think of this? If I had the strength, I would chuck him out of the front door as fast as he came in—that would be his answer. We must know what we are going to have left after this war is over before we can chalk out any plans, and the winning of the war is the first necessity of the case. We will have no land to give away if we do not beat out the enemy; we will have no invitations to send overseas for people to come from here, there and everywhere, from all quarters of the earth, if we let ourselves go down under the heel of the enemy. Under that condition these would all be his possessions, and we would be taxed for generations to come to pay an enormous indemnity, which some of our enemies have already set at a figure as high as twelve to fifteen billions of dollars. We know the way the enemy have taxed Belgium and the cities of northern France, and Serbia and Rumania. Everything moveable in the way of valuables, everything in the way of art, everything that can be removed has been removed, and in addition to that immense taxes have been placed on all the towns and cities of which they have obtained possession. All that has already taken place.

Now are we going to let the enemy beat us out? Because that is what it means if we stall now, and we seem to have become somewhat stalled. I am sorry to say it, I am sorry to confess it, but recruiting is to-day almost dead. The feeling that was rampant a year ago with regard to enlisting exists no more, and we have not done our part, and we have not won the war. Great Britain is straining every nerve. There they have reconstructed two Governments already, and men, no matter how good they were, such as Asquith and Sir Edward Grey, have been put out of power. The name of Lloyd George is on the lips of every man to-day, and we hear such expressions as:

Here is a victory Government and a victory loan. We want a victory Government and a victory loan. I believe that our Government are doing everything possible, but if anything can be done to strengthen their hands, let us all do it. If anything can be given to increase their resources for carrying on the war successfully, let us all give it, let us not hang back, because there will be no place of repentance found though they seek it carefully with tears, if we are beaten out in this war. It is now or never. We have a heritage worth defending. We have a heritage to preserve for which we ought all to be ready to sacrifice everything possible. Are we going to rise to the occasion? Are we going to do what we ought to do?

I could go on, but I do not think it is wise to say more with regard to the war. I have one or two suggestions to make, although I do not know whether they are very valuable or will receive any attention. It is now eighteen months since I introduced a resolution in this House with regard to the control of food-stuffs, both as to prices for home consumption and as to export. I received a good deal of calling down from my own side with regard to this resolution, though I offered it as a business opinion. I may say that during the interval my views in that regard have not changed. I think that if the Government had taken a little of the advice which I endeavoured to offer to them at that time, but which was not accepted, it would not have been amiss. I am referring now to the control of food prices. This is carried on in almost every country that is at war. I do not know of any country except Canada that has not done something along that line; if anybody does know of such a country I should like him to mention it. Every country has been obliged to do it, and we in Canada may yet be obliged to do it. I am not sure that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) has not committed himself somewhat along that line. At any rate, a good many of the people whose interests he looks after have done so, and I have received documents from several labour organizations with whom the pinch in regard to food is a live question now. The pinch is being felt in some of our cities and towns. And this is not a question in relation to food alone. If clothing is too high I am quite prepared to have the Government take any measures they may think necessary to control prices during war time. Let me mention one item, one that appeals to the heart of every Irishman particularly, as well as to us all—potatoes. The situation

in regard to potatoes seems to have become very acute not only in Canada, but throughout the world. Prices that were never before dreamed of are being obtained for potatoes in these days. I am sorry that my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) is not here to tell us about the New Brunswick potatoes.

An hon. MEMBER: He is here.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: We have had New Brunswick potatoes in the district from which I come for the first time in our history, and I am sorry to say that the people of New Brunswick are not sending the best they have. If they are, then their best are not so good as the potatoes we can grow in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN: Perhaps my hon. friend is prejudiced.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I may be prejudiced, but fifteen bags of New Brunswick potatoes were got recently for a small Home of which I happen to be chairman. They looked nice and red and rosy, and appeared to be perfectly sound, but the matron telephoned me the other day that she regretted to report that about half of the potatoes were bad. I only mention potatoes as one item, but it is a big item in the workingman's daily food, and I think that if the Government could make a few suggestions to our friends who sell potatoes that two dollars, or two and a quarter dollars, or two and a half dollars per bag is too high a price, they might have some effect. I for one believe that if we were to prevent the export of potatoes the same as every other item necessary we could control the prices. We are a food exporting country, and are in exactly the opposite position from that of Great Britain, which is a food importing country. She produces very much less than she requires for the people, she grows only from thirty-five to forty per cent of her requirements, while we in Canada grow far more than we require. All we have to do to regulate prices is to prevent too much of our food going out of the country.

Mr. CARVELL: What about the home market that we heard so much about some years ago?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I am finding fault because you are not supplying potatoes at a reasonable price. You are supplying them at two and a half dollars a bag from New Brunswick, and that price is too high.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend talks about the Government taking charge of potatoes and regulating the prices which the farmers would get; would he also approve of the Government taking charge of the flour mills of the country so as to regulate the price of flour?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: My idea is, as I set it forth in a resolution over eighteen months ago, that whenever any of the necessaries of life are unduly advanced in price either by speculation, or by the holding of immense quantities, the Government should say that no export should take place of any of those articles until such and such a price is reached. It has been done in Australia; it is being done there now. It has been done in India, and in Great Britain, and in other countries of Europe. There the prices of food are being controlled by government. It is a proper proposition, and the workingmen in western Ontario are very much concerned about it at present. I have had several communications in that regard. The Government may be a little hesitant; it is a drastic measure, but in war time you cannot expect everything to go on the same as in peace times. We are at war, and we must adopt war measures. If it is necessary to prevent exports, we must prevent them; if it is necessary to prevent imports, we must take the necessary action. Whatever is necessary ought to be done, because the winning of the war should be our first object. The Government have interfered a little, but only a very little, with exports. Let me give one example, the exportation of electricity. That is a matter which we would like to push a little further in our section of the country. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. G. C. Wilson) referred to that. About ten years ago I delivered a speech in this House on this very question. That was in May, 1906, I think, and you may find it by reference to Hansard. A full discussion took place with regard to the exportation of electricity from Niagara to the United States and the handling of the power from Niagara Falls. We in western Ontario have been denied the necessary power because the Americans are getting what ought to be coming to Ontario. That is not as it should be. The power is wanted in the munition factories, and in other ways. The Government have a regulation; they issue licenses from time to time, and these are regulated from the Department of Inland Revenue. They are within their rights in doing that. The Government have the power to regulate the export of electricity, and my contention is that it would be proper for them and competent for them to

exercise that power in regard to other matters. I look for a very acute crisis with regard to some foods in the near future, and particularly with regard to potatoes. Where the farmers in our section of the country are going to get their seed next spring is a problem. Many farmers who had from two to three acres of potatoes in our district did not dig enough potatoes to give them the seed, owing to the conditions that prevailed. I live in a part of Canada that grows in normal times an enormous quantity of potatoes for export. Some farmers grow eight or ten acres of potatoes and make an excellent profit at seventy cents or seventy-five cents a bag. This year the price is two and a half dollars a bag, and potatoes are almost unobtainable. What is going to happen in the spring in regard to the seed, I do not know; it cannot be found. I make the suggestion to the Government that they consider the necessity of regulating the export.

We have heard a good deal about pulp and paper. I am not sure that some regulations are not already in force with regard to these articles. If not they can easily be put in force. I am merely mentioning these articles with the view of suggesting to the Government the advisability of regulating the exports.

I do not know that I need detain the House at any greater length. I may just refer to the trade returns that have already been the subject of considerable comment. I think they are perhaps the most outstanding feature of the war situation, indicating as they do the tremendous prosperity that has accompanied the war, so far as Canada is concerned. Our total trade imports and exports, is somewhere in the neighbourhood of two billion dollars for the twelve months. This is beyond the expectations of the most sanguine. Whether or not honourable gentlemen opposite are ready to give a meed of praise to the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) it appears to me that he has handled the situation very well. It seems to me that there could not have been very much wrong with the trade conditions of this country. My honourable friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) said he did not see how we could stomach the amount of trade we had had with the United States, and he accused the Conservative party of having declared during the last election that there should be no truck or trade with the United States. I think he was totally misrepresenting the situation so far as our intentions at that time were concerned. What we did say was that the trade conditions between the United States and Canada were already sufficiently good without us bargaining for and buying favours that we did not think we needed. The Yankee may be trusted to look after himself. We were doing quite enough trade with him already without giving him additional facilities. Their proposition was to buy further advantages in a market where, in my judgment, they were already doing too much business. I think we should do more business with Great Britain, Australia, and the other dominions, and our Allies, rather than with the United States. But we were going on trading with the United States and increasing our imports and exports, though, after all, a very large part of the increase in our exports has been with Great Britain herself and our Allies. We are doing an immense and very satisfactory trade with them.

In conclusion, if any of my fellow-members in the House think some of my remarks rather harsh, I hope they will take it from me that I was actuated solely by a most sincere desire that Canada, a great country in itself, should live up to what is expected of her, and that the 500,000 men that have been promised or suggested as our contribution to the war should be speedily raised, and every united effort made to win the war that is now raging in Europe.

I might say a little with regard to criticism that has been made of the way our boys are advanced at the front, or the way they are held back, but I think probably no good could be done by that. A great many of these cases have come under my attention, and I have taken many of them up, and I know they must be very bewildering to the Government. I think the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), must know that it is not possible in an army such as ours to have all the men majors and captains and colonels; we must have privates as well. That is about the situation. There are just as many good men probably in the ranks as are occupying the posts of lieutenants, majors, captains, etc. We cannot all be commanders; some of us must follow; some of us must be privates in the ranks; and that is the reason why many of the requests that have been made from time to time have not been listened to.

I think you, Mr. Speaker, for your kind hearing, and I trust the remarks I have

made will be received in the spirit in which I have endeavoured to make them.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): Mr. Speaker, it affords me very much pleasure to congratulate you upon the appointment to the high position which you now occupy. I have had the honour during the last four Parliaments of being a member of this hon. House, and have myself passed through the experience that you have had as Deputy Speaker, and now as Speaker. Knowing you by reputation before you entered the House, and having followed your progress since, I have not the least doubt that you will maintain the high traditions of the position to which you have been elected. I have had the pleasure in the past of visiting your constituency, one of the finest in the Maritime Provinces, and in this case the County of Cumberland is worthily represented by the first Commoner of Canada.

I do not wish to offend the feelings of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Boys), or of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), but as the time in which I have to make my remarks is very brief, there being no evening session to-night, I shall confine myself to a calm review of the situation arising from the speech from the Throne, which deals with the war almost exclusively. In fact, the one great question at the present time is the question of the war, and all Canadians, regardless of their origin, regardless of the province in which they reside, are one in wishing that the Allies may soon win a great victory, the victory of civilization and of humanity. It so happens that both mother countries of Canada are engaged in this war. It was a fortunate thing that Providence allowed that to happen, because had it been otherwise I do not know what might have taken place in Canada. We have extremes in both elements of our population. We have in the province of Quebec men of extreme views; they have been called Nationalists in this House. On the other side, also, in Ontario and other parts of Canada, are men of extreme views. These men of extreme views have never been the main strength of Canada. Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir George Cartier had to contend with them in the past. These extremists will never be of much use to Canada until they modify their views. The present leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), because of his origin, because of the high position to which he was called by the generous will of the majority of the Canadian people who were not of his creed, of his nationality, or of his origin, has himself oftentimes been placed in a difficult position when he had to deal with these extremists on both sides of the fence, some from Quebec and others from Ontario and other provinces. But he always steered the middle course and naturally ran foul of the men who gave birth to the Nationalist idea in the province of Quebec. I shall not deal with the extremists from Ontario, because I should have to go too far back in history, some three hundred years, probably starting with the history in Ireland, where the movement had its inception. But in the province of Quebec the extremists are of a more recent creation, and their history can more easily be traced. It so happens that the hon. member who seconded the motion which you now have in your hand, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Descarries), who is a man very subtle and very skilled in conforming himself to most difficult situations, has, in my experience, been an Ultramontane, at other times a Nationalist, a Conservative, and now a true blue. If hon. members will read in last year's Hansard the speech of the former member for Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche), they will find something very interesting about the seconder of the motion which you now have in your hand, Mr. Speaker. But, en passant, I do not like to mention Mr. Lamarche's name without paying a tribute, if not of admiration, at least of appreciation, of the act which he has done. Mr. Lamarche was a Nationalist who remained true to his ideas. Canada, of course, is a free country. We are a part of the British Empire; we have not yet been absorbed into Hun-land or Bosche-land. Some people in this country are against the war, just as there are some against it in England. All political opinions are permissible in this country. Mr. Lamarche did not have the same views that we have, and he opposed us, and when the Conservative party came into power he remained true to what he had preached in the province of Quebec.

Some reference has been made to the Dorchester election, and I shall have an opportunity of saying a word about that later on. If the present Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sevigny) had preached in 1911 the same gospel to the electorate of Dorchester that he preached in 1917 he would have been elected by acclamation, as was the late Postmaster General (Mr. Casgrain) in regard to whom the leader of the Liberal party implored the Liberals of Quebec not to oppose him, but to let him in by acclamation, be-

cause the late Postmaster General was a sincere, thoroughbred Tory; he stuck to his views and we respected him. But the electors of Dorchester to day are not dealing with a man of that kind, and that is the sole reason why he is being opposed.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Descarries) is the gentleman who, in the month of November, 1909, at Lachine, in his constituency, presided over the banquet which gave birth to the Nationalist party of the province of Quebec. I quote the words of the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche) at last session:—

> The Hon. Mr. Monk, the recognized leader of the Conservatives of the Province of Quebec, parted company with the Hon. Mr. Borden, the then leader of the Opposition. The reasons of the disagreement between Messrs. Monk and Borden had reference to the participation of Canada in the Imperial military preparation. The psychological moment of the severance of the partnership was on the occasion of a memorable banquet at Lachine on the 8th of November, 1900. Mostly all the Conservatives of the Province of Quebec rallied around their leader in his protest against the policy of Mr. Borden.
>
> Mr. Monk at that banquet delivered an address of the highest import in reply to a speech which had been made a few days before at London.
>
> Among the leading orators on that occasion, who all were of one mind with Mr. Monk, I notice the names of Senator Landry, to-day President of the Senate, Mr. Bruno Nantel, who, if I mistake not, was later on called to the Dominion Cabinet, Mr. Philemon Cousineau, the orthodox leader of His Majesty's loyal Opposition in the Quebec Legislature, and Mr. Charles Beaubien, recently appointed to the Upper Chamber by the present Government.
>
> The banquet was presided over with much dash and dignity by one of the leading citizens of the county of Jacques Cartier, who now sits in this House as its representative, namely, Mr. J. A. Descarries.

Then he goes on to speak of the preparations for the issue of Le Devoir a month later, and proceeds to explain why Le Devoir was founded to advocate a policy of Canadian autonomy as against Imperial participation in war, and he gives the text of the resolution that was adopted in the parish of St. Eustache, in the county of Two Mountains, at which meeting Mr. Bourassa, Mr. Monk and the three present French-Canadian members of the Cabinet were present, or if not present, advocated and supported the resolution all through the province of Quebec. This resolution was the basis of the formation of the Nationalist party in the province of Quebec. I have already read it once in this House, but I think it might be worth while to read it over again so as to find the cause of our trouble in the province of Quebec, if recruiting has fallen short; and I want the true Britishers in the province of Ontario to know whom to strike if there has been any shortage in recruiting in our province. The place was well chosen. St. Eustache is a historic locality in the province of Quebec. Away back in 1837 the people of Quebec, and those of Ontario to some extent, were clamouring for responsible Government. They had some déméles with the troops around Montreal, and the habitants of the county of Two Mountains, who were chased over the ice by the troops, took refuge in the old church at St. Eustache. When the British troops came up, they asked the habitants to surrender, and the local doctor, Dr. Chenier, refused to surrender and was killed. The soldiers set fire to the church, riddling it with bullets, and the ruins stand there as a historic monument to-day. The Nationalists chose the locality well to cement the union between the French Conservatives and the Nationalists, without which union this Government would never have been created. Twenty-eight Conservatives were elected in the province of Quebec, and on the 21st of September, 1911, every one of them subscribed to this policy that I am going to read to you now, and which has been the cause of so much trouble in our recruiting propaganda in the province of Quebec. It is the inculcation into the minds of the people of the province of Quebec of the proposition that outside of Canada they owe no duty to the British Crown, and that participation in British wars of any nature would be fatal to the autonomy of this country, which has caused the trouble. The resolution was drafted by Mr. Monk himself, and when Mr. Monk came to Mr. Bourassa for his approval of his resolution, Mr. Bourassa said: I will not accept it unless the policy of Borden is equally condemned. You will find in it the passage that was inserted about the nefarious policy of Borden. Bourassa consented to join because at that time the late member for Jacques Cartier, Mr. Monk, who was a respected man—a man who has the courage to resign his seat in the Cabinet on a question of principle is entitled to the respect of everyone, no matter whether one shares his views or not—was the forlorn leader of a forlorn hope in the province of Quebec. Twelve or thirteen members were lost on the back benches of this House, and the dreamy member for Jacques Cartier said that as long as Sir Wilfrid

Laurier remained at the head of the Government the province of Quebec would always remain loyal to him. Bourassa was dissatisfied with the Liberal party. Why? Because it went to the support of the Empire in the South African war, because the Liberal party gave to Britain the first effective aid which was ever given to the Empire outside of this country, because it set aside the principle which Sir John A. Macdonald had laid down in the Soudan campaign and in other campaigns in which it was urged Canada should send over contingents which Sir John A. Macdonald refused. Bourassa left the Liberal party because the Liberal party had shown itself to be too loyal, and because Sir Wilfrid Laurier was too English for him and those who shared his views.

There are members in this House yet who will remember in the old House when the question of non-participation came up, that three members rose to call for a division, those members being the member for Labelle, Mr. Bourassa; the member for Charlevoi, Mr. Angers; and the member for Laprairie-Napierville, Mr. Monet. And two Tories joined to make five, in order to call for a vote of the House. That was the state of the Nationalist Party, but what was the origin? The party was originated because Laurier was held to be too Imperial and too English. It makes one's blood boil, knowing the facts as we do now, to hear misinformed men—I have no doubt they are misinformed because they would not do so deliberately—charge the Liberals of the province of Quebec with want of loyalty to the British flag and British institutions. The contrary is true. The Liberals in the province of Quebec have worked by day and by night, especially under the leadership of their present great leader, to inculcate into the minds of the people of that province that the province of Quebec forms part of the Dominion and that the Dominion is the greatest of the sister nations of the Empire. That is the gospel that the present leader of the Opposition preached in the province of Quebec and it was against that gospel that Mr. Henri Bourassa and Mr. Monk protested with all those nationalists who were elected in the province of Quebec at the last election, amongst them being the present Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sévigny), the Secretary of State (Mr. Patenaude) and the present Postmaster General (Mr. Blondin). They themselves will admit now that they are trying to undo the work they did then. The first thing that the Minister of Inland Revenue did when he arrived at the station at Quebec the other day was to tell his friends. You find me in a new role, in a new position; I have changed my mind; but there are other people who have changed their minds; look at Lloyd George; he has changed his mind. What instance did he give of the change of mind on the part of Lloyd George? He said: Lloyd George was against the South African war and now he is in favour of the war against the Germans. There is however, not much similarity between the two cases. The people down in Quebec now call him Lloyd George Sévigny as a kind of reminder of that statement.

When the Dorchester election came on the feeling in that constituency was very strong. The representative in the Legislature of the county of Dorchester is a young man of great talent, one who has every prospect of a great future. He is a man of high principle and comes of a good stock, being a son of Mr. Justice Cannon, one of the leading men of Quebec, known to all those who follow municipal matters as having presided over the famous Cannon investigation into affairs in Montreal. Mr. Cannon had been elected by a majority of 500 for a term of five years, four years of which had yet to run. It would have been easy for him to say: If you want to oppose the Minister of Inland Revenue, find another candidate. But he was willing to make the sacrifice. He threw up his mandate and sacrificed the four remaining years of his term in the Legislature because of the unanimous wish of the Liberals of the county of Dorchester, that he should be their candidate to oppose the election of Hon. Mr. Sevigny because of the change in the policy of that gentleman. I do not wish to pose as a prophet, but I think this House will not be much surprised should Mr. Sevigny be defeated, and if he is defeated it will be in vindication of a great principle, a principle which should be respected, not only in Canada but everywhere. That principle is that public men must be true to their declarations. If a public man makes a public declaration, that is a promise to his electors, it is an undertaking with them that in the Legislature he will advocate and maintain a certain policy. It is necessary for the proper carrying on of the public business that public men should be held to the promises thus made by them. When the ex-member for Dorchester was invited by those on the Government side

of this House to take the high office of Deputy Speaker, he should have gone to his electors and said: Conditions have changed, and I want your approval of the change I am about to make. Even had he gone to his constituency when war was declared and told his people that he and his colleagues in Quebec had made a mistake in 1911 in declaring that Canada must not take part in British wars, and asked their consent and approval to a change of policy, he would have been doing what was right. But he never did anything of that kind. He accepted a policy contrary to the one for which he had declared, and now he goes to his constituency asking the people to ratify what he has done. I have no grudge against the late member for Dorchester. He discharged his duties as Speaker remarkably well and to the general satisfaction of members of the House. Personally, I have nothing whatever against him. But I am speaking of matters of political principle, and strongly hold that public men must be kept to their promises.

The province of Quebec was fooled on September 21, 1911, as no other province in Canada has ever been fooled. The difficulty in Quebec is said to be the lack of recruiting. Well, recruiting was opposed by this nationalist movement in 1910—that is the cause of the trouble. Go into the back parishes and outlying settlements of the province of Quebec, and, though these places are usually about equally divided as between the two political parties, any man is likely to meet you with the argument: This is Canada, and it is to our own country that we have a duty to fulfil. They take a limited view of their duties as British subjects. They think that duty is confined to this country. And they point to the Militia Act and declare that for fifty years back this law has provided that no citizen of Canada can be required to serve beyond the borders of this country. They say that it is only fair to presume that they were wise men who enacted that law. Messrs. Bourassa and Monk took that position and the eighteen or nineteen Nationalist members who sit in this House approved the position and declared for it in this resolution:

> We, citizens of Canada, faithful subjects of His Majesty, King George V, declare that we are prepared at the cost of our lives to defend the soil of our country and the rights of the British Crown in Canada, as our fathers did in 1776 against the English subjects of His Majesty, in 1812 against the armies of the American Republic, and as we did in 1885 against our own fellow-citizens in rebellion.
>
> Confiding in the grandeur and efficiency of the principles of decentralization and in the autonomy solemnly proclaimed and recognized for more than half a century by the authorities of Great Britain and of Canada, we are opposed to any new policy which would carry us into faraway wars foreign to Canada, as long, especially, as the autonomous colonies of the Empire do not share with the Mother Country on a footing of equality, the sovereign authority vested in the army and in the Imperial Navy, the treaties of peace and of alliance, foreign relations, the Government of India and of the possessions of the Crown.
>
> We believe sincerely that this policy of concentration and apparent Imperial unity, of which the new naval law is but the first instalment, will produce in the heart, even of the Empire, misunderstandings, rivalries and conflicts which will endanger the peace and the union of the various countries and the people of all races, who to-day are proud to obey the English Crown.
>
> Never having been for Great Britain or for the Empire the cause of any conflict, we believe that a policy of peace and of moral and material development is necessary in Canada for its growth and its cohesion and further for the glory and security of the Empire.
>
> Free citizens of a democratic country, we claim the right of expressing openly our opinion on this question, as well as on all others which affect the fate and the interest of Canada. We recognize to the majority of the Canadian people the right to determine upon any new policy in our relations with the other parts of the Empire, provided that they act in full knowledge of what they are doing.
>
> But we protest against all attempts to remove this grave problem from the free deliberation of the whole of the Canadian people and of each of the groups which compose it.
>
> We disavow the declaration made in Toronto in December last by Mr. Alexandre Taschereau, Provincial Minister of Public Works, who pretended falsely that the people of Quebec are ready to accept blindly any policy of naval defence of the Empire, and we blame the members of the Government and of the legislature of the province who ratified this declaration by their vote on the second of June last.
>
> We blame the Dominion ministry and the Parliamentary majority who imposed upon Canada this new naval law, launched Canada in the vortex of militarism, denounced erstwhile with so much energy by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, endangered the peace of Canada and diverted toward the construction of murderous engines and bloody war, military preparations, millions destined to the development of agriculture and of our transportation routes.
>
> We condemn equally the attitude of Mr. Borden and the members of the Opposition, who, following him, have asked for the adoption of a policy none the less nefarious.
>
> We affirm that Parliament has no right to pledge the future of Canada in a policy which has never been submitted to the people who are called upon to pay the tribute of blood and to bear the yoke of military expenditures.
>
> We approve without reserve, the courageous and loyal conduct of Mr. Monk and of the few members who have remained faithful to their mandate, who have pointed out the danger of this policy and claimed for the people of Canada the right to express their will before their representatives imposed upon it this heavy burden.

That was the basis of meetings held all through the province of Quebec, and upon that platform was fought the election in Drummond and Arthabaska.

That election enabled the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) and the then whip of the Conservative party to wire, in answer to inquiries as to what they thought of the fight in Drummond and Arthabaska: "Anything to beat Laurier." The campaign in Drummond and Arthabaska was organized by the present Secretary of State. If I should read Mr. Lamarche's speech it would show the House that immediately after the election in Drummond and Arthabaska an immense meeting was held in Montreal, some 8,000 people being present, to congratulate Mr. Monk and Mr. Bourassa on the great victory that had been secured in Drummond and Arthabaska. That meeting was organized and presided over by Mr. E. L. Patenaude, the present Secretary of State. The electors of Dorchester county are, after all, exercising their rights as British citizens. They have stood together like men in order to show Mr. Sévigny that they cannot be fooled, and that if he went there to fool them they would give him a lesson. Of course, our friends of the Conservative press have sent representatives down there, and these representatives have sent all kinds of reports. I myself am an old newspaper man, and I know the difficulties of reporting meetings twice a day, one of them at night, sometimes in small villages miles from a telegraph station, at places like Ste. Aurelie and St. Zacharie, and other places where difficulties of transmitting news are very great. All kinds of reports have been sent forward. Some of them may have been faithful reports: others may be subject to misrepresentation. In justice to Mr. Cannon, the standard-bearer of the Liberal party, I would like to put on Hansard the communication that he wired to the Ottawa papers, which as a declaration of principles will be subscribed to freely and voluntarily by every man in Canada who calls himself a Liberal. This declaration, as telegraphed to the Journal-Press, is as follows:

> Your report of my speech in Dorchester greatly misleading. I understand you are obeying the order of your bosses in vile attempt to divide Liberals and create ill-feeling between both races in this country, when a united effort is necessary. My programme as expounded to my electors is as follows:
>
> 1. I am proud to be a British subject, and wish to remain so.
>
> 2. I believe that Canada should give to the Mother Country all possible help in money and men, but most strenuously object to being robbed as we were at Valcartier and other places by Government friends. I do not think, moreover, with Lord Shaughnessy, that our country should be drained of all her manhood and resources.
>
> 3. I am opposed to conscription, especially if it should commence in Quebec, as suggested by Sir Sam Hughes when Minister of Militia. Vancouver, Winnipeg and many other cities think as I do in this respect.
>
> 4. I think the Government should ascertain the available resources of the country in men and wealth, but believe that the National Service cards were badly worded, and not the best means to attain the object in view.
>
> 5. I believe the present Federal Administration corrupt and incompetent to deal with the problems we now face, and opportunity should be given to the electors to express their views.
>
> 6. A change of Government here will be for the good of the country, as it has been in England, France, Russia and all other countries now fighting because, in such a crisis the Government should at all times possess the full confidence of the country.—Lucien Cannon.

That is worthy of Sir John A. Macdonald. That is a declaration of principle that a man can make without being charged with going beyond the pale of his rights as a British subject. The chances are that the new member for Dorchester will repeat his declarations in the House.

I want to impress, Mr. Speaker, on the members of this House the fact that the province of Quebec is not deserving of blame. The province of Quebec, if we consider all things, has done remarkably well. We heard the hon. member for Brantford quote figures for Ontario. Well, there are a million more people in Ontario than there are in Quebec, and that makes a great difference. Then, a large number of Americans came in from the United States and were enlisted in the province of Ontario. A large percentage of the people who were enlisted in the province of Ontario were of British birth, the sons of British soldiers and sailors, or of close British connection. They were men who, like the boys in the West, dropped everything the moment they heard the bugle call and started for the war. The conditions were familiar to them. They were going home, a place sacred in the heart of every Briton, to fight for the cause of British liberty and British freedom and to defend the old homestead and the old flag. It was natural that they should go, and it is to their glory that they went. But take the case of the French Canadian who had a large family to care for and who was going over to a country which was foreign to him in many respects—to France and to Belgium—a sacrifice on his part so great that

I think he is entitled to as much credit as is the British boy—if not more—who is simply going back home.

The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) spoke about the French race not having degenerated on the battle fields of Europe. France has shown that she still remains the first nation of continental Europe: she has shown that she still has in her veins and in her very heart the force that has at all times placed her at the head of Europe. She has repelled the Hun at Verdun after a fight which is the admiration of the world and will be its admiration for all time to come. It is merely a repetition of what they did eight centuries ago at Poitiers when Charles Martel repelled the Saracens and Mohammedans who were over-running Europe. The member for Brantford says: I hope that the French people in the province of Quebec will be as good as the French are on the other side of the Atlantic. The French on the other side of the Atlantic are defending their homesteads and all that is sacred to them. Place the French of the province of Quebec in a similar position. The invader has invaded the province of Quebec on two occasions. You, Mr. Speaker, as a student of history, know that but for the activity of the French population in 1776 and in 1812 there would perhaps be no British flag to-day in North America to defend. The province of Quebec is ready and willing and prepared at any time to do its share, and it has done its share. When the Prime Minister went to Quebec to call for recruits Sir Lomer Gouin, the Premier of the province, stood by his side. Was not the venerable leader of the Opposition himself at a meeting in the city of Montreal, the first public man in Quebec to call upon his compatriots to enlist? Was not the member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) one of the public men who was chiefly instrumental in organizing Major Asselin's regiment? There a mistake was made. This gallant band of French Canadians who were anxious to go to the front were sent to Bermuda, to do the work of the coloured men in that place. After having been kept there six or eight months they were finally sent over to the other side; and what happened to them when they got to the other side? The same thing that happened to our Irish friends from Montreal and our Scotch friends from Nova Scotia; they were disbanded, broken up and sent any where at all to fill up the gaps. These are mistakes that have been committed by the Militia Department and by the general organization, but there are others, so I shall not occupy my time in discussing them now.

But I want to say that the province of Quebec has done remarkably well, all things considered. Our provincial Government has given a splendid example. The Legislature of the province of Quebec voted $1,000,000 only lately to the Patriotic Fund. Last year I think it was the first province in Canada to make a grant of half a million dollars. At the very beginning of the war our hierarchy, led by the venerable Cardinal Archbishop of Quebec and every other archbishop and bishop of the province, called upon the people to come forward and enlist and defend the cause, the British cause, for if there is anybody in this country who has reason to be loyal to the British flag it is the French-Canadian. I want you and the members of this House to put this down deep in your hearts, that the last gun to be fired here in defence of the Union Jack will be fired by a French-Canadian, because for us the British flag means all that we have. To us it is our language, it is our creed, it is our standard as an element in the Canadian nationality. If we can speak in this House the beautiful language that France has spread throughout the world, the language that still remains the official language of the world, it is due to the British flag that these rights have been recognized. Those are principles for which we wish to contend and to fight. But is the Government of the day blameless if the province of Quebec has not given the number of recruits that should have been given? Did the Government of Canada, did the Prime Minister—against whom I have not a word to say personally, because I think he is a high-minded citizen who means well—did the Prime Minister of Canada not commit a fatal mistake when he took into his Cabinet an element of public men from the province of Quebec who did not represent the majority of those people? If the Prime Minister were here I would ask if the reception which was given him when he came to the Monument National in Montreal to speak in favour of National Service was not a magnificent reception? Sir Wilfrid Laurier himself would have received no better. The organizer of the National Service (Mr. R. B. Bennett) can say the same thing. But when the Secretary of State (Mr. Patenaude) rose upon that platform to advocate, almost to adore, what he had condemned a few years before, the conscience of the young French-Canadians of Montreal practically prevented him from being heard. But what happened two or

three days afterwards? The Premier of Canada went to Quebec, but he was not accompanied by the Secretary of State, nor by the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sévigny); he took a thoroughbred Tory with him, the late Postmaster General, who we all regret is no longer with us. The people of Quebec do not object to a Conservative. The province of Quebec was Conservative for forty years, ever since we had public institutions in that province; in fact, without the support of Sir George Cartier, Sir John Macdonald could not have carried on the Government of Canada, because in those days Ontario was a Grit hive, it was largely Liberal. Sir Oliver Mowat kept power there for thirty-two or thirty-three years. Often the strength of the Liberal party in the House of Commons came from Ontario, but the members from the province of Quebec, the old bleus, who were here under the leadership of Sir George Cartier and Sir Hector Langevin, made the Conservative Government possible. Without the French Conservative support from the province of Quebec Sir John A. Macdonald would never have held power in this country as long as he did, and Sir John, in his political testament in 1891, one of the last speeches that he delivered in the old House of Commons, declared that in this country we were all upon an equal footing, that there was no conquered race here, that we all spoke the language that we were accustomed to, that French and English had the same status in this House, and that without the hearty co-operation of the French people of the province of Quebec Confederation would never have been possible. And today it stares you in the face. There is Quebec, the keystone of the arch, the connecting link between the Maritime Provinces on the East and the far West. But, if we in the province of Quebec are not to be treated as fellow countrymen, if we are to be treated as pariahs, if we are to be dubbed with all the misfortunes and all the mistakes and held responsible for all the shortcomings of the present Administration, if the whole thing is to be laid on the back of the province of Quebec, how can you expect that the province of Quebec will respond to the call which is now made to it? The province of Quebec is prepared to do its duty; but we are faced with this alternative: You have declared, and your public men, members of this Government, have declared, that the man at home, producing upon his farm, or the man in a munitions factory, working at the production of munitions, is doing as effective work for the Empire as if he were on the battlefield itself. I had the honour last year of addressing a meeting of my compatriots in the Russell theatre here, in company with the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White). I had not spoken in that theatre for eight years before, the last occasion being one when I appeared with Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Lord Grey to ask for support for the movement for the creation of the battlefields at Quebec into a national park to commemorate for all time to come the union of the French and English races in Canada. We thought then that, on the rock city of Quebec, near the spot where Wolfe had died in the arms of victory, where Montcalm had shed his last drop of blood for the flag that he had defended so long, where France closed her glorious chapter on this continent—we thought then that in that place we had cemented forever the races and had put an end to these dissensions between the French and English of this country. But apparently we had not. I heard the Minister of Finance on that occasion say that enlistment and recruiting was a matter of conscience. He said, in effect, although I do not pretend to quote his exact words: I am not here to ask you to enlist or to ask you to enroll yourself; but if you do so you will have done a noble thing, a noble deed. Here is the cause we are defending, here is the cause which we ask you to go and defend upon the other side of the ocean; but if you feel that you can be of more service at home, if there are ties that keep you here which cannot be broken, I consider that the man in the munitions factory, or the man who is producing on a farm for the supply of this country and the supply of the Allies, is doing as effective work for the Empire as if he were in the firing line.

I represent a constituency which is peopled largely by French and English. One-third of my constituents are English. Probably three hundred men from my constituency have gone, although many of them enlisted in New Brunswick regiments. These people would have been the first victims if the Huns had crossed the ocean. Entering the St. Lawrence the invaders would have fallen upon the coast of Gaspé and Bonaventure. My people knew what the war meant and what support of the Empire means. They know that we are fighting for ourselves in fighting for England.

To-day I received a resolution from the municipal Council of St. Alexis de Metapedia, which I translate as follows:

Province of Quebec,
Municipality of Metapedia,

At a special session of the municipal council of Metapedia, convened by special notice, for this fifteenth day of January, nineteen hundred and seventeen, at seven o'clock of the afternoon, and held at Mr. Ludger Galant's place:

There were present: Mr. Thomas Levesque, Mayor, and Messrs. Benoit Martin, Alexis Arsenault, Ludger Galant, Jean Martin, councillors, the whole forming a quorum under the presidency of the Mayor.

The Mayor read a letter from the Director of the National Service addressed to the Municipal Council and asking said Council to help him to promote all measures taken in the interest of the Empire, during the present war.

After deliberation, on the motion made by Mr. Alexis Arsenault, seconded by Mr. Benoit Martin, it is resolved as follows:

Whereas the parish of St-Alexis in the municipality of Metapedia is an agricultural parish;

Whereas the voluntary recruiting for military service already produces a shortage of hands for the proper development of agriculture, and besides has undoubtedly enhanced the cost of living; and whereas this council is of opinion that forced recruiting, or in other words, forced obligatory military service in Canada would hurt the development of agriculture and thereby the agricultural production asked for by the National Service;

The Municipal Council for the parish of St-Alexis of Metapedia, whilst affirming its loyalty towards our Sovereign, His Majesty King George V, manifests its formal opposition to any law of conscription for military service in Canada under any form whatever, as being detrimental to agriculture.

Whereas the municipal officers do all in their power so that the National Service cards be returned in perfect order, the secretary-treasurer of this municipality is ordered to forward a copy of this resolution to the secretary of the National Service and to our member of Parliament, the Hon. Charles Marcil.

THOMAS LEVESQUE,
Mayor.

JULES DUFOUR,
Sec.-Treas.

What are you going to do about it? Are you going to ask these men to abandon their farms? Are you going to ask the only son or the second son who remains on the farm to abandon his farm, to abandon his property and to go into Montreal or Quebec and enlist? The Government should say one thing or the other. They have decided to send 500,000 men. That is one alternative. Lord Shaughnessy said that that could not be done except by crippling the economic resources of the country. But, if you want to send your 500,000 men, do not say at the same time that there is a shortage of munitions. The chairman of the Imperial Munitions Board says that he has 600 factories at work in Canada at the present time, and calls upon the manufacturers to fulfil their contracts, as that is the most effective way of helping the Empire. What are we going to do? Are we going to drop production, or are we going to drop recruiting? In the province of Quebec there was no system of organization in regard to recruiting. Recruiting in that province was the result of the efforts of private individuals, of many public-spirited individuals in Montreal, Quebec and elsewhere, who undertook the organization of battalions. They have organized a number of battalions and sent them overseas.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to the rule.

Thursday, January 25, 1917.

The House met at three o'clock, the Speaker in the chair.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill No. 5, respecting The Guardian Accident and Guarantee Company, and to change its name to "The Guardian Insurance Company of Canada."—Mr. Achim.

Bill No. 6, respecting The Athabaska Northern Railway Company.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill No. 7, respecting The Continental Heat and Light Company.—Sir Herbert Ames.

Bill No. 8, to incorporate The Bishop of Mackenzie River.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill No. 9, respecting The Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill No. 10, to incorporate The Grand Lodge of the Canadian Association of Stationary Engineers of the Dominion of Canada.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 11, respecting The Canadian Order of the Woodmen of the World.—Mr. Glass.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

List of Shareholders, Chartered Banks of Canada, as of date December 31, 1915.—Sir Thomas White.

Report on certified cheques, drafts or bills of exchange, dividends remaining unpaid and unclaimed balances in chartered banks of Canada for five years and upwards prior to December 31, 1915.—Sir Thomas White.

Governor General's Warrants issued since last session.—Sir Thomas White.

Expenditure on account of unforeseen expenses from 1st April, 1916, to 18th January, 1917.—Sir Thomas White.

Statement of temporary loans, Dominion of Canada, from 1st April, 1916, to 18th January, 1917.—Sir Thomas White.

Report of the Ottawa Improvement Commission for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1916.—Sir Thomas White.

Report of the Royal Society of Canada for the year ended 30th April, 1916.—Sir Thomas White.

Statement of the National Battlefields Commission for the year ended March 31, 1916.—Sir Thomas White.

Statement of superannuations in the Civil Service during the year ended 31st December, 1916.—Sir Thomas White.

Report of the Superintendent of Insurance, under section 17 of the Civil Service Insurance Act.—Sir Thomas White.

Part II, of the Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1916.—Hon. Mr. Hazen.

Copy of the amendments to the Radio-Telegraph Regulations since 1st August, 1914.—Hon. Mr. Hazen.

IMPERIAL WAR CONFERENCE.

BUSINESS OF PARLIAMENT—PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN, (Prime Minister): My right hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, in his speech in the debate on the Speech from the Throne, referred to the course which might be taken with regard to the business of parliament in view of the invitation which has been extended to the First Ministers of the overseas Dominions to participate in a conference which will begin in London in the early future and in which, for the purpose of that conference, the ministers alluded to will be regarded for the time being as members of the War Cabinet. Before the debate on the speech from the Throne had been initiated, the subject, of course, had received some consideration from my colleagues and myself, and I am disposed to think that the course which my right hon. friend suggests is the course which it would be proper to adopt under the circumstances, subject to one or two considerations which I shall mention. I should think that it would be proper to vote the Supplementary Estimates as they would be required before the probable date at which Parliament could resume. I think that there should be a vote on account, such as is ordinarily given, say to the 30th of June. It would seem to me appropriate, and indeed my right hon. friend suggested it, that the vote for war purposes should be passed in its entirety in order that we might ensure absolutely the participation of Canada in the war if it should continue for the full period of the next fiscal year. In addition to that, I understand from my colleague, the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) that a Borrowing Bill, which I think will not be controversial, ought to be passed in order that adequate financial provision for certain necessary purposes may be made.

That is all the programme that we would propose before adjournment, with one exception which was suggested to me some time ago from different parts of the country, and as to which I wrote to the right hon. gentleman about five or six weeks ago. He will remember that in 1914 the Railway Act with its amendments was consolidated; a Bill was introduced by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane), and was referred to a Committee of this House, and a Committee of the Senate was also appointed which, under arrangement, met with the Committee of this House in order that consideration might be given to that Bill by a Committee of the Senate and by a Committee of the House of Commons at the same time, acting indeed as one committee, although not formally or technically one committee. It has been suggested to the Government and especially to myself during the past autumn that, although the war is in progress and there are very important matters connected with its prosecution which continually engage the attention of the Government and of Parliament, nevertheless this Bill is of so important a character that its consideration ought not longer to be delayed, and I would therefore propose, so far as this Bill is concerned, to have it introduced, to have it read the second time without discussion, and then to have it referred to a committee constituted in the same way as the committee of three years ago. That would comprise all the programme which the Government would propose before the adjournment.

I have a further telegram with regard to the presence in London of representatives of the overseas dominions, in which some urgency is expressed as to an early date. I have not brought it down because it is otherwise not a very important communication and I am expecting another. During the course of the afternoon I will submit it to my right hon. friend and he will see precisely what the purport is. I will also take the occasion to discuss with him the probable length of adjournment, as to which perhaps I may be able to speak with more definiteness and more certainty after receiving the further communication which I am expecting.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I acquiesce entirely with the suggestions which have been made by my right hon. friend. There is nothing new in them except the subject of railway legislation. My right hon. friend has alluded to the fact that he wrote me some few weeks ago in regard to that subject, and I think I replied to his letter.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, my right hon. friend expressed his entire acquiescence.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The House will readily understand that the subject of railway legislation is one which is liable to open the door to many amendments and suggestions, but in these war times I suppose that everybody would agree to pass what is, as I understand it, simply a consolidation of the different Railway Acts. That would be very convenient and useful and I see no objection to introducing the Bill and disposing of it as my right hon. friend suggests.

The only other thing of importance is the passing of a vote on account for supplies, which I understood my right hon. friend to say he desires until the 30th of June.

Mr. GRAHAM: That will be 25 per cent.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is a little more than we are used to granting, but in war times we are disposed to be generous, and we will agree to it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not know whether I make myself perfectly plain. I thought we might introduce the Railway Bill, pass it through the second reading without discussion, and then possibly it might be arranged between a committee of this House and a committee of the Senate that some work be done upon that during adjournment.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Whether or not that would be possible, I do not know; members are not, perhaps, very anxious to work during the period of adjournment. At all events, this House and the Senate could give to the members of the committee, whoever they may be, an opportunity to do some work in the interim. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries reminds me that it may be necessary to introduce a Bill, which, I think, will not be controversial, with regard to the Harbour Commission works that are proceeding at Quebec. If my right hon. friend should find that the proposal is controversial we shall not press it before adjournment, but if he is disposed to accept it we would have that also put through before adjournment.

Mr. MURPHY: The right hon. gentleman intimated that a borrowing Bill would be introduced. Will the provision of that Bill relate solely to borrowing for war purposes?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: General borrowing, I think.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Bill will be similar to the Bill covering $75,000,000 which was passed at the last session. It will be borrowing for the general purposes of the Dominion. I will explain the reasons for it when the Bill is under consideration.

ESTABLISHMENT OF LABOUR BUREAUS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. LEMIEUX: May I renew the question which I have put to the right hon. leader of the Government concerning the date upon which he will receive a certain delegation in reference to the establishment of labour bureaus?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I believe that Miss Wileman communicated with me on the subject, as well as with the Minister of Labour and with some of my colleagues. I greatly regret that it will be impossible for me to arrange my personal attendance at the proposed meeting. The great demands upon my time in view of my approaching departure prevent me from having that privilege.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Am I to understand that one of the right hon. gentleman's colleagues may receive the delegation?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did suggest that if application were made to the Minister of Labour a date would be arranged.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The reason why I appear to be a little insistent is not that I have

been asked to accompany the delegation, but because it is stated in the letter which is addressed to me that some gentlemen from the western provinces have been telegraphed to and are on their way.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I cannot add anything to what I have said. An opportunity will be given for making such representations as may be desired, and no doubt they will be communicated to me, but personally I cannot be present.

WESTERN COAL MINING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. BUCHANAN: Has the Minister of Labour any further information about the coal mining situation in southern Alberta? I have a telegram stating that the miners at Lethbridge, Coalhurst, and Chinook went out last night and that they are taking a referendum next Tuesday as to whether or not they will accept the Harrison finding. It is also said that the cause of their going out was their annoyance at the Government's failure to enforce the finding of Commissioner Harrison. I would like a statement from the Minister of Labour with regard to this matter.

Mr. CROTHERS: All that I can say is that negotiations are progressing, and I confidently expect that within a few days they will reach a satisfactory conclusion.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. G. C. Wilson (Wentworth) for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Wednesday, January 24.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure) (Resuming): Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock last night I had attempted to answer what I considered to be a reflection, unintentional, perhaps, which had been made during the afternoon by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) and the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) regarding the situation in the province of Quebec.

I am glad to congratulate the Prime Minister on the stand that he is now taking in announcing his acceptance of the proposal made by the right hon. leader of the Opposition. We are passing through difficult times, and there must be some give and take on both sides. The Liberal party gave a splendid example of that principle at the very outbreak of hostilities. In the early days of August, 1914, when most of us were basking down on the seashore at the summer resorts, taking our usual holidays, we suddenly learned with dismay that war had broken out in Europe. We were summoned to an extraordinary session. The Parliament of Canada was called upon to ratify the action which had been taken by the Prime Minister and his colleagues to throw Canada into a European war. The step was a most extraordinary one, having no precedent in our history. The Prime Minister declared in his speech that he had taken upon himself the responsibility of that action without having consulted his own colleagues, and we have it now that he did not consult the Liberal party or its leader. The representatives of the people came here in large numbers and in four or five days they passed all the necessary legislation, voted all the necessary money and gave Canada an example of union, harmony and concord which will stand to their credit in the annals of this Parliament. Since then we have tried to carry out that line of policy to the best of our ability. How easy it would have been for the distinguished leader of the Opposition to have merely laid down the constitutional rule that any important departure like this should first be submitted to the referendum of the people; that their consent should first be asked. But he overlooked that, and took the stand that he had always taken in his public life; that England's difficulty was Canada's difficulty, that England's case was our case. And we took it for granted that the people of Canada would ratify our action. I am glad to say that the people whom I represent, a mingled community, not all of the same origin or of the same stock, have all gladly ratified my action and by their enlistments in the English and Scotch as well as in the Acadian French settlements have made a record which will forever stand to their honour.

I know that the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) is an imperialist, and I will not take very seriously a passing allusion he made in his speech, because towards the end of his address he apologized to some extent for what he had said. But he made a passing allusion, which, though not offensive, is not altogether to the credit of the Empire of which he is an apostle. The member for Brantford is an ardent imperialist, and in speaking of this war in which Canadians have taken part in such large numbers, he referred to the fact that

there were so many people in this country of British stock and so many others—fifty-seven other classes. He did not refer to any other particular class at great length, but he made particular allusion to the Brantford Indians. I think that the member for Brantford makes a very grievous mistake if he considers that the glory, the strength, the power, the very foundation of the British Empire, rests merely upon the subjects of the King who are of British stock. It is the pride of England, and it is the pride especially of the British Empire, that the greatness of the Empire is to be found in its 450,000,000 subjects, of whom but 45,000,000 or less are of British stock, the remaining 400,000,000 being composed of all nationalities, of all creeds, of all languages. To say that in Canada a man must be of British stock to be a loyal supporter of the Government, to be a loyal supporter of the institutions of Canada, to be a loyal supporter of the Crown and of the flag, is to exhibit a most deplorable ignorance of our history. Canada would never have existed as it exists to-day but for the subjects of the King who speak the French language. The hon. member for Brantford knows full well that when rebellion did break out on this continent it broke out among the English-speaking subjects of His Majesty the King. The temptation for the French subjects of His Majesty the King on the banks of the St. Lawrence to have followed the new star spangled banner was great; but it stands to-day to their credit that although the English-speaking subjects of the King, of British stock, rose in rebellion against Great Britain, it was his French subjects of the province of Quebec who in 1774 saved Canada to the British Crown. The hon. member made a reflection upon the people of Quebec which I am quite sure he did not intend; and if he had intended it, I would refer him to our friend from Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), the most outspoken member on the Government side, the man who says what he thinks, who wired, the day after Courcelette, to the hon. member for Rouville, that London was ringing with the praises of the French-Canadians. That testimonial, unsolicited, came from the hon. member for Peterborough, and it was quite true.

Leaving these things aside, I was dealing yesterday with the difficulties that we had to contend with in recruiting in Quebec, and endeavoured to show that there had been conditions in the province of Quebec which made it difficult to secure recruits in as large numbers as we should have liked. And with your permission, without showing any ill-feeling, with all due respect to the feelings of everyone here, with all due admiration for the manhood of Ontario an the West and of the maritime provinces who have gone to the front, as well as for those of the province of Quebec who have enlisted, I think it is only fair, in justice to the province of Quebec and to its citizens, that the facts should be set before this country, that they should be embalmed in the records of Hansard, so that hereafter no unfair aspersions may be cast upon the province of Quebec on the score of recruiting. I hope to be able to prove this afternoon by acknowledged facts that the wrong crew were in charge of recruiting in the province of Quebec; that those who are now the ministers of the King from the province of Quebec do not possess the confidence of the people of that province, and that they were either sincere in 1911 when they spoke against Canadian participation in the wars of the Empire, or else they are sincere now, when they are speaking in favour of such participation. Were they sincere in 1911 when they were speaking against participation in all wars of the Empire, or are they sincere now? The people of the province of Quebec were put in that dilemma. But the responsibility, if it had rested there, would have been of secondary account; we of Quebec who are familiar with the facts would have passed lightly over this thing.

But there is another responsibility that has been assumed by one of the great political parties of this country; that responsibility has been assumed by the right hon. gentleman who is now the King's chief adviser in this great Dominion, and in the interests of fair play and justice to the province, in the interests of that British justice to which we are always so proud to refer, I think the facts should be made known and should be stated, without any doubt whatever. Yesterday, in my address, I called your attention to the most extraordinary fact that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Descarries)—and I regret that at the present moment there is not a single member from the province of Quebec on the Conservative side of this House and has not been for the last three or four days, the bulk of them being down in Dorchester leading a forlorn hope—the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who seconded the motion now in your hands, was the gentleman who, in 1910, in the town of Lachine, presided over the birth of the National party. I had known the hon. member for Jacques Cartier for many years prev-

ious to that. I had known him in the provincial life of Quebec; I had known him when he was an ultramontane supporter of the Mousseau Cabinet; I also knew him when he was a supporter of the Quebec Government in the days of the Riel troubles in the west. I knew him later on when he was a strong Conservative, when the Conservatives were again in power. I knew him as a Nationalist, and I know him today as a True Bleu, expressing from his place in this House astonishment at the fact that the electors of Dorchester do not allow Mr. Sévigny to be elected by acclamation, and hoping that this slight insurrection, as he calls it, will blow away. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier was the man who presided at the birth of the Nationalist party. The sponsors for that party were, among others, the present organizer of the Dorchester election, the hon. the Secretary of State (Mr. Patenaude), who first distinguished himself as organizer in the election in Drummond-Arthabaska, who repeated his work in the Chateauguay election and is now on trial in the Dorchester election. Along with these two sponsors was Mr. Cousineau, an unfortunate leader, who can say, as Francis the First said, all is lost save honour. Mr. Cousineau lost all he could lose in the province of Quebec. He was the leader of the Conservative party in that province in May last. He is the man who went forward with eighty-one candidates in the province of Quebec. Six of these were returned—no, five, because one was at the front and was allowed to be elected by acclamation in Westmount. Five of his candidates out of eighty-one were elected. The present ministers of the Crown representing the province of Quebec have constituencies there. Part of the constituency represented by the Secretary of State (Mr. Patenaude) returned by acclamation the Liberal organizer for the district of Montreal. The constituency of the present Post Master General (Mr. Blondin) went back on him to the tune of sixteen hundred votes; and the county of Dorchester which Mr. Sévigny carried by three hundred in 1911 as a Nationalist elected Mr. Cannon in the last local contest by over five hundred majority. Why did the province of Quebec turn so strongly to the support of the local Liberal Government? It was because the local Government was a good Government to begin with, but above all because the immense majority of the people of Quebec were tired and sick of Tory rule at Ottawa and at Quebec. Mr. Cousineau was one of the sponsors at the birth of the Nationalist party. This National party came into existence at Lachine; it took its first flight into history at St. Eustache, where the resolutions that I read yesterday were passed. Mr. Monk submitted these resolutions, but one paragraph was inserted at the request of Mr. Bourassa, who refused to take the leadership of the new alliance unless it was stated that the Borden policy was condemned as well as that of the right honourable leader of the then Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), These people began to preach this gospel. What was that gospel? It was: that the policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier was nefarious —that the policy of the Hon. Mr. Borden was equally nefarious. And what was meant by this word nefarious. It meant going to the support of England when England was at war; it meant that we should exercise our rights as free and loyal subjects of the King; it meant that Canada should not vote one dollar, or send one man to the defence of the Empire in any of its wars. That was the nefarious policy which Sir Wilfrid Laurier had preached in the province of Quebec, and which Henri Bourassa condemned, which the Conservatives of the province of Quebec condemned, and which every French-Conservative elected in the province of Quebec condemned. These gentlemen were elected upon this platform. But here I put a query. There are two facts in this case which have not yet been brought to light. The members of this House who knew the late Mr. Monk had for him nothing but respect. The honourable Mr. Monk was a man who gave a sincere proof of his convictions when he resigned his portfolio and practically retired from public life because he did not seek to impose a new naval policy upon Canada without consulting the people. The honourable Mr. Monk had given his promise to the electors of Jacques Cartier that he would not vote any money for the creation of a Canadian navy, that he would not vote for a contribution to the navy unless the people of Canada were consulted upon the subject. He moved such a motion in this House, and he declared so openly throughout the whole campaign. After the election, when, to the great surprise of the whole Dominion, and, I might even say, to the surprise of the whole English-speaking world, it was learned that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had been defeated by a combination of Nationalists and Conservatives, what happened? The present Prime Minister of Canada

handed over to Mr. Monk the choice of his colleagues for the province of Quebec. The first man who was called upon by Mr. Monk to enter the cabinet was Mr. Armand Lavergne, the man who refused to answer the call of the late Minister of Militia to muster his regiment in the county of Montmagny, and enlist for overseas duty. Our friends from Ontario escaped the fate of having Mr. Armand Lavergne as one of their leaders, as one of the members of this Cabinet. Mr. Armand Lavergne is just as good as the three gentlemen who are in the Cabinet now. They all preached the same policy. I think Armand Lavergne is better.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MARCIL: Armand Lavergne stood true to his policy, and if the Liberals of Dorchester, or of Champlain, or of Montmagny, had been willing to support Mr. Lavergne, in doing what his Conservative friends in the province of Quebec did, enter into an alliance with the Nationalists, he would have run there. The very reason that Mr. Cannon is opposing Mr. Sevigny to-day is because the Liberals in the county of Dorchester insisted upon having a Liberal candidate in the person of Mr. Cannon, who is a loyal member of the party.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh. oh.

Mr. MARCIL: If Mr. Armand Lavergne was invited by Mr. Monk to enter the Cabinet—and that will not be denied if we are to accept the version of Mr. Monk, and of Mr. Lavergne—Mr. Armand Lavergne came to Ottawa, and what did he do? He turned over the portfolio to Mr. Pelletier, the late Postmaster General. This was a very generous act on the part of Mr. Lavergne because Mr. Pelletier, during the campaign in the county of Quebec in 1911, had recognized Mr. Armand Lavergne as his leader. Mr. Pelletier had also been a political chameleon. In his early days he was a strong Conservative, but in 1885 he broke away from the Conservative party and ran against Sir Hector Langevin in the city of Three Rivers. Sir Hector Langevin was then leader of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec, and Mr. Pelletier became a strong supporter of Honore Mercier. He was the Nationalist representative of Dorchester, the very constituency to which we are referring now. Then he went back on Mercier, and went into the Conservative Government after Mercier fell from office. In the days of the Laurier Administration, he was seen sometimes in Ottawa in company with the Minister of Public Works, the late Mr. Tarte, at the time when Mr. Tarte had left the Cabinet. He was preparing for another volte-face. Mr. Armand Lavergne also came to Ottawa. These facts were known to the Prime Minister and his colleagues. These were the men who were brought in to represent the people of the province of Quebec as the King's advisers. Mr. Pelletier was accepted because in the campaign in the county of Quebec, at Lorette, he had declared "My leader is Mr. Armand Lavergne; I am proud to serve under his leadership." And so Mr. Armand Lavergne turned over his portfolio to Mr. Pelletier, who was put down as choice number one. Mr. Monk had the selecting of his colleagues, and if he could select Mr. Pelletier why did he not offer a similar position to Mr. Bourassa? If Mr. Bourassa had been willing then to enter the Cabinet, could the Prime Minister of this country have refused him if Mr. Monk had insisted upon his going in? That question has never been cleared up, though Mr. Bourassa himself declared that he had never had any intention of entering the Borden Administration. Mr. Pelletier came here as a minister of the Crown, and there were two other gentlemen who came with him, Mr. Monk and Mr. Nantel. Mr. Pelletier was chosen because Mr. Armand Lavergne made way for him. Mr. Nantel was chosen because the representation of the French element in the Cabinet would be reduced to two, if the Irish element were to be represented by the Minister of Justice and the Protestant-speaking element by the hon. member for Argenteuil (Sir George Perley). It was upon that occasion that the hon. member for Argenteuil waived the old time right of the Protestant representation of the province of Quebec, to a portfolio, so that the silent member for Terrebonne (Mr. Nantel) should have his portfolio. En passant I may say that Sir George Perley has been doing important work for the Empire on the other side of the ocean. He is now charged with a heavy responsibility. But if the duties of the representative of the Protestant element have been neglected they have been assumed by the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), because when the Conservatives in the province of Quebec, particularly in the Montreal district are discontented in regard to questions of patronage and cannot get all the appointments they want, they

place the blame on my honourable friend the Minister of Justice. These three men, Messrs. Monk, Pelletier and Nantel started in. What has become of them? Mr. Monk resigned on a question of principle; Mr. Pelletier went out of office to take a judgeship; Mr. Nantel accepted a railway comissionership, and Mr. Coderre, who came in afterwards, has also accepted a judgeship. When he started his Nationalist campaign in the province of Quebec, Mr. Bourassa stated that Nationalism was not a party, that Nationalism was an idea. It was an idea that he wanted to put into the minds of the Nationalists: "Le Nationalisme c'est un apostolat, c'est une idée et non pas un parti", and his idea was to lead a certain group of men to form a Canadian political party and to exercise the part of arbiter between the parties. He had eighteen, nineteen or twenty followers elected—

An hon. MEMBER: Twenty-three.

Mr. MARCIL: But he mistook his men. They abandoned the idea, which was to go to the fountain head, we might say, of constitutional principles, and they went into trough politics. They went in the wrong direction. The present Prime Minister of Canada has been kept busy appointing these Nationalists to office. Practically, the only changes in his Cabinet have taken place in the Nationalist ranks and in relation to Quebec matters are going from bad to worse. The old-time Conservatives in Quebec, Conservatives of the eminence of Sir Alexander Lacoste, Sir Auguste Real Angers, and Hon. Louis Beaubien, men who for forty years upheld the traditions of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec, are no longer represented on the Treasury benches. The old Conservatives in the province of Quebec have been wiped out. It is Nationalism that is triumphant; the Nationalists are there, they are in office and they intend to stay.

There was another point that I wanted to have cleared up. Our friends in the province of Ontario think that the people of Quebec are very bad. I am amazed sometimes to think that men of the intelligence of John Ross Robertson and Sir John Willison can publish in their newspapers, the Toronto Telegram and the Toronto News, so much rubbish in reference to the province of Quebec. You will not find in the British Empire a more contented, a more peaceable, a more law-abiding citizen than the average farmer in the province of Quebec. If you wish to know what genuine hospitality is, if you wish to see what genuine politeness is—the politeness which existed in the old days—go into one of the parishes of Quebec. Every man you meet will bow to you, whether you are a perfect stranger or not. If there is anything he can do in the way of giving you information, or inviting you to his house, or extending to you hospitality, he will do it and you will find in him the true, ideal citizen. Do these people in the province of Quebec bother their heads about what is going on in Ontario or in the other provinces? Not at all. They are peaceful, law-abiding citizens; they never see the Toronto News or the Toronto Telegram; they never will, and they do not care whether these papers exist or not. Some of them have noticed the name of Sir John Willison as the former biographer of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. None of these people have ever seen or read the Orange Sentinel and never will. I want to say a word to our Orange friends from the province of Ontario who may be in this House. I do not agree with Orangeism, but this is a free country and a man has a right to think as he pleases in politics as well as in religion. But, if our friends from the province of Ontario want to know the true political history of Canada as Orangeism knew it in the old days, if they want to know what true, political liberty has been in Canada, they will find it in the province of Quebec. They will find it in the life of the late Julius Scriver, one of the "noble thirteen" from the province of Quebec who represented the county of Huntingdon—which ranks as the banner Orange constituency in that province—for twenty-five years on the floor of this House and who was not found in the ranks of the Conservative party. When my hon. friends utter such nonsense as that a vote for Laurier is a vote for Bourassa they must be very childish if they expect any one to accept an assertion of that kind. The people of the province of Quebec are prepared to extend to all the greatest cordiality, the greatest friendship and the greatest freedom of thought in religious as well as in civil and political matters.

In the past history of Quebec there are instances of this which are worth citing. The English element in the province of Quebec has sent to this House some distinguished men such, for instance, as the late Hon. Luther Hamilton Holton and the late Hon. Lucius Seth Huntingdon, the man who brought about the change of 1873 in connection with the Pacific scandal, and

these great men were to be found in the ranks of the Liberal party. These men represented constituencies which were largely peopled by French-Canadians. In that province the Irish element, which is not as numerous, probably, as it might have been if circumstances had favoured a larger immigration from Ireland, has been represented in this House by distinguished men. I might mention the late Hon. Mr. Curran from Montreal Centre, the late Hon. Thomas D'Arcy McGee—the greatest of all—the present Chief Justice of Canada and the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty). Two of them have gone but I appeal to the other two who remain to say if I am not giving a true statement of conditions which to-day exist in the province of Quebec. These gentlemen sat in this House largely as the representatives of French-Canadian electors, especially the present Chief Justice of Canada, who was the spokesman of the Irishmen of Canada, and who represented a constituency which was 99½ per cent French-Canadian. He was here as the representative of French-Canadian electors, but he spoke for the Irish people throughout Canada. The Minister of Justice knows well that one-half, if not more, of his constituents are French-Canadian. The people of Quebec are broad-minded in these matters; they elect English Protestants to this House and these are things that our Orange friends should remember.

There is an incident that I wish to recall. One day, when I was campaigning in Simcoe, near Penetanguishene, against the present representative of that riding, I was invited by the then Liberal candidate, a former member of this House, to enter an Orange lodge after the usual evening's business had been disposed of. My friend said: They will look upon you as a curiosity coming from the province of Quebec. I did not find any objection to entering this Orange hall. I entered and received a hearty welcome. Naturally, I was invited to speak; I did speak, and I gave these people a brief review of some of the conditions that had prevailed in the past political history of the province of Quebec; I showed the broad-mindedness of the French-Canadian people, and I cited the fact that the only instance in which the Protestant minority in that province had been honoured by having one of their own number elevated to the premiership of that province was when Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière, a knight of the old school of chivalry and one of the greatest and noblest in Canada, was placed by the Liberal party at the head of public affairs in the province of Quebec.

I mention these facts because, incidentally, upon reading the morning papers, I saw that the present Minister of Inland Revenue is going to some trouble to explain that the present candidate in the county of Dorchester is an Irishman, that he has Irish blood in his veins and that he has no authority to speak for the French Canadian people. There are Englishmen, there are Scotchmen and there are Irishmen who have undertaken to speak for the province of Quebec as their representatives in this House and I hope this will always happen because the people of Quebec look more to the man than they do to his creed.

I noticed that the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) went to some trouble to give a French pronunciation to the name of Mr. Cannon. Mr. Cannon is a good Irishman, he is the great grandson of an Irishman and the "Lucien" very probably came to him from his French mother. Yet, the Minister of Inland Revenue makes it an offence for him to undertake to speak for the French Canadian people in the county of Dorchester. But this is nothing new for the Minister of Inland Revenue. The first time he appeared upon a public platform in the province of Quebec was as a candidate for the local House in the county of Nicolet. Then he ran against a gentleman who was well known to many hon. members of this House, a broad-minded, great Canadian who, unfortunately was cut down in his full manhood. I refer to the late Hon. Charles Devlin, a man who had the distinction not only of being a member of the Canadian House but also of being a member of the Imperial Parliament and who died while a Minister of the Government of the province of Quebec. When Mr. Devlin went into the county of Nicolet, he was the bearer of an Irish name, but he appealed to the French Canadians and he was elected by them. The Minister of Inland Revenue at that time raised against the Hon. Charles Devlin the cry that he was "un Irlandais," an Irishman, and said that he should run in one of the Irish constituencies of the province of Quebec. So the present Minister of Inland Revenue is now reaping what he has sown.

There is one other point that I should like to clear up for our Ontario friends, as they may not know it, and that is with reference to the understanding that was arrived at in the province of Quebec in the reciprocity campaign of the summer and

fall of 1911. Hon. gentlemen who were members of the House know what took place. I had the honour of being Speaker of the House at that time, and I know full well what happened. Speech after speech came from the Conservative benches urging Sir Wilfrid Laurier to go over to England and attend the Coronation. The idea of having the late King Edward VII, the great peacemaker, the creator of the bonne entente, the real entente cordiale, crowned in the absence of the great French Canadian Premier of Canada, was a thing not to be thought of. Hon. gentlemen opposite insisted day after day that the Premier must go over to the other side. Well, he did go over, and during his absence what did the present member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) do? I have great respect for the hon. member personally. He has done remarkably good work in connection with the Patriotic Fund, and I believe he is sincere in his political views; but he is very devoted to his party. He undertook the organization of the district of Montreal in the reciprocity campaign. Charles Chaput, a good old-line Conservative, was made chairman of the Anti-Reciprocity League, but the hon. member for St. Antoine was its chief organizer. He undertook to look after what we consider the English constituencies in the province of Quebec, and he agreed with Mr. Monk and Mr. Bourassa that they should look after the French constituancies of that province. While the hon. member for St. Antoine and his English friends were thundering against reciprocity, it was understood that Mr. Bourassa and Mr. Monk were to thunder against the navy. Mr. Bourassa has declared repeatedly that it afforded him considerable enjoyment to receive money from the Conservative election fund to enable him to carry on the campaign against a Canadian navy. It has been stated over and over again that the hon. member for St. Antoine, who at that time was representing the Conservative party in the district of Montreal and the Eastern Townships of Quebec, contributed personally in some form or another to the campaign fund, either in the shape of subscriptions to Le Devoir, or for the support of candidates in doubtful constituencies. I understand, however, that he contributed in the form of subscriptions to Le Devoir, to have it circulated in the province, because Le Devoir was against Laurier at the time, and they acted on the old principle, "anything to beat Laurier." So there we have the explanation of that fight. The manufacturers of Montreal, and in fact throughout Canada, opposed reciprocity; and the consumers of Canada all know now why the manufacturers were so stubborn against it at that time. But the Nationalists said, we cannot very well oppose reciprocity in the province of Quebec, because the people here think it a reasonable thing; they live alongside the American border, and do not see any difficulty in dealing with our American neighbors. So Bourassa and his allies, with Le Devoir, gave up the campaign against reciprocity and confined themselves to the navy; and Bourassa enjoyed it immensely, because his paper was being circulated at the expense of the Imperial-Conservative funds in the province of Quebec. These, Mr. Speaker, are the gentlemen who have been put in power and trusted by the Canadian Parliament and the Canadian people with the organization and maintenance of Canada's participation in the war.

The people of the province of Quebec now find themselves in this quandary: Were the Nationalists sincere in 1911 when they told us that under the Militia Act of Canada, framed 60 years ago by the representatives of both elements in this country, the duties of Canadians should be confined solely to the defence of Canada, or are they now sincere when they come with their new Imperial ideas and tell us we must go beyond the seas to fight? In Drummond and Arthabaska they won a victory, and contributed to the downfall of the great man who leads the Liberal party. But now they are reaping the whirlwind; they sowed then, and now they must reap.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier has been generous ever since war was declared. He allowed the late Postmaster General to be elected by acclamation in the county of Quebec, where at the last election the local Liberal member was given a majority of 1,600. Sir Wilfrid Laurier had to go and plead with the Liberals of the city and county of Quebec to allow the late Postmaster General to be elected by acclamation. The present Postmaster General (Mr. Blondin) passed through the same door that was opened for the late Mr. Casgrain. When the ex-Secretary of State, Mr. Coderre, was elected as the successor of the late Mr. Monk, Sir Wilfrid Laurier again appealed to his people to elect him by acclamation. What was the reason for all this? The reason was that Sir Wilfrid Laurier wanted Canada to be united, that we might take our full part in

the great war that is now in progress. The people of the province of Quebec, every man, woman and child of them, are heart and soul with the noble cause of the Allies, and we are so for two reasons. First, because the blood of France flows in our veins, and secondly, because of England, to whom we owe our liberty and our present status as free citizens on the North American continent. We are with the Allies for those two potent reasons, and there is not a man, woman or child in the province of Quebec who is not in some way or other helping the cause of the Allies. Away down in the Gaspé Peninsula, in the county of Bonaventure, in the whole south region, and in the north region, the people of the province of Quebec are contributing to the Red Cross fund, the Belgium Relief and other funds. Tag days are so numerous down there that there seem to be two or three of them every day. Then there is the work of the women, sewing and knitting, and the work of the school children, the work of the clergy under the appeal of the Venerable Archbishop Cardinal of Quebec, and of the whole episcopate of the province. All that could possibly be done in Quebec has been done to give the ranks of the Allies a fair representation of the people of the province of Quebec. If there has been failure, the failure is to be charged against the Government and its representatives in that province. It is to be charged against the men who represent the King in that province, and in whom the people have no confidence, and it is to be charged against their faulty organization.

I do not intend to speak at any greater length, but I wish to add this with regard to the National Service. The National Service cards have been circulated through the province of Quebec, but the questions are so vague and indefinite that it is difficult to obtain satisfactory answers, particularly in the more remote districts. When you ask a fisherman or a farmer living on the outskirts of the province of Quebec, and having a large family—and families in the county of Bonaventure and Gaspé are generally large—whether he is willing to give up his present work to do similar work in another part of Canada, he is in this position. Is he going to give up his farm and undertake munition work in other parts of Canada? And if he is free to leave the constituency where he may be earning $1.50 or $1.75 or even $2 a day, which is the highest rate of wages, is that man going to undertake to work in Montreal, Toronto, Ottawa or Winnipeg at those rates? He naturally cannot undertake it and at the same time look after his wife and family who are left at home. The appeal in this respect is ineffective, and the returns would not be satisfactory. But what is troubling the people of the province of Quebec more than anything else is this. What impelled the Prime Minister of Canada to establish the fixed number of 500,000 men when an authority like Baron Shaughnessy, who in these matters I should consider is the equal of the Prime Minister, declared that 500,000 men could not be sent out of Canada without crippling its economic and industrial resources? Now, what is the Government after? Is the Government after men to go to the front? The speech from the Throne does not say so. The paragraph dealing with the National Service is very mild and is worth reading:

> Steps have been taken by my advisers for better organization of National Service, and attention has been given to the more thorough utilization of our natural resources.

But the questions are so vague and indefinite that people do not know what they mean. If the Government would send a circular throughout my constituency saying: We need 500 shantymen at $40 a month for a period of six months, they would get them in a week. If they would send another circular saying: We need so many deep-sea fishermen and we are going to pay them so much a day and employ them for so long, they would have an immediate response. But the Government cannot expect a deep-sea fisherman or a planter of potatoes to undertake to go to work in a munitions factory in London, or Winnipeg or Montreal, leaving his wife and family behind. The whole organization is faulty.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: If the Government sent out a request for 200 volunteers, would they get them in your constituency?

An hon. MEMBER: That is a different proposition.

Mr. MARCIL: I am proud to say that the county of Bonaventure has sent nearly 300 volunteers.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I am just asking what would happen if the Government sent out a request for another 200. Many counties have given three or four thousand.

Mr. MARCIL: If my hon. friend wants to have a splendid vacation next summer, he should come down with me to New Richmond, in the county of Bonaventure,

where he will meet two thousand sturdy Scotch Presbyterians who will give him his answer. The county of Bonaventure is peopled by both races, and amongst those who have fallen was a gallant young Liberal, a man who, had he lived, would at some future time have become one of the representatives of my constituency. I refer to Mr. Frank Maguire, who entered the ranks as a mere private, but who worked his way up until he became captain, and who died on the field of honour. I know of one family in Matapedia where the whole family have gone away, the girls as nurses, and the boys as soldiers, at the front. The same thing has happened all through the country, the French-Canadian enlistments being almost as numerous as those of the English-speaking Canadians. I have seen copies of the letter sent by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, addressed to Gallants and Doucets and others whose relatives have fallen on the field of battle, in which letters the Minister of Marine and Fisheries extends his deep sympathy to the families in their bereavement. Do you want the people of Quebec to leave the farms of that province and enter the factories, or to enlist? Yet in your thrift campaign you have stated that work on the farms is as important as work in munitions factories. In the province of Quebec we have a number of young men who are not farmers or machinists, and who could do much better work as soldiers than they could do in the factories or on the farm. Let me give an instance of the haphazard manner in which recruiting is carried on. Last week man from Montreal was killed, leaving a widow and ten young children penniless. Is there any sense in that kind of recruiting? Could not that man have been utilised on this side just as usefully for the cause of the Empire?

If there is any necessity for men, Canada witnessed a strange spectacle last year. There were 150,000 enlisted men scattered throughout the country doing nothing. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) mentioned two or three regiments around his district which were anxious to go to the front. Yesterday I mentioned Major Asselin's regiment. Olivar Asselin was the man who placed in Henri Bourassa's head the idea of the foundation of the Nationalist party, and he is known amongst the people of Montreal as the Father of Nationalism. Having been through the Cuban war, and having seen considerable fighting, he thought it was his duty to enlist and he came to Ottawa and offered to raise a regiment on condition that the officer commanding should be someone who had already been to the front. His offer was accepted and the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) went to the province of Quebec and made an appeal for recruits, and the ranks of that battalion were filled. We were proud of that regiment, and it was a spectacular move on the part of the old French-Canadians in the province of Quebec to fill up the ranks so rapidly. What happened to that regiment? Was it sent to the front? It was packed off to Bermuda, where it spent six months, and it has now gone over to the other side. Major Asselin is left without a position, the regiment having been broken up, meeting the same fate as the Irish-Canadian Rangers, raised by the Minister of Justice, and the Highland Brigade, mentioned by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). In the province of Quebec the people have come to the conclusion that the whole thing has been maladministered; that there has been no organization; that there has been nothing determined; that there has been no fixed idea. Above all, you cannot take up a Conservative paper published in the province of Ontario without finding in it some slur cast upon the province of Quebec in regard to recruiting. We in the province of Quebec read both English and French papers; the people in the province of Ontario do not read our papers, and thus they do not get our side of the story, and they take for granted that everything said on the other side is all right. If, when the Premier, after having attended the Conference in London, and becoming thoroughly acquainted with the situation, comes back and tells us that this war cannot be won unless another hundred thousand men are supplied by Canada, he will get those hundred thousand men and Quebec will do its full share. But we want to know whether, at the present time, the Government is working for the factories or for the front, or what it really wants.

The Prime Minister yesterday very boastfully stated that the total trade of Canada would probably be $2,000,000,000 at the end of the present fiscal year. Well, what is the reason of that? The people of Canada have been producing. It was a sight, during the whole of last summer and up to the close of navigation, to see at the Montreal docks the enormous quantities of goods that were being shipped to the Allies—cheese, bacon, ham, wheat,

everything under the sun. The men who produce these are entitled to some respect. The farmer who remains at home and works his farm, having probably only one son to help him and being unable to work the farm unless his son is there, is entitled to some respect, because he is helping the Allies. The same may be said of the thousands of men who are working in the factories. In one factory in Montreal 6,000 men are employed in manufacturing munitions, and I dare say that eighty per cent of them are French-Canadians. Between 7,000 and 8,000 French-Canadians are employed in the munition factories at Lachine; these men are working as effectively for the Allies as if they were in the firing line.

I have nothing in particular to say against these munition works because I do not know what the facts are, but the Montreal newspapers announce that in July last the Montreal Munitions Company paid a dividend of 900 per cent upon its earnings. Is there any fairness in this? Is this the way this thing should be run? Is that the way it has been run in Australia, in England, in France?

Let us be fair on this question. When the Premier of Canada launched the policy of participating in this war, did he intend that the effort should be a party effort or a national effort? When I first came to the House of Commons many long years ago I heard a phrase fall from the lips of Sir John A. Macdonald to the effect that he was always working by the party, with the party and for the country. When the Premier of Canada conceived this participation in the war, was his idea that of working by the party, with the party and for the party, or was it for the country and the Empire?

France has undergone a transformation which is almost marvellous. To-day France has a government comprising members of all political parties, it is truly a national government. What was the condition in England? Mr Asquith was a great man and a great leader. He is a man whose name will be embalmed in British history with that of William Ewart Gladstone and the other great Liberals who have done so much for the British Empire. But it was thought that Mr. Asquith did not fill the bill, and he was put aside for Mr. Lloyd George. Before that a coalition government had been called in; the strongest men in the realm had been brought together and England was really making a national effort in the war. Mr. Speaker, how has the Liberal party, representing half the population of Canada, been treated since that party gave its consent to our participation in the war? Have we had anything to say in the matter? Has any attempt been made by the men now in power to secure a truly national effort on the part of Canadians? Not at all. This thing has been run solely as a party effort, solely to obtain credit for the Conservative party. I am sorry to say that if an appeal were made to the country to-morrow you would hear men claiming credit for Canada's participation in the war and saying that that participation was solely due to the Conservative party and its great leader. The right hon. Prime Minister declared that he was going to stand by this policy of participating in the war. It was easy to stand by this policy because he had with him the whole of the Canadian people, regardless of origin or of creed. But in the sanctity of the cause that we had to defend we of the Liberal party overlooked the fact that we had been put aside and the great leader whom we have at our head gave us that example. Liberals went into the trenches; some Liberal members of this House enlisted as privates and have done their part. Others in the province of Quebec and in all parts of Canada enlisted in spite of all difficulties. They had no favours to expect either from this side or from the other side.

A slur has been unintentionally cast upon the province of Quebec. But, Mr. Speaker, the province of Quebec is at the present time running the war. Sir George Perley, the representative of English Protestants in the province of Quebec, does he not represent the county of Argenteuil on the Ottawa river, a constituency which is composed largely of French-Canadians? Who is in charge of the Canadian troops on the other side but General Turner, son of Hon. Mr. Turner, who is the representative of my constituency in the Legislative Council of Quebec? The province of Quebec has something to say in this matter, after all. It has produced good men, and it will produce more good men. Unfortunately for the effective participation of Canada in the war, the Conservative party has made this work a party work, seeking nothing but party advantage, hoping for the greatest glory to their own party and overlooking the country at large. Now they are passing through a crisis. They are up against it. They are called upon to supply more men, and they cannot very well do that if they are to keep up the production of the country, because

if you send more men to the other side you cut off the producing power of the country in the mines and mills, on the water and in the factories.

The Prime Minister has said that production in the country at the present time is very high and that our exports have reached a value of nearly $1,800,000,000. But at what cost has that trade been created? At what cost have our exports and imports increased? At the cost of placing many a Canadian family in Canada in the direst necessity. We know what the cost of living is to-day compared with what it was some years ago. When the Government goes to the country the high cost of living will be the great question they will have to face. The day that peace is declared 600,000 men in this country will be out of employment. We have heard hon. gentlemen on the other side complain of the heritage which they received from the Liberal party when it went out of office; what will be the heritage that the Liberal party will assume when hon. gentlemen opposite go out of office? In the meantime, cost of living is tremendous. It is getting worse every day, and according as our products go to the other side the heavier does that cost become. Some articles are now entirely banished from the table of the ordinary workingman, because he cannot purchase them. The Minister of Labour has undertaken to arrive at some solution of this problem, but I must tell him that the housewives of Montreal have no confidence in his methods. In no case has the price of a single article decreased. Nothing has fallen; everything is going up, and the men of the middle classes—not those who work in the munition factories at $6 a day, or the members of the Montreal Munitions Company who get their share of the 900 per cent dividend—the middle classes, I say, the men with fixed incomes and with large families, who have to pay 70 cents a dozen for eggs, 50 cents a pound for butter, $2.50 a bag for potatoes, and so on: these are the men who are going to give the silent vote at the next election, because they think they are not getting a fair deal.

I was amazed yesterday when the hon. member for Brantford, who is a strong upholder of the protectionist idea and believes in a high tariff for Canada, spoke about the control of food, and referred to what he considered to be the high prices paid for potatoes produced in the provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick. It would almost bring tears if it was not so funny. But I do not insist upon that. I have spoken at much greater length than I had intended, and I wish to sum up in a few words.

I am willing to go to the end with this mandate of the Government. If the Government go to the country to-day I am willing to go with them. If they go to the country in three months I shall be ready to go—or in six months, or at any time. But if the Government want to make the country feel before their term is ended that they really want to help the Allies in the present instance, let them come forward and say what is wanted. If the men are to leave their homes in the country districts to go elsewhere, they must be told where they are going, to the front or to the rear, or whether they are going to the factory; what they are going to be employed at and what they are going to get, so that they can look after those whom they will leave behind. That practical suggestion I make. So I close these remarks, hoping that later on in the session I shall be able to supplement them by what I consider not unfair, but fair, criticism.

My chief object in speaking to-day was to put the position of the province of Quebec in its fair light, to make it clear that to say that the province is indifferent or is lukewarm to the cause of the Allies is the greatest slur and the greatest untruth that can possibly be uttered. If there has been any deficiency in recruiting in that province it is because proper methods have not been practiced, and these proper methods could have been adopted if we had had other men in the Cabinet from the province of Quebec. In the province of Quebec, before the war, we had very few militia regiments outside of the cities of Quebec and Montreal. We had one effective French-Canadian regiment in each of these cities, but the country regiments were practically only on paper. Some of them met only once a year, or not even that often. I represent a constituency with thirty thousand people. In each of the counties adjoining mine, Gaspé, Rimouski and Temiscouata, there are thirty thousand people. and more. We had a regiment there in the old days, but I do not suppose they met more than once a year, possibly not more than once in two or three years. I cannot mention Rimouski without saying a word in favour of the Deputy Minister of Militia, who comes from that constituency, and who has worked so earnestly and well in the prosecution of this war. He is another good man whose name may be added to those of

Sir George Perley and General Turner, as the men from Quebec who are really running this war.

If we had had in Quebec the skeleton of a military organization and had twenty or thirty regiments with which to start the work of recruiting, the result would have been different. But the recruiting was altogether mismanaged from the start. The hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) came down several times, but he did not seem to be able to get in touch with the proper parties to undertake the work, and those who succeeded him seem to have thrown up the job altogether, because I see in the Gazette that for a week there has not been a single recruit in Montreal. The Government itself is to blame, and until they adopt better methods it is no use trying to place the blame on the shoulders of the people of Quebec. The people will not accept that responsibility, and will protest against it on the first opportunity that comes. The people of Quebec have as much interest in this war as any one, because they would be the first victims if the Huns ever got across. It would be up the St. Lawrence that the invaders would come, and none of their boats could ever reach Ontario. But we in Quebec would get it full. So the province of Quebec is willing to do its share, and if there has been any apparent shortage in recruiting, if all the circumstances are taken into consideration, it is wholly due to the faulty methods which have been followed.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Mr. Speaker, I should not want a better setting for the few remarks I have to address to the House to-day than the incidents that have taken place. We have heard in the opening proceedings here to-day the announcement of the Prime Minister of Canada (Sir Robert Borden) to the House and country that he is prepared to accept the offer of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for joint action for regulation of the conduct and business of this House. When he said that, I think he went a long way to prove what I intend to argue here to-day, that if it is good for both parties in this House to join together for the conduct of the business of the House, then the time has come for both parties and all parties and all citizens of this country to join hand to hand for the successful accomplishment of this war. Then if I wanted another setting for what I have to say to-day, would it not be found in the speech of the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) just delivered to the House? I do not agree with all he says. I regret much of what he has said here to-day, because it went to show that there was a most regrettable divergence of opinion between the two great provinces of Ontario and Quebec in regard to the conduct of the war, and also to show that in connection with the election now under way in the county of Dorchester there is a great divergence of feeling, that there is almost, I shall not say hostility of race, but a strong feeling based more or less on race in connection with this war; and that should not be. Something ought to be done to bring about absolute unity in this country for the winning of this war. The little that I have to say will be in this direction. I am not going to appeal to provincial views or to race views; or to dwell on divisions that may exist between our people; but I am trying to find out if there is not at this stage of the war—and now it is more serious than ever—an opportunity of in some way uniting the country and doing away with all this discussion about differences between provinces and between races. Why should we not unite as they have united in every other country in the world for the successful accomplishment of the war? They have absolute unity to-day in France for the conduct of the war. There is no party spirit there. They have got together in England. They have got together in Russia. They have got together in the other countries, and they are all united for the war. Yet here we have to-day in Canada to listen to the speech—and I am not condemning the speech, bear in mind—made by the hon. member for Bonaventure. We have listened to this discussion to-day and have read of the other discussion that is going on in the county of Dorchester, and, in view of these discussions and of utterances of the press of the country to-day, I cannot see how we can have a successful participation by Canada in this war while these dissensions, or what appear to be dissensions, exist.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: There are none on this side of the House.

Mr. MACLEAN: I do not think I said there were any on this side of the House; there are dissensions in the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friends do not represent the whole country.

Mr. MACLEAN: I think I will be able to give some reasons why there should be

co-operation, but first I want to point out that the war situation to-day is more serious than it has ever been. Within a few weeks, there will probably be the greatest active line of battle ever known in history. All the battles of the past, all other struggles, will be mere ant-hill contests compared with what is now impending in Europe. The liberties of the world, of Canada, and the safety of our homes and families are all concerned in this enormous struggle, and if the issue is so stupendous, and if Canada is to do her part, as I believe she will do her part, we have to find a way, we ought to find a way, of uniting the country on the conduct of this war. We ought to have an absolutely united Government, a united nation, with a united people behind them for the accomplishment of the war. We should not be a divided people. We should not have the discussions we have had, and are having now. These discussions divert and use up the energy of the people that should be directed to winning the war. Mistakes have been made. I could pass reflections on the province of Quebec; I could pass reflections on other provinces, upon my own province. There may have been derelictions in certain directions, but these are not things to talk about in the face of this great struggle and in the face of the Canadian people who are anxious to see this war brought to a successful conclusion. I think this House will learn when we go to the country, and the country has an opportunity to express its opinion, that the people of Canada, irrespective of party, want to see national unity in the shape of a national Government for the successful prosecution of the war. It is not a difficult thing to bring about. They have accomplished it in England where they had two or three adjustments. Call it a coalition Government if you will. The word "Coalition" may be objectionable; I am willing to take the responhibility of saying that—call it a coalition government, or a national government or a new party, if you will——

An hon. MEMBER: A third party.

Mr. MACLEAN: I expected that the hon. gentleman would say that. I do not feel ashamed of saying that if it is necessary, if we cannot unite, we may have to fall back on a new party. Not the hon. gentleman, but the people, will be the judges as to that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: We want a change of some kind anyway.

Mr. MACLEAN: How can this be done? If we can unite for the conduct of the business of this House, as has been shown here on many occasions, does not the safety of the nation and the welfare of the Empire demand a similar unity? When the conduct of business calls for union, both parties seem willing to unite. Every one of us are doing our utmost for the war, and by union you will force Liberals and Conservatives to do all they can for the attainment of the great end we have in view. Instead of making charges against each other, you will get them to work for the successful prosecution of the war. That means something. There would be no dissensions in this country over recruiting. There would be no dissensions as to the enforcement of the Militia Act. I believe that the day has come when about the first thing to do is to enforce the Militia Act. It may be that we shall have to come to conscription in this country, and I am not afraid to say that if the situation becomes any more critical and the liberties of the world become more endangered, I am ready for conscription. If we are to have conscription we ought to have behind us, supporting it, a united people, a united Parliament and a united Government. To my mind the situation is even more serious than I have indicated. The war has been going on now for over two and a half years, and victory is not yet in sight. The struggle may be extended, and may run into another year. We all hope that it will end this year, but if so, and if the end is to be successful, every effort will need to be consecrated to that end. There should not be a single voice raised from a partisan point of view.

Party politics are all right; they have been at the bottom of our constitutional system for many and many a year. But when a supreme struggle comes there has to be a different attitude in the matter, and instead of looking to the advantage of a party we should only take into consideration the success of the war, the greatest war the world ever saw. I am not going to criticise the Government in power to-day, but we have in office a Government that is a peace-time Government and the result of a peace election, and I am not quite prepared to say that because a Government is the outcome of a peace election that Government is the best possible Government for the conduct of a war. A war Cabinet has to be forged out of different material from that out of which a peace Government is formed. I do not say that there is better material in the other party; not for a moment do I

say that the material is better in the one party or the other. I believe that the best material for winning the war is to be found in both parties, and that a union of both parties in order to get a really strong war Cabinet is the only way in which Canada can successfully play her part in the conduct of this war.

I come to another phase of the matter. I cannot come to this House and say that the House can advise or tell the Government what to do. The only thing that I can suggest, or that anybody in the country can suggest, is that the Prime Minister might see his way to approach the Opposition to the end that there may be union of the two parties and of all classes in this country for the successful prosecution of the war. It is the Prime Minister's absolute right to do this. We in this House cannot tell him what to do; nobody can tell him. The initiative rests absolutely with him. He may think, as he has a right to think, that he should not intervene in this matter. Then there is left the only other thing, the indirect drive of public opinion. And he does not need to respect that or obey it, but it might have some influence upon him. All that I am trying to urge upon him, or rather upon the House and the country, is that instead of following the course we have followed, resulting more or less in dissension and disagreement, and also in a manifestation of disloyalty, we ought to try at this stage of the proceedings to follow the example of other countries and have a united party, a united people, and a united Parliament to prosecute the war and to stop the bickering that we have seen in the press and that, I fear, we shall see hereafter to a greater extent.

The Prime Minister does not need to listen to any suggestion of this kind, but if he will listen he will hear something in the country in the direction of what I am stating here to-day. First of all, I want to speak for my own city of Toronto; I want to speak for the province of Ontario, and I believe I am voicing the views of the people of Toronto and of Ontario, when I say that they are in favour of uniting and solidifying the country for the winning of this war, irrespective of party views or party fortunes. They want to see the people of Canada united. In this connection I want to call the attention of the House to the bon entente banquet given in the city of Toronto and attended by representative citizens of Quebec and Ontario. The big business men and the bankers were there, and I never saw such a representative meeting in Toronto. If I gathered anything from that meeting it was that the people of Toronto, as represented by their leading citizens, were in favour of joining together the people of Ontario and the people of Quebec, French-speaking and English-speaking, in order to win the war. That is the sentiment of the people of Ontario, and I believe it is the sentiment of the people everywhere. I think it is the sentiment of the great West, and I have had opportunities, directly and indirectly, of ascertaining what the people of the West are thinking upon this question. My summing up of it is that the people of the West are among the most loyal in all Canada and are prepared to make the greatest sacrifices in order to bring about the successful conclusion of this war. They have sent to the front their full quota of soldiers and are prepared to send others. I met farmers in the West within the last two or three weeks who, speaking on behalf of themselves and of their fellow-farmers, said: The Government can have every bushel of wheat that is left in our barns—and they have immense stores yet—if they say they want it for the winning of the war, they can have it, take it at their own price and we will never object. That is the feeling of the West. I believe that the same feeling animates the whole of the people of Canada. There was a meeting held here the other night, a meeting of the Canadian Club of Ottawa. I was not able to attend, but from what I gathered of that meeting I believe that the members of that club are in favour of a Canadian policy and a united Canada in regard to this war. I know that is the feeling which has been expressed by some of the Canadian Clubs in the West, and that is the feeling which is being expressed all over. It was expressed yesterday, I believe, by the Canadian Club of Winnipeg. We may have to wait a time until they have had the opportunity of expressing their opinions, but the feeling of the people of Canada is for union and the discouragement of any kind of dissension until the war is won.

If the Prime Minister saw fit to make a bid in the direction which I have suggested—and it is only a suggestion—what should we get? First of all we should get a war cabinet, and that is the essential thing in this matter. You want a war cabinet and you want men in that cabinet who will best represent the sentiment of the people. I do not think that a cabinet, selected in time of peace, is the best

possible cabinet for the conduct of a war. If you had a war cabinet you would get a good start. The cabinet to-day may represent the people of the country, but it is to be remembered that it is six years since we had an election and the greatest political force that Canada ever saw has been developed and developed in the Canadian West within the last five years. I have paid some attention in my own way to what has been going on in the West and I have found out what that force is. The greatest democratic force in Canada to-day is located in the Canadian West. They are men of progressive ideas, they have new ideas in regard to economic questions, they have strong ideas in regard to this war, and they constitute a powerful political element in this country which is bound to dominate the country in the next election and say how it is to be governed. That element should have a voice in the national Government which, I hope, will be created forthwith. The support of that great and new democratic and modern element which has developed in the West would be the greatest backing that the Prime Minister could have in the successful carrying on of the war. The new war cabinet, which I hope we will have, will also find a place for a representative of labour in this country. What is the strength of the new war cabinet in Britain to-day? It is that it is headed by Lloyd George, who has the confidence of the labour men of the Mother Country and who has in his war cabinet the Right Hon. Arthur Henderson, one of the ablest representatives of labour in the British Islands. The British Parliament to-day has in it not two or three labour representatives, but it has a great number—I forget whether it is forty or fifty. For the first time labour there has a strong and absolute force in the conduct of the war; and labour in Canada, under the proposal I suggest, would be represented in this new cabinet, and the working men, who are at times questioning what has been suggested to them in connection with the conduct of the war, would come in and would be a strong influence in aiding the Government. Would it not be a good thing if in some way we could find a way of uniting our people in accomplishing the object for which we are striving in this war? If we could have labour represented in the war cabinet, if we could have the farming element represented —and the great producing element to-day is the farming element, and they are all loyal and devoted to the cause—it would be a good thing because such a readjustment would bring about that union which is so necessary to success.

The farmers and working men of this country want to know something about two things. A good mission has been undertaken by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) with a view of bringing about the mobilization of the man power of the country. I am glad to know that satisfactory progress has been made in that direction. But not only have we to mobilize the man power, we have to mobilize the industrial power and the accumulated profits if we are to succeed in this war; and the only proper way to mobilize the man power of this country and its resources, for the successful prosecution of the war, is to reconstruct the Cabinet in such a way that it will be representative of the farmers of this country and of labour. If we had a National Government such as I have described, we should have all the support for the war that we now have, and we should have a more definite declaration from the farmers and from organized labour as to where they stand with regard to the war. The whole resources of our country would be mobilized.

You cannot mobilize labour only. You have also to mobilize the profits that have been made in this country and devote them to the war. So far the talk has been largely of the mobilization of men, but I want to see a mobilization of all the resources of the country, as well as of our man power, in order that they may be devoted to success in this struggle.

Not only have we before us his great task of winning the war, and it is still ahead of us, but there is another very serious task to be accomplished, and that is the regeneration and reconstruction of our country after the war. How can we build up this country and find employment for all our people after the war unless we have some kind of co-operation between the two parties to that end? I say that neither the Conservative party nor the Liberal party in this country, as we know them to-day, is in a position to reconstruct this country after the war unless the two parties co-operate. That may be a rather strong statement to make, but when you see how stupendous the task is, and what are the things that have to be done, and how easy it is to create dissension over these things if dissensions

are encouraged by party appeals, you can also see how easy it would be to reconstruct the country if there was unity between all parties, and a united Parliament, as we ought to have. And the first thing in the work or reconstruction in this country is what? Great reforms in regard to the finances of our country. As I have said before in this House—and the war has fully justified what I have said—we have got to have in this country a national currency instead of a banking currency, and we have to have a great system of re-discounting in connection with our finances.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

W. F. MACLEAN: We have got to have farm loans, based on the credit of the country, in order that our farmers may get cheap money, on good security, for the development of our country and for the raising of live stock and the grain crops of the West. To-day the farmers are paying too high a rate of interest, and they are living alongside of a people who have all the advantages of which I have spoken in regard to financial reforms. We have even got to have, in addition to our larger banks with their branches—and I had the pleasure of speaking on this subject to a western audience the other day—a system of small banks, based largely on the same principles as those of the United States. When the American farmer comes to Canada, with all his experience of what they are doing for the farmers there in the way of small banks as well as large, cheap farm loans, which they have there, and a system of rediscounting which can be carried right to the farmer, and which gives him a low interest on mortgages and banking accommodation on live stock for long periods at low interest, that American farmer is going to draw a line of discrimination as between the United States and Canada. We must have progressive legislation in connection with the regeneration of this country after the war. They already have it in the United States, where it was worked out by that same progressive democratic element that we have in Canada to-day. The victory of President Wilson was not the result of the votes of the people in the East; they voted against him. But for the first time in the history of America—and I want to tell the House of Commons what they are up against—the majority of the voters in the United States happened to be located in the West, and it is from the West that all the progressive legislation came that they now have in the United States. To-day there is an equally strong demand from Western Canada for the same kind of legislation here, and that will form part of the work of regeneration of Canada after the war. I can see no way of doing this unless we get both parties together and have a real national policy for the successful accomplishment of the war, and for the regeneration of the country when peace is re-established. If anybody thinks that one party can administer the country and carry on the work of regeneration and do it successfully without asking the assistance of the other party, in my opinion he will be disappointed. But if in some way the two parties can get together and get the movement started, it would quickly gather impetus and would be carried forward successfully, and the war would be won in a way that none of us could expect.

While I am speaking only for myself, somehow I think I am reflecting the opinion of the great bulk of the people of this country, and if the people of this country cannot be heard in Parliament through the action of the parties in Parliament, and especially through the action of the Government, the people may take the matter in their own hands, as was suggested by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) the other day. Perhaps the best thing would be to have the free wind of a general election blow over the country and the people find out just where they are in regard to the war. But to my mind there is no necessity for that. This is not the time for an election appeal; this is not the time for party discussions; this is not the time for such a contest as is now going on in Dorchester, though I blame neither party for that contest. This is a time when all parties should get together and form a war administration, so that we may have unity, and get the best ability in the country devoted to the war.

What would be the result? Is there any better news that we could send forth to the world to-morrow, in view of the present severity of the war and its uncertainty, than this: that all Canada was united; that both political parties were united for the successful accomplishment of this war. That would have a disciplinary effect on Germany which would be surprising. It would cheer the people in the old land, and put heart and hope, though they are full of heart and hope yet, into our boys in the trenches, and aid them in doing their best to win. Would not that be a great thing for Canada to give to the world to-morrow? Would it not be a clear intimation to our neigh-

5 p.m.

bours to the south of us of what Canada really thinks of this war and of the issues at stake?

And the issues at stake, are they not the liberties and the freedom of the world? Would not Canada disappear from the map if Germany should succeed in her attack now on the liberties of the world, and would there not be a great German influx from the United States? But the thing to let the Huns know, and to let the Mother Country know, and our boys at the front, is that all Canada is united now, irrespective of party, for the successful accomplishment of the war.

I have to repeat it, come back to it, and yet it is what is forced on me to say to-day, and I have said it in as plain a way as I can say it, thinking that in some way I am reflecting the views of my fellow-countrymen from one ocean to the other. They want to win this war; they want the strongest and best men in the Cabinet for the conduct of the war, and they want all the energies we have to be devoted to the war. We have not yet begun to give what we ought to give, and we must give more. Is it not a fact that at this moment we are hardly keeping up the strength of our fighting force? I have met officer after officer who is practically stalled in his efforts to enlist the full strength for his regiment, and regiment after regiment throughout the country is stalled because it cannot recruit up to full strength. The progress is slow; it is hard to get the men, and there are not enough of us out preaching to the men of this country that they must go to the front. I do not agree with the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) that the man who produces on the farm or the man who works in the munition factory is the equal of the man who is in the firing line. The man in the firing line is the man of all men in this country, and we have to go out and get fighting men, because the regiments are not filled up, and their officers are discouraged on that account. I trace the cause of that largely to the political dissension in this country and to the fact that even yet, in the third year of the war, we have not begun to realize what war means. How many of us know what the English prayer book means until we read it now in the light of this war? The prayer book of the Church of England from one end to the other is a repetition of thanks to God, and also of prayers to God to save the nation from its enemies, and one understands what that means in the British Navy and in the British Army. We have been a peace-loving people, knowing little about war; but now we are beginning to see what war is and what it means for us and for our country, and if we are to keep a hundred thousand men in the fighting line and provide for the wastages and the reserves, we must change our system or we are not going to accomplish what we set out to accomplish in taking our proper share in this war. When I have said that I have said practically all that I have to say to the House; but in saying it, I think I speak for the people of Canada, and although no duty can be forced upon anyone in regard to the matter, it is incumbent upon this Government and upon the members of this Parliament not to think about party dissensions, but to think how they can get together and strengthen their resources for the winning of the war. The most discreditable thing that could happen to this country or to the Empire or to civilization would be that this war should not prove to be a success in putting down for all time the abominable doctrine that the Huns are preaching to-day, that they are the elect of God to rule and govern mankind, and that a military system made up of land-holders and men devoted to the business of soldiering must rule and govern the world. Germany has that in view to-day, as well as the destruction of the liberty, not only of the British and of all the other European peoples, but of America and especially of Canada, and our Canadian people would suffer terribly for the next twenty or thirty years if in any way Germany succeeded in carrying out her nefarious designs. If any one tells me that we are on the eve of a great victory, I say that I hope that is the case, but the evidence is not in sight. There is more fighting to be done, more enlisting required; more money must be spent, more munitions must be made, and, most of all, immense sacrifices must be made. There is no happy day for any of us in this House or in this country for the rest of our lives. The losses are so extensive up to the present time, and so many more have to come, that we are now a sobered people by reason of this war, and we are all, men, women and children, beginning to realize what sacrifices have to be made. Even our youngest children will grow up in the atmosphere of this great war, and will understand what it means for families, for homes, for the nation, for liberty and for the right to live. We are all in that sober attitude now; we know what war means in the prayer book and we know what we ought to do. There

is only one thing to do, and that is to cease this partisan struggle in connection with the war, and to hold out the hand of fellowship of one party to the other and join together, consecrating our lives and energies to winning the war. We are not doing that, and we shall not be able to do it as we are trying to do it now. When the members go back to their constituencies at the adjournment of Parliament, I want them to visit the homes of the men who are making the sacrifices. In my constituency in one church a list was read out of over a hundred men who had been killed in the war, and I can go from church to church and find lists of a hundred or a hundred and twenty or a hundred and fifty men who have gone to the front, and many of them killed. Crippled men are beginning to appear in the streets of Canada, and if you go into a street car, you will meet men who have lost a leg or an arm; you will see everywhere the evidences of the atrocity of this war in its inception and what it is going to be hereafter, and the settlement is not in sight. If that is the case, I appeal to the members of this House to forget party, to unite irrespective of party.

As this is a constitutional machine and works as a machine, a union of parties can be made only along political lines; it cannot be done by sentiment. Would the Conservative party or the Liberal party be disgraced if they joined together on the conduct of this war? If they unite to work it out, they will be doing only their duty, and they will be voicing the views of their constituents and of the nation.

I could go into details concerning the records of the different parties and of the two races, but I do not wish to widen the breach; I rather prefer to try to heal it in some way. I wish to impress upon the House how necessary it is to consider the political union that can be accomplished here and that will assist in winning the war. Unless we get that union the war will last longer and cost more. Canada's record in this war will be judged largely by what our boys have done, but it will be judged also by what we have done here in this House. We have started well at this session, and since it is demonstrated that there can be a joining of hands in regard to the conduct of the business of this House in order to assist in the effective prosecution of the war, surely there can be a joining of hands and a union of hearts with regard to the main object—that of winning the war—of all the parties, peoples and races who call themselves Canadians.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville): Mr Speaker, I wish first of all to pay you my respects, as you have been elected the First Commoner until the end of this Parliament. Although I had the best possible relations with your predecessors, I am somewhat inclined to express the wish that you had adorned the Chair since the beginning of this Parliament, because it is deemed by all parties that you, Sir, possess the three essential qualities which make an ideal Speaker: dignity of bearing, probity of life and unfailing courtesy.

I wish also at the beginning of my remarks to say that the new Governor General, in his accession to the gubernatorial functions, has been well received by the whole population of Canada, nowhere else, perhaps, as well as by the old province of Quebec, which since the beginning of British rule has always had the best possible relations with the head of the nation. The Duke of Devonshire, as was stated the other day, belongs to one of the great Anglo-Saxon families. The name of Devonshire is deeply enshrined in the hearts of all true Englishmen. That name, Sir, means, if it means anything, that the one, whose honour it is to carry it, bears it as a man of common sense. The illustrious uncle of the present Governor General known in England for years as the Marquis of Hartington and bearing later the title of Devonshire, was a man who pre-eminently possessed that very uncommon quality, common sense.

I have listened with great pleasure. as I always do, to the very interesting remarks which have been made by the member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean). My hon. friend has advocated a cessation of political hostilities and the formation of a national government. I quite concede that there are rumblings from one end of the country to the other which indicate the feeling that there should be a change in the political direction of the affairs of Canada. Not later than yesterday I received a resolution which was passed by a mass meeting at Regina on January 3. It reads as follows:

> That it is desirable that honesty, efficiency and singleness of purpose be established in the nation, and to that end we do here and now appeal to the patriotism of Sir Robert Borden to at once place the resignation of his Government in the hands of the Governor General and advise His Excellency to call as his new advisers a government in which all classes of the nation will be represented and particularly in which the working people will have such

trusted representation as their numbers and importance in the country would justify.

This and many other resolutions adopted throughout the country show conclusively that there is a feeling of dissatisfaction and unrest, and that a radical change is demanded by the people. Whilst I do not agree with all the remarks which have just been made by the member for South York, I think that the ideas which he expounded are indeed deserving of very great respect. He is an old party man and an old fighter, and I commend him for the sacrifice that he is making on the altar of his country in the interest of the cause which he has just embraced. I wish, however, that the member for South York, considering the position that he occupies in his party and the influence that he commands in the House, had given expression to those sentiments at the very beginning of the war. I am bound to say to the hon. member and to those in the country who share his views—there are many, and I respect their opinion—that to give effect to the suggestion that a national Government be formed, a revolution would be necessary; a Cromwell would be needed in order to remove the present Government from office.

I say that the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for South York should have been expressed at the very beginning of the war. I do not blame him; probably he expected that the leader of his party would have been a big enough statesman to come to the conclusion that with the approach of danger and the looming up of the tremendous problems upon the horizon there should have been a union of the parties. Mr. Speaker, I do not speak for the leader of the Liberal party; I speak for myself. Respecting the spirit of the truce which had been proclaimed by the Liberal leader, I have said on many occasions that the present Prime Minister was in duty bound from the very beginning of the war to open his heart to the leader of the Opposition. It was the patriotic duty of the right hon. Prime Minister not to ignore the leader of the Opposition. On the contrary, it was his duty to consult the right hon. leader of the Opposition, who is recognized as one of the veteran statemen not only of Canada but of the Empire; who is one of the oldest Privy Councillors of the Empire, and who has been proclaimed by Mr. Asquith as the Nestor of imperial conferences—it was his duty, I say, to make terms with the right hon. leader of the Opposition pending the termination of the war.

That was the duty of the statesman; it should have suggested itself to the patriot. It is well that the country should know why this was not done. And it was not done for one reason, that reason being that the Tory party meant to run the affairs of this country on party lines during the war. Of course a national government would have been the proper thing. We take our precedents from the British constitution; we follow the lines of British statesmanship, not only Canada but even the United States, which has borrowed so much from Great Britain. What happened at the beginning of the war in England? The Radical party was in office. Mr. Asquith was Prime Minister. From the very outset the leaders among the Opposition's statesmen, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Austin Chamberlain, Mr. Bonar Law, gained admission to the inner councils of the Cabinet; and, Sir, a few months later on, a coalition Government was formed, and we know what happened not later than a few weeks ago. Another change took place. A Government headed by a well-known Radical, Mr. Lloyd George, a war Cabinet composed of members of both political parties, came into office. These are precedents which have been set by the Mother Country, by the mother of all Parliaments. In France the parties were even more divided. There is in France, so to speak, a mosaic of parties. You have the Radicals, you have the moderate Republicans, you have the Socialists, you have Royalists, you even have some old Bonapartists; you have Liberals like Mr. Ribot, the distinguished Finance Minister. You know that the French people are very emotional, that they are very eager in politics, and that at times they were very quarrelsome in their Parliament; yet, Sir, when war came, the French nation gave a great example of that sacred union which has never since ceased to exist. Royalists, Socialists, Labourites, Republicans, Bonapartists, Catholics, Huguenots, Free Thinkers, all united to save the country from the invasion of the enemy. That was the great example given by France and given by the Mother Country, England. Was it followed by the hon. gentlemen who claim to be the super-loyalists of this country? No, Sir; the Liberal party, the Liberal leader, were ignored from the very beginning; and it is only to-day, when you see their party shattered to pieces on the eve of a general election, that some

pious Tory editors are anxious to have a national government. Mr. Speaker, a national government is overdue. It is not a revolution that will take place, but a revulsion of feeling, when the Liberal party will again be placed at the head of affairs. The right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will be able to form, not a Nationalist Government, but a truly national government.

I agree that during war time the discussions in Parliament should be as harmonious as possible, that there should be no party wrangling and that the Government measures should be given a fair hearing and generally the Cabinet should be given fair play. But, Sir, you are too good a parliamentarian not to admit that if during ordinary times, in peace times, criticism is healthy and necessary in order to secure a proper administration of the affairs of the country, in war time, when there is a huge expenditure going on, criticism is even more needed in the interests of the country and of the Treasury. If it had not been for the healthy criticism of His Majesty's loyal Opposition last year, do you believe that we should have to-day the Imperial Munitions Board? No, we should still be saddled with the old Shell Committee. En passant, let me say that I congratulate the Imperial authorities upon having confided the war orders of Canada to the present Munitions Board. I believe that with Mr. Flavelle and Mr. Gordon at the head of the Imperial Munitions Board, the country need not be nervous; the affairs entrusted to that Board will be run in a businesslike way, and with honesty of purpose. Again, I say that even during war times a loyal Opposition should not abdicate its duties and functions.

The other day I listened to the right hon. gentleman, the leader of the Government (Sir Robert Borden) when he was speaking about the probability of a general election. He told us that it would be sad indeed if we were to send the ballot boxes into the trenches. Would you believe it? Why his words are still ringing in my ears when, sitting in the old Commons chamber, the right hon. gentleman charged the leader of the Opposition and all those who questioned the propriety of sending the ballot boxes into the trenches, with returning officers passing over the graves and the crosses of our boys who had laid down their lives at the front, charged us with disloyalty. I remember that his slogan—if it was not his, at least, it was that of the Minister of Militia at the time—was: for each gun, one ballot. It was refreshing to listen to the Prime Minister the other day. Thanks to our criticism of that objectionable law, the right hon. gentleman realizes to-day that it is improper to give it effect. Sir, the Opposition should never abdicate its function—in war time less than in any other time. Who did not hear, year after year, the criticisms levelled at the Ross rifle in this House. When war began, during, not the short session of 1914, but the session which followed, at the very opening of the House, I called the attention of the hon. Minister of Militia of that day to an item which had appeared in the Canadian Courier, a paper published in Toronto. In that item it was reported that one of the soldiers, a Canadian, writing to his father, had said that when our boys had left Shorncliffe, the first thing they had done was to discard the Ross rifle. I asked the minister whether the statement was true or not. He denied it. Later on, complaints and criticisms were made. Finally, in the month of May last year, if I mistake not, there appeared mysteriously, perhaps, in the Ottawa Citizen, the letter of General Alderson condemning the Ross rifle with which our boys had been equipped. Mr. Speaker, can you say that it was not the duty of the Opposition to find out whether or not the facts mentioned in the letters from our boys at the front concerning the national weapon of Canada were true or not? When that letter was read in the House, my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) who never goes half way, stated that if the name of the civil servant responsible for the leak of the document became known he would take it upon himself to send the delinquent to the tower. After prorogation, my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) made several speeches throughout the country in one of which, speaking of the Ross rifle, he said: Of course we shall be taken to task for having equipped our soldiers with the Ross rifle. Defending the position of the Government in advance, he went on to say that they were bound by the contract entered into between Sir Charles Ross and the Laurier Government. Probably my hon. friend the Solicitor General knew at that time the contents of the report made by Sir Douglas Haig. What are the facts to-day? I do not state that Sir Charles Ross is right or that he is wrong; I say that if the Opposition had not fulfilled its true function of criticising the Government,

possibly our soldiers to-day would still be equipped with the old Ross rifle. It is due to our criticism that the hand of the Government was forced, and that we have the report of Sir Douglas Haig condemning the weapon with which our soldiers were equipped. It is all very well to speak of a union of hearts, of a national government; but no national government, no coalition government, would tolerate a defective rifle for our soldiers.

The Government are spending huge sums of money, and in that respect their acts should be very seriously scrutinized. A speech was delivered not long ago by the Minister of Finance, in which he said:

> If every citizen of Canada would save to the utmost of his power in these days of high world prices for our produce and enormous munitions expenditures at home, I believe that notwithstanding the huge increase in our national debt which the war will bring, the people of Canada would be stronger financially when the war is over than before it commenced.

Further on he said:—

> I believe the people of Canada will rise to this as to all other occasions, and that the men at the front will not suffer for lack of shells so far as the industrial facilities of Canada are able to provide them. Let us economize. Let us save. Let us make our savings serve the purposes of the war. Let us make our dollars fight the Hun.

I agree with the Minister of Finance, but while he preaches economy I say that he does not practice it, and the example of economy should come from the gentleman who holds the strings of the purse. I was shocked last year, Mr. Speaker, when, during the hours preceding prorogation, the Government brought forward a measure authorizing them to spend something like six million dollars on the purchase of the Quebec-Montmorency, Quebec-Saguenay and Lotbiniere-Megantic railways, and this at a time when two transcontinental railways were declared in so many words to be bankrupt, at a time when a railway commission of experts was being appointed to investigate the whole railway situation of Canada, at a time when every man, woman and child in this country was being urged to save and economize, not only on their own behalf, but to aid the Belgian Fund, the French Fund, the Serbian Fund, the Patriotic Fund and the Red Cross Fund. At that very moment, Sir, the Government were asking Parliament for authority to spend six million dollars in order to disentangle some promoters from mysterious railway difficulties below Quebec. That policy was nothing less than scandalous, and I hope that the Government will think twice before they pay the amounts that are being asked for the purchase of those railways.

There are many problems apart from the war which are very important and require solution. From every part of Canada reforms are being urged. I have here, for instance, a copy of the resolutions adopted the other day by the farmers of the West, a body representing sixty thousand affiliated farmers. In spite of the war, they think that some reforms are overdue. For instance, they ask for an amendment of the tariff laws by reducing the duty on goods imported from Great Britain to half the rates charged under the general tariff, and they urge further adjustments in the remaining tariff, such as will insure complete free trade between Great Britain and Canada within five years. They ask that the tariff be so amended as to give free agricultural implements, free farm machinery, free vehicles, fertilizers, coal, lumber, cement and illuminating, fuel and lubricating oils. They urge all of these reforms, and it is not because we are at war that the Liberal party should not voice them. It is our duty to bring these questions to the attention of Parliament and the public.

This much having been said as to the duties of the Opposition during this war, let me refer to the all-absorbing question —the question of the war—and the firm determination of the Canadian people to win that war. First of all, let me tell you that I am a British subject and a Liberal. It is because I am a British subject and a Liberal in the British sense that I stand for the Allied cause in the present gigantic conflict. I resent any imputation to the contrary. I do not care—I may just as well say so frankly—to be labelled a loyalist. The appellation "British" is good enough for me. As my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) stated the other evening, in the very excellent address which he delivered, loyalty is proven by deeds and not by word of mouth. Might I recall to this House the words of a famous woman who played a part during the French Revolution—Madame Roland. As she was brought to the guillotine at the Place Royale, she passed on her way the Statue of Liberty, and as she bowed reverently while passing before that statue, she exclaimed: "Oh liberty, how many crimes are committed in thy name!" I say to these ultra loyalists who are always parading their lip loyalty:

Oh loyalty, many crimes are committed in thy name! I am a Liberal, and I say that since the beginning of the war the Liberal party has adhered to the pledge which was given by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Prior to August 4, 1914, that right hon. gentleman said:

> I have often declared that if the Mother Country were ever in danger, or if danger even threatened, Canada would render assistance to the full extent of her power. In view of the critical nature of the situation, I have cancelled all my meetings. Pending such great questions there should be a truce to party strife.

There, the word "truce" was first uttered by my right hon. friend. The answer was a statement made at a ward meeting in the city of Toronto by the present hon. Minister of Militia (Mr. Kemp), who said: "Why speak of a truce? There was never any truce and will never be any truce." That was the loyal answer made by a gentleman who has now a seat in the Cabinet. It is true that we have had from an honoured member of the Tory party in Toronto, Mr. McNaught, a declaration to this effect: Oh, during this war some Liberals may be loyal, but their leaders have not been loyal. Mr. McNaught was a member for the city of Toronto of the Ontario Legislature. The Liberals of Eastern Ontario met at Ottawa during the month of November last, and they passed the following resolution in answer to the onslaughts made on the patriotism of the Liberal party by such Tory heelers as Mr. McNaught:

> RESOLVED: That this convention of representative Liberals of Eastern Ontario, in session asembled at Ottawa this 16th day of November, takes this earliest opportunity of placing upon record its unswerving loyalty to the King and Empire and pledging ourselves to assist in the ultimate success, and at the same time to record our resentment at the reported remarks of certain Conservative politicians inpugning the loyalty of the Great Liberal party, which remarks we consider as entirely unjustifiable and an insult to the thousands of true Liberals who to-day mourn their sons and brothers who have given their lives at the front as proof of their loyalty and love of the British Empire;
>
> And that this Convention express its condolence and heartfelt sympathy with all Canadians who have lost their sons and relatives at the front.

What has been the official attitude of the leader of the Liberal party since the war began? His attitude has been to educate public opinion in his province, and such education was needed because it had been shamefully poisoned by at least three of the members of the present Government. Mr. Speaker, the sentiments of the leader of the Opposition are well known. They were expressed lately in a manifesto which was issued on the first of January, and from which I may read later on.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Resuming): Mr. Speaker, when the House took recess I was explaining the attitude taken by the leader of the Liberal party during the war, and was stating that his whole object, whilst to strictly observe the truce, was to educate public opinion, in his own province and in the Dominion generally. In his own province where it had been poisoned by three members of the present Government, not to speak of those who have been shelved. Perhaps the House will bear with me if, before giving the poison, I serve the antidote. Let me quote the language of the leader of the Liberal party in his speech in the city of Quebec at the last recruiting meeting ne addressed in that old historic city. I do this, Mr. Speaker, because it has been hinted in the course of this debate, and in the Tory press generally, and on public platforms, that he had not kept the promise which he made some years ago as leader of the Liberal party, that if ever the Empire was in danger, or even faced a time of trial, he would appeal to his fellow-citizens in the province of Quebec to answer the call of duty. Speaking at Quebec only a few weeks ago he said:

> It is not for Britain that Britain is at war to-day. Was it Britain which was invaded in 1914? Was it on Britain that Germany declared war on August 3, 1914? No, it was Britain which on the next day declared war on Germany, because of the invasion of Belgium, and her atrocious attack through Belgium on the heart of France because she stood true to her ally. Our children are to-day shedding their blood on the fields not of Britain, but of France, the land of our very own ancestors. Many have been wounded, many have died, but it was not for Britain that they fought. They gave their lives freely and loyally that France, as part of the comity of nations, might live and continue her role at the head of civilization. And it is for that ideal that I am here to ask young Canadians, and especially young French-Canadians, to take their part in a war which is one for civilization.

It is with such appeals as this that we have been able to muster in the province of Quebec the 35,000 young men who are to-day either at the front or ready to go there.

I was rather surprised the other evening to hear the right hon. the leader of the House (Sir Robert Borden) state that the leader of the Opposition had in one of those speeches mentioned the fact that in 1870 England had not gone to the rescue of France. The right hon. gentleman thought it was very bad form on the part of the leader of the Opposition to speak in that way of the Mother Country's attitude. The right hon. gentleman, if he will pardon my saying so, is rather over sensitive. The attitude of England during the war of 1870, and the consequences of that attitude are well known; it is a matter of history; and the statesmen of England to-day are the first to admit England was wrong in 1870 for not interposing herself between Bismark and Thiers, who then pleaded for France. It is simply a matter of history, just as it is a matter of history that England in 1854 to use the language of Lord Salisbury "backed the wrong horse" in siding against the Russians in the Crimean War. Just as it is a matter of history that England through Lord Salisbury made a blunder when she ceded Heligoland to Germany. But if it is a crime for the right hon. gentleman to refer to such an historical fact as he cited what shall we say about the Montreal Gazette, the best informed Conservative paper in our province, and certainly one of the most moderate in the whole Dominion of Canada? Speaking of the defeat, or I should rather say, the retreat of the Asquith Cabinet, the Gazette said editorially:

> The spectacle presented by the Asquith Government in the first days of August, 1914, was unlike anything that could have been imagined. On August 3, Sir Edward Grey, who also has fallen short of what was expected, came into the House of Commons and announced that Parliament was free to decide what the British attitude in the conflict then beginning wou'd be. Great Britain, he said, had not committed herself to anything but diplomatic support; but the Government had warned the French and German Ambassadors that if war were forced on France public opinion in the British Isles would rally to France. The Government abdicated its leadership when leadership by men who knew or should have known what conditions were was most needed. Never in England's history was there another such spectacle. When France chose war the noise of the yelling London press was taken for the voice of public opinion, and as if there were no hand on the helm the Empire drifted into war. All know the subsequent story.

That is the language, not of the Globe, not of the leader of His Majesty's loyal Opposition, but that of the leading Tory paper as regards the attitude of England, not in regard to the war of 1870, but in regard to the present war. England, according to the Montreal Gazette, did not yield to the voice of public opinion; England yielded to the voice of the yelling London press. That is the language of the loyal Tory press of Canada.

Let me once for all state, on behalf of my fellowmen in the province of Quebec, their real attitude in regard to this war. In their judgment there is but one question before us, and that is the paramount question of the great war which is now raging beyond the seas. It is the question of the participation of Canada in that stupendous struggle. It is, above all, the determination which they share in common with the people of other provinces that the Mother Country and her gallant Allies shall ultimately triumph. That is the opinion of the province of Quebec. The British Empire is made up of various races. We happen to belong to a minority, and we are rather proud to belong to that minority; yes, we are proud of the blood that flows in our veins. Because of that very fact we may perhaps present in a more dispassionate spirit the British point of view, as it appeals to us who are members of the minority. Yes, in the midst of this great war, where freedom is assailed, where all laws are trampled upon, where one man, surrounded by a military caste, backed up by formidable hosts, and seized with the lust of domination, has challenged the world, it is the proud privilege of those who were born and have lived under free British institutions in Canada boldly to proclaim what Britain stands for in the present emergency.

In our judgment, Germany stands at the bar of history. She and she alone is responsible for this awful catastrophe. Why did she precipitate the conflict? The answer is obvious: The German Empire had become too small for its population, and for economic reasons it needed expansion. "Expansion" is not the proper word to use; what Germany had been planning and scheming for during the last half century was nothing less than world-domination, and that will be the verdict of history.

To gratify her insensate ambition she determined to dominate Europe by crushing the small nations, by maiming our old mother country, France, for the second time, and by humbling the British Empire, which has given us and still maintains for us the liberties we enjoy. Her victory, in our judgment, would mean not only the

garrisoning of Europe, but the garrisoning of Canada and possibly of the whole continent of North America. To attain that end she inaugurated a campaign of frightfulness, which, if unchecked, would bring humanity back to the dark ages. What kind of humanity and nationhood has she not violated? She has broken international faith for the sake of getting the first advantage of war—a heinous crime among nations. She has carried on through the war a campaign of frightfulness directed from headquarters, regardless of the virtue of women, the crying appeal of children and the sanctity of the home. She has thus poisoned the wells of her fair fame; she has not fought the fight in broad, square, manly fashion. She has sunken vessels in which thousands of neutrals and non-combatants have been sent to the bottom; she has murdered Captain Fryatt and Edith Cavell. Worst of all is that, by all classes of her people from the bishop of the cathedral to the artisan, every crime, every barbarity her men have committed in the name of the war has been saluted in Germany by the flying of flags and the giving of iron crosses. We know that it is to avenge such appalling crimes that the sons of Britain from every clime, from every Dominion, like the knight errants of old, have been called upon to buckle on their armour. Their object we know is not to conquer new territory; the aim is to crush militarism once for all, to restore small nations to their rights, to make civilization, justice and freedom secure forever. That is the view of the situation held by the people of the province of Quebec.

The tide has now turned and the silver lining of the cloud can be detected. For many long weary months the outlook was far from being bright; there were black days, black moods and a swaying indecision; but under the immense crisis Britain and overseas Britain, France and her Allies, have lifted to a clear determination. It has been stated in our province by the friends of the present Government that England had not done her full duty during the present war. That has been stated over and over again by the Nationalist allies of the hon. gentleman opposite. We know that England has not been deficient. No one I am sure, will say that the British fleet is not a decisive factor in the present war; and thanks to that fleet, a whole gigantic phase of the enemy's life has been suddenly blotted out. It is not only doing all that was expected of it; it has met with an amazing energy and ingenuity new obstacles. Under its protection, the best merchant service of England proceeds as usual. Her ships, those of her Allies and of all neutral countries sail the seven seas. The sleepless vigilance of the grand fleet and its silent victories during this war speak volumes for British efficiency.

On land England, at the beginning of the war was not expected to muster more than 200,000 soldiers, and of all the European countries she alone would not accept the principle of compulsory service: but, after Mons and Le Cateau, where the flower of the British aristocracy so gallantly perished, after the splendid example given so spontaneously by the overseas dominions, the British Parliament enacted a law of compulsory service. England, which, as I said, was not expected to give more than 200,000 men, and possibly less, started to raise an army which has reached the five million mark, and this vast army is rapidly being equipped with arms, guns, ammunition, clothing and food, as no army in the world has been in the past. But that is not all. On England, aided chiefly by America, has fallen the task of supplying, in a large measure, the manufactured necessities of war of her Allies and of some of her dominions, and while thus financing her Allies and her overseas dominions England has been exporting goods at the rate of $2,000,000,000 a year, and conducting a larger than ever increasing proportion of the carrying trade of the world. I have no hesitation in saying that in this battle for freedom, the effort of Great Britain constitutes the most staggering exercise of human energy of which history has any record.

And what of France, the great ally of Britain, in this gigantic struggle? We, in Canada, may speak with pride of the idealism of old France as evidenced by the pioneer days of this continent; but may we not also state that it is the same idealism and the same old spirit which to-day inspires the Frenchmen of the third Republic? The battles of the Marne and of Verdun will ever remain the most flamboyant names in history. Only once or twice in history has the world witnessed such a spectacle of greatness at tension. Everything spiritual in a nation touched with genius has been mobilized. Fineness of feeling, the graces of the intellectual life, clarity of thought, all the playful tender elements of worthy living are burning with a steady light. It is the

fashionable cant of the day to say that a new France has arisen out of the ashes and ruins of the old; that warfare and deadliest peril have created in the breasts of Frenchmen another and nobler spirit of steady valour and stubborn endurance. And to us, this cant of admiration seems even more strange than the malignant misrepresentation which during the last half century pictured the men and women of France as a fickle, emotional race, voluble in peace, but weak in the stress of doubtful, stubborn battle. No, the French nation has not changed in these two years of war. The French nation to-day is exactly what the French nation has been for centuries. The French soldiers have had no new creation of valour and hardihood. The voice of France at Verdun is the voice of France of centuries ago.

Peace proposals, Mr. Speaker, have been mooted. Who believes that peace would be durable if not based upon the success of the Allied cause? To me, the situation is precisely that which the great Pitt, described in one of his greatest speeches, delivered one hundred and sixteen years ago; and the world echoes his words to-day. He said:

> I see no possibility at this moment of concluding such a peace as would justify that liberal intercourse which is the essence of real amity; no chance of terminating the expense or the anxieties of war, or of restoring to us any of the advantages of established tranquility. . . . As a lover of peace, I will not sacrifice it by grasping at the shadow, when the reality is not substantially within my reach. Why, then, do I refuse peace? Because it is deceptive, because it is perilous, because it cannot exist.

Mr. Speaker, the British Empire simply re-echoes the sentiments expressed by this great statesman. It contains the only answer which can be made to appeals coming from Washington or from elsewhere in favour of peace.

I stated a moment ago that the three Nationalist ministers in the present Government had consistently poisoned public opinion in the province of Quebec during the years which preceded the coming of the present party into office, and I referred to the antidote which was contained in the admirable speeches delivered in that province by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition. Is that or is it not a true statement of the case? Let me marshal here a few facts, dates and names, and then the House will judge whether or not the statement be true. As the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) stated this afternoon and yesterday in the admirable speech which he delivered, we know that the Nationalist League was organized in Quebec in March, 1903, under the leadership of Mr. Bourassa. Among the articles of the programme launched by that League can be found the following—it is important to note them, because they give us the background of the agitation which followed:

> 1st. No participation of Canada in Imperial wars outside her territory.
> 2nd. To spurn any attempt at recruiting for British troops.
> 3rd. To oppose the establishment in Canada of a naval school with the help and for the benefit of Imperial authority.

Please mark the words, Mr. Speaker: "To spurn any attempt at recruiting for British troops." How did this article of the Nationalist programme come to life? You will remember, Mr. Speaker—I think you were a member of the House then—the introduction of a resolution during the session of 1909 for the building of a Canadian navy. A resolution was introduced by my friend the present Minister of Trade and Commerce, (Sir George Foster), accepted by the then leader of the Government, the present leader of His Majesty's Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and adopted unanimously. During the session of 1910 a Naval Bill based on that resolution was introduced by the then Prime Minister. Strange to say, it was bitterly opposed by the very man who had introduced the original resolution and who had declared himself in favour of a Canadian navy, manned by Canadian officers and sailors, and flying the Canadian ensign with the British flag. Why was it opposed? Because at that time a tacit alliance had been sealed between the present ministers and their friends who claimed to be the Conservative traditionalists in Canada, and the Nationalist League. The first fruit of that alliance was the victory in Drummond and Arthabaska. It is well that we should remember who were the organizers of that famous election campaign, in which a candidate nominated by the Nationalist party, M. Gilbert, ran against a straight Liberal candidate, M. J. E. Perrault, barrister, from Arthabaska, who declared himself in favour of Canada's helping the Mother Country. Who organized that election for the Nationalists? The late Mr. Monk, the Hon. Mr. Pelletier, ex-Postmaster General, who has been promoted to the Court of the King's Bench in the province of Quebec; Hon. Mr. Nantel, ex-Minister of Inland Revenue, also pro-

moted to the Railway Commission, and Hon. Mr. Coderre, later on Secretary of State, also promoted to a judgeship in the city of Montreal. Who else took part in that famous election? Who delivered fiery speeches? The three present Nationalist ministers in this Government, the Postmaster General (Mr. Blondin), the Secretary of State (Mr. Patenaude), and the probable—it is not very sure—

An hon. MEMBER: Improbable.

Mr. LEMIEUX: —the improbable future Minister of Inland Revenue. Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that the appeals they made were justifiable? Would any one say to-day that those appeals were such as should earn the consideration of true and loyal subjects in this country? Let me quote one of the speeches delivered by the present Postmaster General. Speaking at a political meeting at St. Louis de Blandford, Quebec, on October 25, 1910, the Hon. Postmaster General used the following language:

> You are intimidating the people in waving the British flag and adding that we must contribute always and everywhere to the defence of that protector of our constitutional liberties; but we will not be made to forget that in 1837 it was necessary to bore holes in it in order to breathe the atmosphere of liberty.
>
> The English have never done anything for the French-Canadians. We do not owe them anything. The only liberties which we enjoy have been snatched. England has sown the world with hatred, quarrels and wars. We have had enough of England and the English.

I shall be reminded perhaps that the Postmaster General, when he was appointed Deputy Speaker of this House, suddenly denied ever having used that language. I shall observe that when he was receiving the loaves and fishes it was an easy matter for him to deny. What was the language of the present Imperialist candidate in the county of Dorchester, the present defender of the British Constitution and British liberties as against that infamous Lucien Cannon? Speaking on October 21, 1910, M. Sevigny said:

> The Laurier Cabinet is a Cabinet of Imperialists who want to sacrifice Canada's interest and plunge us into wars with which we have nothing to do. What has England done for you? She has no need of your help. You must protest against helping England in her wars.

I wonder if the Ottawa Journal or the Journal-Press will publish that to-morrow morning. Later on he said at Arthabaska, on November 1—All Saints Day—1910, when commenting on that provision of the Naval Act by which it is enacted that the control of the navy is vested in the King. He said:

> The navy belongs to His Majesty. Is that a Canadian navy? Who is His Majesty? Have we any Majesty here?

You are surprised that there are people in the province of Quebec who are not very anxious to enlist to fight the wars of Great Britain and the wars of the Empire when they see the men who preached that doctrine promoted from year to year to what is best in the Government of the day. Mr. Speaker, public opinion was aroused. But that is not all. Mr. Sévigny did not speak in Arthabaska only. Speaking on the 26th of July, 1911, at Ste. Flavie, in the county of Rimouski, he used the following language:

> When they talk of war with Germany, Russia, and probably France they would like to force Canada, which has always been happy and peaceful, to give cannon and a navy in order to make war against such great countries. Well, we do not want our money to be spent, because it belongs to our people and to our country. It is to you electors to obtain from us that this iniquitous naval law be repealed by sending to the House of Commons true patriots and not men deprived of honour like Brodeur, Lemieux and others.

Mr. Speaker, the campaign in Drummond and Arthabaska aroused the feelings of the country, and one of the leading English organs of Montreal wired, the day before the election, to the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) quoting the speeches delivered by the Blondins, the Sévignys, the Pelletiers, the Patenaudes and the others, asking his opinion about that campaign. What was the answer of the Minister of Trade and Commerce? "The first duty of Drummond and Arthabaska is to defeat Laurier." That was the typical answer, the loyal answer, of the present Minister of Trade and Commerce. And on the night of the election the whip of the Tory party, Mr. George Taylor, now Senator Taylor, wired his congratulations to Mr. Gilbert who carried the election—and I might remind you that when Mr. Gilbert was introduced in the House of Commons by the late Mr. Monk and perhaps by the present Prime Minister, he took his seat—at your left to-night? No, Mr. Speaker. He went and sat with the faithful at the then left, he sat with the good Tory members of the House of Commons, and he voted with the Tory party as long as that Parliament lasted. He has since been appointed by the Minister of Inland Revenue as revenue collector in the town of Victoriaville.

That election came in 1911, and as was stated this evening by the member for

Bonaventure, it was arranged that a double-barrelled policy should be preached by the Tory party. In the English-speaking provinces reciprocity was the bugaboo, but in the province of Quebec, it was the Naval Bill. Two committees were formed in Montreal, one presided over by my good friend from St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames), and the other presided over by the late Mr. Monk, one Tory committee and one Nationalist committee. And, as my hon. friend stated this afternoon, Le Devoir was circulated in the English-speaking portions of the country when there was a sprinkling of French votes. Help was given to Le Devoir with genuine Tory funds by my friend the present member for St. Antoine. I remember my colleague the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) coming to me one day and saying, in his mild language: How is it that in and around Edmonton, where there are many French-Canadian electors, Le Devoir is circulated by the carload? Who pays for this distribution of Le Devoir? I did not know then that Le Devoir was circulated through the good offices of the present knight who represents St. Antoine in this House. Well, Sir, the elections were won by the alliance, a cabinet was formed, and it is well known that Messrs. Bourassa and Lavergne were offered portfolios, which they refused because they were sincere, whilst others, as I said a moment ago, accepted the loaves and fishes. Certainly Mr. Bourassa was not satisfied with pounding his views in Quebec; he was invited to go on the border land. He went into northern Ontario, at the instigation of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, and on the request of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Smyth). Mr. Speaker, it might be interesting to read some of the telegrams that were exchanged during that election. Mr. Bourassa, as I said a moment ago, was sincere; he meant what he said. But he was not sure that those who were so keen to invite him to speak were as sincere, and, therefore, he exacted pledges from them. So Mr. Charles McCrea, of Sudbury, Ont., was addressed as follows on the 8th of September, 1911, by Mr. George Gordon, now Senator Gordon:—

I certainly am opposed to reciprocity and will support request for appeal of Naval Policy and a referendum to the people, no matter who is Premier.

You remember that Mr. Bourassa and the Nationalists were opposed to the Laurier Naval policy and to the equally nefarious policy of the then Mr. Borden, now Sir Robert Borden. Mr. Smyth, the member for Algoma, was forced also to give a pledge. He wired to Mr. McCrea—evidently Mr. McCrea had the confidence of Mr. Bourassa. Mr. Smyth's telegram was dated Providence Bay—quite an ominous name—on September 28, 1911. " I am opposed to the reciprocity pact "—that was for the English-speaking electors of the constituency.

I am opposed to Reciprocity pact. I am opposed to Naval Policy of Liberal Government. I will support request for repeal of same, and referendum to the people on Naval question, no matter who is Premier.

There were some doubting Thomases in the constituency. There were some good old Tories who were rather nervous at the sight of Mr. Bourassa in the constituency; and they began to howl, and to howl very vehemently. Mr. Gordon had to come to the rescue, and he wired: "The Liberals are blaming us"—of course he had to put it on the Liberals as usual; one would think we were reading the Journal Press—

The Liberals are blaming us for bringing the Nationalist leader here. I am willing to take full responsibility and to express my full admiration for Bourassa. I have no use for the navy and I think Reciprocity is a baneful policy. I give Monsieur Bourassa the keys of the district.

What did Mr. Bourassa say? In a statement published a year or so ago he said:

Mr. Cochrane, usually very shy of his compliments, has since done me the honour of telling me that my arguments had made a deep impression, deeper still among English-speaking than French-speaking people.

Mr. MARCIL: Mr. Gordon resigned.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, he resigned, and was promoted to the Senate, if it is promotion—and one would think it was, judging from the anxiety displayed by so many members of the Tory party. Five gentlemen only have been appointed, Mr. Speaker, and I have met in the lobbies of this House some members grinding their teeth and willing to give but one chance to the master of the Administration. If they are not appointed before the adjournment to fill some of the vacancies, I verily think the Government will be defeated.

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend had better give the names.

An hon. MEMBER: You can give the names.

Mr. ROGERS: No, I cannot.

Mr. GRAHAM: Do not commit yourselves.

Mr. LEMIEUX: After the elections had been won in that way, the members of the new government, of course, held divergent views on the essential issues which had been fought at the polls; and when they were sworn in, one could not help remembering the incident referred to by my classical friend, the ex-Secretary of State; one could not help remembering what Lord Melbourne once said to his colleagues: "Gentlemen, it does not matter what views we hold in the Cabinet, but, mind, we must hold the same views before the public." In the Borden Government are Royalists and Republicans. There is a combination of the Guelphs and the Ghibellines, of the Lancasters and the Yorks, the two Roses, the Red and the White; an unholy alliance indeed. It reminded me of the very composite character of Lord Chatham's administration as described by Burke in one of his great speeches. Speaking of that administration, in which there were Whigs and Tories, " the King's Friends," as they were called, because in those days they claimed to be the King's only friends, Burke said:

He made an administration so checkered and speckled; he put together a piece of joinery, so crossly indented and whimsically dovetailed; a cabinet so variously inlaid; such a piece of diversified mosaic; such a tesselated pavement without cement; here a bit of black stone, and there a bit of white; patriots and courtiers, King's friends and republicans; Whigs and Tories; treacherous friends and enemies; that it was indeed a very curious show; but utterly unsafe to touch and insecure to stand.

Mr. Speaker, that is the best description I could give—and I thank the immortal Burke for affording it to me—of the present Tory-Nationalist Government. The Tory party is not unlike the untamed horse immortalized by Byron in "Mazeppa," the untamed horse which rushed out into the passes of the mountains, through the vales and across the fords, but could not unshackle itself because it bore the weight of Mazeppa on its back. The present administration is saddled with the Nationalist party, and it will carry it until the day of judgment; and when that day comes, both the horse and Mazeppa will be torn into pieces. The Tory-Nationalist party at present also reminds one of the robe of Nessus. The Tories cannot tear it away without suffering excruciating pain, and the supreme pain of a Tory is the loss of office.

Some people are very much excited over the Dorchester election. I know that there are a number of Orange representatives in this House. It is their right to belong to Orange lodges,—I myself would like to be invited to speak before an Orange audience at times. Be that as it may, I call their attention to a statement made by the Sentinel, the official organ of Orangeism in Canada. The Sentinel of January 25, 1917, contains the following, which I specially direct to the attention of my hon. friends, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers), the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen).

Mr. GRAHAM: The Minister of the Canadian navy.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, of the Canadian navy, and I promise that I will not speak of the obsolescence of the Canadian navy. I call their attention to this statement published by the Sentinel, and I hope that to-morrow the chain of papers from the Atlantic to the Pacific which seems to receive its inspiration from Ottawa will publish it. Would you believe it, Mr. Speaker, the Sentinel "views with satisfaction the nomination of an opponent to Mr. Sévigny in Dorchester."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Sentinel says:

If he is defeated, it will open the way for an English-speaking member of the House to become Postmaster-General. Besides, it is well to have a show-down with the Nationalists without delay. The sooner the country is made aware of the course this type of politician intends to take the better it will be all round.

Let me repeat these words: "The sooner the country is made aware of the course this type of politician intends to take, the better it will be all round."

Mr. ROGERS: That refers to Cannon.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Sentinel of January 25 contains another very interesting statement, and I call upon my hon. friends who belong to Orange lodges to listen to this:

The by-election in Dorchester, Quebec, supplies an informing spectacle for the electors of Canada. The candidates are Albert Sevigny, the new Minister of Inland Revenue, and Lucien Cannon, who sat for that constituency in the Quebec Legislature. Mr. Sevigny won his seat in Dorchester in 1911 by playing the Nationalist game. His appeal to the electors of that county was upon lines dictated by Mr. Bourassa. On the present occasion he finds it impossible to talk Nationalism because he is a member of the Borden Government, and must defend the policy of that Administration. In 1911, he was the candidate of a party

which was not in power, and played the Nationalist to get votes. The situation is different to-day. He must be more circumspect in his utterances. No doubt that is why he places a greater restraint upon himself than is found necessary by his opponent, Mr. Cannon.

Ah, Mr. Speaker, you have it all in the Orange Sentinel. They played the game in 1911, they played the Nationalist game and to-day they affect to be horrified at the idea that Mr. Albert Sévigny should be opposed by one of those disloyal Liberals in the province of Quebec.

I remember during the naval debate the speech delivered by the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). He heard all these quotations in the House, he listened to them and he looked somewhat despairing at times. How could he get out of it? As the Sentinel states here, it was only too true that they had played the Nationalist game in order to reach the ministerial benches. But, he took his courage in both hands and bluntly said: Yes, there was an alliance, but who won?—and he concluded by stating that the Tory party had had the better of it. I differ from the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. Who won? Duplicity won and Canada lost. But what about the poor people of the province of Quebec who were led astray by the colleagues of my hon. friend? Their lot is a sorry one indeed and I pity the electors of Dorchester. They are traduced to-day by those very men who, five years ago, bargained in hard cash for the support of Mr. Bourassa, who, according to the Toronto News, spoke in Nipissing like a man inspired, whose words and sentences glowed like coals of fire. This is the same Nationalist leader who, according to Sir John Willison to-day, grows contemptible as he grows in experience. Of course, Mr. Bourassa is no more in alliance with the Tory party. He is still a Nationalist, but Sir John Willison, who has been knighted by the Tory party, thinks that Mr. Bourassa grows contemptible as he grows in experience. Yet, the good honest people of Ontario are led to believe that the great realities of the war, its needs and duties, are not grasped as speedily in Quebec as they ought to be. Notwithstanding the despicable campaign of 1911, waged by these three Cabinet ministers, Quebec, I am proud to say, is honourably represented in the trenches and at the front. Let us talk sense——

9 p.m.

Mr. ROGERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If my hon. friend will explain why the National Service is opposed in Winnipeg, Regina and in some other cities in the West, while the labour unionists in Montreal of French-Canadian origin are standing for it, I am sure it will be very interesting to the House. Recruiting is active in urban centres. It is not in rural centres. Where you have industrial centres you have active recruiting. The French-Canadian is not militaristic. During the early days of British domination it is known, and you can verify it by reading any elementary history of Canada, the French Canadian farmers were disarmed. They were ordered by the authorities to give up the arms that were in their possession and for a hundred years they have enjoyed uninterrupted peace. It is not surprising that you do not find within the province of Quebec the same military spirit that you find amongst people who have come from Europe, who have been brought up in military environment. The French Canadian is above all a tiller of the soil. Remember also, that there is no immigration coming from the old country to replenish the homes of Quebec, whilst during the past twenty-five or thirty years there has been in the English speaking provinces, and especially in Ontario and the West, a steady stream of British immigration. Therefore, it is easier, amongst the newcomers, to find recruits than it is in the rural sections of Quebec.

I have not the exact figures but I take the figures which have been given by the press. By the press here in Ottawa it was stated two or three weeks ago that according to our rosters there were something like 35,000 French Canadians at the front or who had enlisted and were ready to go. This figure includes not only the soldiers who actually bear arms, but also those in the hospital and auxiliary services. Senator Mason last year in the Senate gave figures which established that sixty per cent of the recruits were to be found amongst the British born and that forty per cent must be divided between the foreign born, the Anglo-Canadian born and the French-Canadian born. When you come to analyse these figures and to make up the averages you find, as I stated a moment ago, that the showing of the province of Quebec is quite honourable. I regret that in the press of this province and elsewhere Quebec is being branded as a province of slackers and shirkers. I make bold to say that with proper recruiting arrangements, and proper recruiting agents, goodly numbers of men could still be got in the province of Quebec, if the Government wish to carry out their promise

of giving to the Mother Country 500,000 men. But do not send into the province of Quebec as recruiting agents your three Cabinet ministers, who in 1911 preached the very contrary doctrine to the people of that province.

Mr. REID: Why don't you do it?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Have I ever refused to deliver a recruiting speech in the province of Quebec? From the very day that war was declared I have been at the service of my fellowmen. Who recruited the 22nd Battalion, which fought so nobly at Courcelette? Sir, I claim some credit for having helped to recruit that battalion. I joined my humble voice with that of the late Postmaster General and the right hon. leader of the Opposition, and in less than three months we had raised a splendid regiment. I was also elected chairman of the civilian committee that helped to raise the Asselin Regiment, and in less than three months we had raised that battalion, which, I regret to say, instead of being sent to the front was sent to Bermuda to do the work of the negroes there. It should have been despatched at once to England. If that had been done, it would now be in the battle line. I addressed meeting after meeting, appealing for recruits. No less than three weeks ago I addressed the people of Montreal East, and urged them to sign the National Service cards. I explained to them that National Service did not mean conscription, but the mobilization of the economic wealth of the country. Sir, have I done nothing to help in recruiting? My nephew, a youth of 22, was killed at the Battle of Ypres, a cousin is serving at the front at the present time, and I have given my only boy, 18 years old, to the service of His Majesty. That is my answer to the hon. gentleman. But I have too much respect for the decencies of public life and too much regard for the common sense of my fellow-men in the province of Quebec to parade myself with the three Nationalists who appealed to that province, not with the hope of getting recruits, but with the hope of being interrupted and mobbed, in order to make votes in Ontario for the Tory party. What happened in Montreal the other day when the right hon. the Prime Minister went to Montreal, accompanied by my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Bennett), and by the present Secretary of State (Mr. Patenaude)? I say without hesitation that the right hon. gentleman was given more than a fair hearing; he was cheered and cheered to the echo, as the leader, not of his party, but of the country, by the French-Canadians who were massed in that large hall. The hon. member for Calgary also addressed the meeting and received a very cordial reception. But the moment the Secretary of State appeared on the platform he was hissed into silence. Why? Because the people were disgusted at the idea that a gentleman who had branded the Tory and Liberal parties as traitors in 1911, because, forsooth, they stood for King and Empire, had the audacity to come before the people and preach the very contrary doctrine to that he preached in 1911. What happened a few hours afterwards? The Prime Minister went to old city of Quebec accompanied by my hon. friend from Calgary and by the late Postmaster General. The Prime Minister was listened to there with careful attention, and was supported by the Prime Minister of the province of Quebec, Sir Lomer Gouin, whose son is leaving for the front in a few days. The hon. member for Calgary was given a good reception, as was also the late Postmaster General, who, although not persona grata in the province of Quebec, was none the less respected, because the people knew that his ideas and principles of to-day were the ideas and principles which he had always cherished and expounded before them. They knew he was no traitor. Do not be mistaken; do not be led astray with the false notion that some hon. gentlemen have, that the speeches of the three Nationalist members of the Cabinet will help the cause of recruiting in the province of Quebec. The habitants have common sense and good judgment. But enough of this subject.

Let me say a word or two about the Imperial conference. I am glad that the right hon. the Prime Minister should have accepted the suggestion which was made by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition. We know that the right hon. gentleman will nobly represent the greatest of the overseas dominions at that important conference. I notice that his presence at that conference is made necessary, to use the language of the speech from the Throne, "for war purposes only." I am glad that the right hon. gentleman will not commit Canada to anything at the conference except what is regarded as necessary for the winning of the war. But I am rather surprised that in connection with that conference the Northcliffe press has evolved a scheme of reorganzing the Empire. I know there are people who are not satisfied with the present condition of the Empire. There are some

ambitious people who are uneasy at the Empire's present position, and wish to reorganize it. It is easy to reorganize the British Empire, according to them. They take their pen and a few sheets of paper, frame a new constitution, publish books, and believe that with the dissemination of their ideas the Empire will at once be reorganized.

May I give, first of all, the sound of that alarm bell which preceded the invitation to that conference. I notice that in the month of October, Lord Northcliffe, who is so busy defeating Liberal Governments in the old country, sent out a series of cables, which bear a marked resemblance whether they are circulated in South Africa, New Zealand, Newfoundland, Australia, or Canada. One of these cables reads as follows:—

I voice the widespread feelings of the Canadians, South Africans and Australians here that it is for the dominions, with the breath of broader life, to revivify and give fresh boldness to authority. Fresh blood from Greater Britain is urgently needed in the central administration now.

The moment has come for courage, greater campaigns and real initiative. Will the dominions show the way?

About that time appeared the book of Mr. Lionel Curtis, The Problem of the Commonwealth, in which he states bluntly that the overseas dominions—

—may manage their own domestic affairs, regulate their commerce, create forces by land and sea, and do anything they please short of attempting to handle for themselves the ultimate issues of national life and death. Those issues, the moment they are raised, must be left to a Government in which they have no more voice than the peoples of India, of Egypt, or of Fiji. So far as the first, last, and greatest of all national interests are concerned, they are not self-governing dominions. They are simply dependencies, and no thinking man can face this conclusion and yet believe that communities like Canada and Australia can long continue to accept that position.

It is strange that a very noisy minority on the other side think that we are absolutely dissatisfied in Canada, Australia and elsewhere, and that there is an urgent need of reorganizing the Empire in order to centralize the army and the navy in Downing street, and possibly to enact a hostile tariff against the world.

The Nation, a good radical review published in London, speaking about the purpose of the Imperial Conference, contains the following: Of course, I would not myself offer such comments, because, forsooth, I should be considered as being very disloyal.

Mr. HAZEN: Is the hon. member reading from the National Review?

Mr. LEMIEUX: No, from the Nation. It says:—

The immediate practical purpose of this Imperial Conference is a little harder to discern than its emotional significance. It may suggest in a subtle, non-committal way to his new patrons that they need fear from him no inconvenient enthusiasm for any constructive idea of international peace, and it does this without wounding the feelings of the rest of the nation. But what is the immediate purpose? The immediate purpose is apparently to enlarge the war cabinet. We had been led to understand that the Empire would be imperilled, and victory jeopardized, if the War Council were to consist of more than three men —Mr. George and two others. We saw with alarm that it expanded to five. It will presently be swollen by the addition of another six or seven, who are to attend its sessions continuously and rank with its members, apparently giving a majority to the representatives of the dominions. There will be some able figures among the colonial premiers. But with the exception of General Botha, we should doubt if any of them will bring an appreciable contribution to its military wisdom. It is doubtful whether the Borden Government stands for Canada in any other sense than as a stop-gap to the coming Liberal reaction. Mr. Hughes (if he is still Prime Minister of a Commonwealth which has rejected his policy by a mass vote) may have energy and a certain facile eloquence. But it is a strange Cabinet which admits him as an adviser on European strategy and statecraft and excludes Mr. Balfour.

I myself dare not make such comments. They are made by a good old English radical editor, and there seems to be much common sense in the lines I have just quoted.

Sir, participation in the wars of the Empire overseas must be settled by the Parliament and people of Canada as such wars arise, and not by a war council in Downing street. There are too many men anxious to rebuild the Empire. Lord Derby, possibly the best friend of the present Governor General of Canada, speaking at a farewell banquet given to the Duke of Devonshire in London, used the following language, which I commend to all the busybodies who wish to frame a new constitution for the British Empire:—

New relations may arise after the war between ourselves and the dominions, but none can be as strong as these which are binding us. now. People talk glibly of a new constitution. Well, I am a Conservative, and the old Constitution is good enough for me when it gives such results as during the present war. Anything that can bind us together more closely, let it be done, but do not let us think by making a cast iron Constitution for ourselves or the dominions we are going to increase the affection they have for us.

This is good reasoning, which I commend to the right hon. gentleman who will represent us at the next Imperial Conference.

One other word from a little book which I read a few years ago, which was published by the famous English journalist, Mr. J. A. Spender, under the very captious title, The Foundations of British Policy. He says this, which applies exactly to the present situation:—

> The great thing for the moment is that the self-governing states are becoming thoroughly alive to the importance of this question, and our business is to make it easy for them to go forward. That we certainly shall not do, if we present them with the cut-and-dried logical dilemmas which are so much in favour with certain schools of strategists and Imperialists. Either, say these people, you must come under the control of the Admiralty or your navies will be useless in time of war; either your support must be unconditional or the Imperial Government must disregard it as a factor in its offensive scheme; either you must do more and come closer, or you may as well do nothing for the real purposes of war. If these logical martinets had their way, there might be an Imperial fleet directed from Whitehall; but there would not long be a British Empire.

Again I commend those words of wisdom to the re-organizers of the British Empire.

In conclusion, Sir, let me say that I fully agree with the paragraph in the Address having reference to the fiftieth anniversary of our Confederation. Some years ago I moved a resolution in the old House of Commons in anticipation of that event, and I suggested that a fitting commemoration would be the holding of a universal exhibition in Canada. But war has upset this plan, and to-day we are left with no programme for a fitting and proper commemoration of that great event. May I make the suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that no monument, no spectacular demonstration can make more for the welfare of the Dominion that the healthy movement which I am pleased to state has been inaugurated by the Fourth Estate in this country: I mean the "bonne entente" movement. Much credit is due to the British-Canadian journalist who has started the "bonne entente" movement; I refer to Mr. Arthur Hawkes, one of the editors of the Toronto Star. That movement, which has already budded into life, will, I believe, continue and will grow in proportion as the months and years roll on. There could be no better commemoration of the founding of our Confederation that this "bonne entente" movement. It should be promoted and firmly rooted in Canada. There should also be more intercourse between the east and the west. Mr. Speaker, we need no monument to celebrate this fiftieth anniversary of the union of the Canadian provinces it we but live up to the ideals of the Fathers of Confederation, which ideals have been revivified by the "bonne entente".

Mr. Speaker, when the new Parliament Buildings shall have risen from the ashes of the old, I hope that on its portals there shall be inscribed the watchword of the Scotch Highlanders when they were fighting with the French in France against a common enemy—"bon accord." Let us fervently hope that the star of union, harmony and justice will soon rise over Canada's fair land.

Mr. JOHN H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I wish to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your promotion to the Chair. It is no small honour to be the Speaker of the Canadian House of Commons. If I remember rightly, you are the first Nova Scotian who has had the honour of occupying that position, and we on this side of the House who have come from that province feel that we have some share in the honour that has come to you. I feel sure, Sir, that you will prove yourself to be worthy of the long line of distinguished men who have occupied that position in the past. I trust that you will have no occasion, however, during the present session of Parliament to put any of us on this side of the House in the Tower, or to use that weapon of political warfare known as the guillotine which the Government has placed in your hands.

In the Speech from the Throne reference has been made to the celebration of the national jubilee of this Dominion. We all agree that such an important event as the completion of the first fifty years of our history is one that should not go unnoticed. I trust, however, that no gaudy or expensive display will be thought of, for such a thing would be out of keeping at the present time. All good citizens are thinking these days of how they may best play their part in the great struggle in which the nation is engaged. Permit me to suggest, Sir, that the occasion be used to call for a very large contribution—I do not know how much but would suggest fifty millions of dollars—to equip and endow a home for battered and disabled soldiers, somewhat after the plan of the Chelsea Hospital in London, which is one of the great institutions of that great city. That hospital was built some 240 years ago, and it has been one of the glories of the British Empire that they have always taken good care of the veterans who have risked their lives in the Empire's cause. There is room in that hospital for about

540 pensioners, each one of whom has his own room, which is his home. He has in that room his own furniture, books and pictures. He is at liberty to go and come when he pleases. Attendants bring him his meals, if he would rather have them in his own room than in the general dining-room. He can go away for two or three months, if he wishes, and visit his friends. This room is his home, he is entitled to occupy it for life, and he is among his old comrades. In connection with the Chelsea Hospital is a chapel in which are hung the flags that have been captured by the veterans in the various battles in which they have figured on behalf of the Empire, and trophies of war are hung around the hall. Many of these men are unfit to do any kind of work. This hospital is open only to men who have distinguished themselves in battle and who have lost their sight or limbs in defence of the Empire. One of the most interesting sights that I saw at the Coronation ceremony in 1911 was a group of old soldiers who were standing at the end of the street called Shoe Lane, waiting for the King's procession to go by. These old fellows were battered and broken; some of them had lost arms or legs and some of them were blind. Some fifteen of them were grouped at this point, ready to salute the King as he passed, and the King stopped his carriage to speak to them. I afterwards learned that they were inmates of Chelsea Hospital and that they were the sole survivors of the Light Brigade. I do not suggest that this hospital which I am advocating should be available for all wounded soldiers or that it should in any sense take the place of the pension system. The pension system would suffice for the majority of cases. Among the four hundred thousand men who have enlisted, many of whom will be wounded, there will be broken and battered men, and lonely men, who will not have any families of their own, and they will be more contented among their own comrades at a place like this. Then, too, it seems to me that this would be a fitting memorial for the Canadian people to erect in memory of the war. The greatest achievement that Canada has yet won has been the part that she has taken in this war. It is more important, to my mind, to commemorate this than to commemorate the Jubilee. The very fact that in this country of free institutions we have been able to recruit between three hundred thousand and four hundred thousand men without any compulsion, is to my mind one of the triumphs of democracy; and this would be a fitting way to commemorate it. It would also be an opportunity for some of the older men among us, who are too old to fight, to contribute towards the comfort of those men who have sacrificed so much for us.

Mr. Speaker, this debate would be much more interesting to me if hon. gentlemen opposite would take a more active part in it. What is the reason that there is no response from the other side of the House? Hon. gentlemen on this side have raised some very important questions. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has attacked the military record of this Government; he has raised such important questions as military promotions, whether they are made on merit or by favour. He has also raised the question of the treatment of the sick and wounded as dealt with in Dr. Bruce's report. These vital questions call for some answer from the leaders of the Government, but we have not had that response from them which we are entitled to expect. It looks to me as if when my hon. friend from Pictou spoke, all the big batteries on the other side were silenced. We have had some bombardment from the smaller mortars and machine guns, but we should like to hear from the big batteries, we should like to have some answer to these accusations, if there is any answer possible. It is awkward for us on this side of the House, as no man wants to be caught thrashing a dead donkey.

However, in this debate, the one overshadowing question is the war. The Empire is at war, and it is at war with the greatest military power in the world. When the Empire is at war, Canada is at war. This war has already lasted two and a half years, and the end is not yet in sight. We have three thousand miles between ourselves and the seat of the contest; the enemy has not yet knocked at our gates, but why? Because the strong arm of Great Britain and the strong arm of France are keeping him back, and because the British Navy still rules the seas. This war is not Great Britain's war any more than it is our war. This battle line, extending over these vast plains and along the river banks and the foot-hills of the mountains for thousands of miles on the eastern and western fronts is our battle line; and the result of this conflict is just as important for Canada as it is for Great Britain, or for France, or for Belgium. It is not a question of doing our share. I have seen that suggested in cer-

tain newspapers and by certain speakers. I do not look at it in that way. It is not a question of counting up what our share is, but it is one of winning in the fight; it is a question for us of doing whatever is necessary to obtain a complete victory. I was very much pleased the other day to read an interview by Sir Gilbert Parker, given to a New York newspaper. This is what he said:

> There will be no end to this war without victory to the Allies. England will win or perish.
>
> "I have not changed my mind," he said. "I look for peace this autumn—or sooner."
>
> He spoke of the drain upon English resources, of the toll of life and the outpouring of money. The war is costing England £6,000,000 a day, he said. How long can England stand this drain on her resources? he was asked.
>
> "Just longer than any other nation fighting" was the calm rejoinder. "In spite of the smallness of our nation we have a reservoir of imperial strength that is greater than the newly created empire of Germany. And don't forget this: In Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa there are four confederations with unlimited resources, ready to mortgage the last man and the last dollar of their possibilities. Don't ever forget in regard to this war that what was believed to be the weakness of England—a loosely organized empire—has proved to be of monumental strength."

I have no doubt that Sir Gilbert Parker in that statement voiced the sentiments of the British people, and, at the same time, the sentiments of the Canadian people.

Reference has been made frequently in this debate to the splendid record made by Canadian soldiers at the front. There is nothing too good to say about those brave fellows. Some of them have won promotion and military honours on the battlefield; others are returning home, maimed and broken; others will never return. But it is for us to cherish their memory and to do anything that we can do to show that we are worthy of the sacrifices that they have made for us. We are all proud of them, and I know that whatever the future has in store for us, we can depend that the boys at the front will do their duty. To-day people are asking themselves everywhere if we are worthy of the sacrifices that are being made for us. Men have died in France and in Flanders, in Galipoli and on the Tigris, and on the high seas. They have died in tens of thousands, they have staked their lives and their hopes. What for? Surely not alone in order that we, who are left at home, might be spared what they have suffered. We should be unworthy to be citizens of the country for which these men gave their lives unless their sacrifice made us better men, willing, as they were willing, to sacrifice all for the common good.

Referring to the military record of the Government, I am not inclined to be too severe upon them. I know that they have had their own difficulties. I am inclined to agree with the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), who said that they were doing their best. But, at the same time, if that is so it furnishes to my mind the very strongest argument why there should be, with as little delay as possible, a reorganization or a complete change.

Some hon. gentlemen seem to deprecate all criticism in connection with the management of the war. Let me say that if the reputation of this Government was beyond suspicion, like Cæsar's wife, they would welcome criticism from any quarter. We on this side of the House do not look for perfection in the ranks of this Government. We expect mistakes to be made, mistakes of judgment; but we have a right to demand certain things, and those things we always will demand. In the first place, we want prompt decision whenever a matter of importance comes up, especially in regard to military affairs. In the second place, war appointments should be made on merit and not by favouritism. In the third place, there should be no party patronage. In the fourth place, there should be absolute honesty in the disbursement of every dollar of public money.

The motto of the Liberal party from the inception of the war has been: millions for the war, but not a dollar for graft. Patronage is bad enough, but there are certain things that are even worse in our circumstances than patronage. The leader of the Opposition struck a very important note of which the people of this country have been taking notice. He said that one of the great sins of the present Government was its indecision and lack of leadership. I submit, Sir, that the point was well taken, and that there is evidence to go to the jury. In England only a few weeks ago, they deposed a great man because he was lacking in certain qualities required in a leader of a Government in time of war; and if it was necessary to do that in England, why should we hesitate to do it in Canada, if we can secure more efficiency by doing it? Let me ask this question: Is there at present any driving force in this Government in regard to our military affairs? If so, where is it? Our military energies are scattered here and there. We have a War Minister in London, and no person seems to have defined with any exactitude his duties. We have also, if I remember

rightly, a Military Council in London. We have also a Military Council at Ottawa. We have an Under Secretary of War who is travelling a good deal, from place to place, and I believe, carries about his office in his beaver hat. We have a National Service Commission and a Munitions Board, also various other commissions. Then we have the Minister of Militia himself and his departmental staff. You will see, Mr. Speaker, that the military affairs of this country have been spread out so thin that instead of a clear-cut forward policy we have drifted into a condition of what I will call sprawling incohesiveness. Lord Macaulay says that battles have been won under bad generals, but that never in the history of the world was a victory won under a debating society, especially when the debate lasted for four months.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition referred to the internal dissensions of the Government, and also to the lack of leadership. The Prime Minister in his reply did not deny the internal dissensions but he took issue with the leader of the Opposition on the question of the lack of leadership. The Prime Minister evidently regards himself as a man of decision. The proof that the Prime Minister gave that he was a man who could arrive at a quick decision was one particular instance in his own experience. He said that when the war broke out in August, 1914, he decided at once, without any reference to his Cabinet, that Canada would participate in the struggle. I am quite willing to give him credit for having made that decision promptly, but that is not sufficient. One case of prompt decision does not prove anything. The statesman who promptly declares that he will go to war, and then hesitates about the means of carrying on the war may become a very dangerous leader, and may bring disaster to the country. What then is the evidence of indecision? The most direct and convincing evidence is furnished by the Cabinet itself. No one can read the correspondence that passed between the Prime Minister and the ex-Minister of Militia without being convinced on that score. The ex-Minister of Militia was on the inside and knew what was going on. He gives us one notable example. He says that the second contingent was delayed for four months while the Government was fighting over a question of patronage, a petty question as to whether or not certain people were to get commissions out of the purchase of motor trucks. Let me quote his exact words so that there may be no mistake:

> I have closed my eyes to the petty intrigues and ambitions about me. It is not necessary to analyze, in detail, all disappointing matters in my association with you.
>
> I have yet to learn where once the Finance Minister of Canada brought before Council any proposed loan for the Dominion of Canada or any single important act concerning the administration of that department. The same observations apply to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. It is difficult for me to recall where you have actively supported me in the passage of any Order-in-Council concerning the upbuilding of the Militia when opposed by two members of the Cabinet actually antagonistic to anything proposed by me. As you are aware, it took up four months, in the midst of this great war, to fight through the principle of purchasing, for the Second Division, trucks at the lowest wholesale prices, instead of allowing large commissions to local agents who have had nothing whatever to do with securing the orders.

In this paragraph we have the statement of the ex-Minister of Militia that these gentlemen were actually fighting over who would get the graft arising from the purchase of these trucks. The innocent people of this country thought that the fighting was going on over in Flanders, but we have, Sir, the humiliating spectacle of fifteen Cabinet ministers in the Council Chamber in the Eastern Block chewing one another's ears for four months over this petty question of whose friends would get these commissions, while all the time thirty thousand soldiers were marking time at Valcartier or some other military camp, and waiting until the wrangle was over.

To show the utter lack of leadership in the Cabinet the ex-Minister of Militia goes further. It appears from this letter that the Prime Minister had complained to the Minister of Militia of the conduct of other ministers. The ex-Minister of Militia says:

> You instanced the Post Office Department, the Railway Department and the Public Works Department, where projects had been undertaken without authority by Order in Council, and I remember distinctively you stated that some boats had been purchased and other large expenditures incurred without your knowing anything about it.

If we are to believe what General Hughes says, if we are to credit his statements, these ministers were allowed to do just about what they pleased, and were absolutely without any Cabinet control. The Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries were incurring large expenditures without referring them to the Cabinet, thus showing that there was no leadership or control at all,

so far as the large expenditures of the country were concerned.

Take the question of the Ross rifle, and you will find there a glaring case of incompetence and indecision. The best judges were surely the men on the firing line who were using that rifle. As early as June, 1915,, Sir John French condemned the Ross rifle for the following reasons:

(1) That the Ross rifle could not be relied upon to work smoothly with the ammunition then available, and

(2) The want of confidence in the Ross rifle which a large number of the Canadian infantry felt was evidenced by the fact that 3,000 of them had re-armed themselves with Lee-Enfields taken from casualties.

You see, Mr. Speaker, that Canadian soldier on the battlefield had to hunt round for a dead German, or a dead Englishman, to get a rifle fit to fight with. That is how matters stood when Sir John French wrote that letter in June, 1915. You would suppose that this condition of affairs would have been corrected, that, on receiving that letter from Sir John French, some effort would have been made by the Government to see that a proper rifle was placed in the hands of the Canadian soldiers. That was not done and we have the proof that it was not done. Nearly a year after that, in May, 1916, nothing definite had been done and Canadian soldiers were still armed with the Ross rifle. Then we have a report from Sir Douglas Haig to the War Office, in which he says:—

I have satisfied myself, after extensive inquiries carried out throughout the Canadian corps, that as a service rifle, the Ross is less trustworthy than the Lee-Enfield, and that the majority of the men armed with the Ross rifle have not the confidence in it that it is so essential they should possess. The inquiry upon which these conclusions are based was the outcome of an urgent application from a battalion of the 3rd Canadian Division for re-armament with the short Lee-Enfield rifle in consequence of a high percentage of jams experienced with their Ross rifles during a hostile attack on the 1st of May, 1916.

You see that nearly a year after Sir John French had laid his complaint before the Canadian Government, the soldiers were still using the Ross rifle, and that, in a hostile attack, in which they were sent into battle in May, 1916, there had been a very large percentage of jams, as reported by Sir Douglas Haig. This is a matter in connection with which delay and indecision was nothing short of a crime. It is plain from the two paragraphs I have read, the one written by Sir John French, and dated June, 1915, and the second by Sir Douglas Haig, dated May, 1916, that nothing definite was done for nearly a year. In other words, a year after Sir John French had reported that the rifle could not be relied upon, 20,000 Canadian soldiers were sent into action armed with this unreliable rifle, and the soldiers themselves had to petition Sir Douglas Haig to make some change so that they would have a proper arm to go into battle with. This letter of Sir Douglas Haig bears date the 1st of May, 1916, and, if it was a cable message, and no doubt it was, it must have been in the hands of the Government on the 17th May, 1916, when the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) threatened to confine the editor of the Ottawa Citizen in the tower because he had published the Alderson letter relating to the same matter.

There is another question in regard to which indecision has been shown and that is the question of patronage which has been referred to in this debate. We do not forget that the leader of this Government pledged the party to the abolition of patronage. If, Mr. Speaker, you read the Halifax platform, as I have no doubt you often do, you will find that what I am stating is true, that we were to have no more patronage after the Conservative party attained power. There are men who occupy seats on the other side of the House who used to make stormy speeches in regard to this question. I am thinking of one especially at this moment, my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid). I recollect how flushed his face was as he denounced the crime of patronage from the Opposition benches. In those days he set his face against it like flint, but since he has got into power he sets his face not like a flint but like a pudding. Nobody will deny that patronage is rampant so far as this Government is concerned. Officers of the Department of Militia and Defence were examined under oath before the Public Accounts Committee. The purchasing agent of the Department of Militia and Defence admitted that he had 8,000 names on his patronage list. We asked him to bring the list to the committee room. He told us that it was a card system and that he would have to bring it in a wheelbarrow. It will not be denied by hon. gentlemen opposite that if there was such a large list as that in the War department alone, it must be still more formidable when you take into consideration all the other departments of Government. Our whole war system has developed into a huge system of outdoor

relief for the Conservative party. We have to-day a minister of the Crown running an election in the county of Dorchester, in the province of Quebec, and he appealed to the people there the other day on this question. He said: if you elect
10 p.m. me you will have a friend on the Government benches; if you elect Mr. Cannon, you will have a man sitting in the cold shades of opposition who cannot do anything for you; meaning that the patronage system was the avowed policy of the present administration. Vote for me and we will get something for you; we will get jobs for you; we will get military expenditure for you; whether you fight or not, you will get the money of the Canadian people because we will give it to you, if you elect me. That is the doctrine. Then, the Prime Minister responds by sending this gentleman a telegram congratulating him on the campaign he is conducting. He made no reference to his speech on patronage, but his speech on patronage was a very material part of his campaign and the Prime Minister ought to have made reference to it and condemned it. There is not much leadership about that. You must admit after all is said and done, that this country belongs to the people and not to the Conservative party.

But, this lack of decision on the part of the Prime Minister and the leaders of the Government is not confined to military operations. You can go over the whole history of the present Administration and you will see signs of inaction and half measures. Take the high cost of living; instead of doing something definite about the high cost of living which is oppressing the workingman all over this Dominion the Government adopted the usual subterfuge of appointing a royal commission. This royal commission sat for about a year and then produced a report that did not contain one practical suggestion. There has been nothing done with it. The evidence upon which the report is based is so voluminous that no man has ever had time to read it, and the commission having got through with it the Government seems to have lost interest in the whole matter. It reminds one of Dickens' story about the celebrated Micawber who, when he was pressed for a debt that he could not pay, and when it came to the point at last that he was about to be sued, gave a promissory note and said: Thank God that is paid:

Take another instance. When the railway situation became acute about four years ago, instead of outlining a vigorous railway policy for Canada, the Government as usual allowed the matter to drift. But in the meantime the Government was pressed by the railways for money. If I remember rightly, in the year 1914, $15,000,000 was paid out, in 1915 $45,000,000, and in 1916 $10,000,000. In those three years $70,000,000 in all went into the sinkhole of the Canadian Northern, and after that money was all gone the Government resorted to its usual method of appointing a royal commission to find out what they should do next. The royal commission has not yet reported, and the Lord knows what kind of a report they will give and whether the Government will follow their advice when they get the report. Now, every hon. member of the House knows very well that the railway situation is not a question for a Royal Commission to solve. What is wanted is some kind of a railway policy, and the decision and the courage to carry it out.

Then take the question of the commandeering of Canadian ships. Here was another case of indecision. When the war broke out this Government should have acted promptly in regard to that matter. They did nothing. The Imperial Government began to commandeer Canadan ships without reference to the Canadian Government. They did not ask their advice at all. I believe that after the ships were all commandeered the Canadian Government did pass some kind of an Order in Council authorizing themselves to commandeer Canadian ships. I do not say that Canadian ships should not be commandeered. I do not say that Canadian ships should not be used by the War Department for any necessary purposes in connection with the war. Canadian ships should be used as well as British ships, and I am sure every Canadian ship-owner would be willing to give his last ship for the purpose of carrying on the war. But the commandeering of our ships should have been done by the Canadian Government and not by the British Government. Then the ships could be turned over as required. This is a free country; we have a Government of our own, and we manage our own affairs. The Imperial Government has no more right to commandeer ships than they had the right to commandeer Canadian men or Canadian money, and they would not have done it if our Government had looked after Canadian interests as they should have done. That

is another case in which the Government showed its characteristic indecision.

There are numerous other instances of the same kind. I could name one in connection with the naval controversy. You will recollect, Sir, the indecision that was shown by the Government in that matter. You will remember that the question of the repeal of the Naval Service Act hung fire for a great many months; that certain gentlemen elected on that issue in the province of Quebec insisted on an answer in the House; that day after day the question was read by Mr. Speaker, "Do you intend to repeal the Canadian Naval Service Act?" That question stood on the Order Paper for months. The answer finally was given, "Yes, we intend to repeal the Act." But they never did repeal it. Again the Prime Minister himself, when he returned from England in 1912, at a large public meeting in the city of Montreal, propounded a naval policy for his party. My policy, he says, is to ask Parliament to vote $35,000,000 to build three dreadnoughts for the Admiralty, and if Parliament refuses to vote the money I shall appeal to the people. The Prime Minister carried out the first part of his programme and asked Parliament to vote the money. Parliament refused to vote it, and the Prime Minister could never make up his mind to make his appeal to the people of Canada. It was another case of indecision.

I have given a large number of these cases to show that hon. gentlemen opposite are past masters in the art of marking time. I do not know whether anything can be done to rouse them. If I might be permitted to use the elegant language of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia, I would say: "The time has come when this Government should begin to scratch gravel."

I wish to refer for a few moments to another matter. Since we last met the long-looked-for report of Sir Charles Davidson has been made public. Now, Sir, if royal commissions are to be used for the purpose of delaying exposure, the first prize must certainly be given to Sir Charles Davidson. After two years he has brought down his report, and the report, now that it is brought down, turns out to be chiefly white-wash. Permit me to select one case as a sample. I refer to the case of the sale to Col. J. Wesley Allison of 3,000,000 rounds of small-arms ammunition. It will be remembered that the auditor general brought this scandal to the attention of the House and the country. When the war broke out, the Government had in the arsenal at Quebec 3,000,000 rounds of small arms ammunition. They kept it there for several months, and then sold it privately to Col. J. Wesley Allison for $20 per 1,000 rounds. The ammunition had cost $34 per 1,000 rounds to make. When this transaction was exposed in the House it was defended by the ex-Minister of Militia, supported by the Prime Minister, on the ground that it was sold to Vickers Limited for the purpose of testing guns. We accepted that explanation at the time, but that explanation had to be abandoned when Vickers Limited denied ever having anything to do with the purchase of the ammunition. After considerable investigation the truth came out that the ammunition was sold, not to Vickers Limited at all, but with the assistance of Sir Trevor Dawson, one of the directors of Vickers Limited, it was sold direct to the British Admiralty for $25 per 1,000 rounds, giving a profit of $15,000 to Col. Allison out of the transaction. Judge Davidson cannot discover anything corrupt or anything wrong in this transaction. There is one phase of it, however, to which he does not refer at all, but which I think is the main question in regard to it, and that is this. In the early period of the war, when, as I have stated, this small arms ammunition was lying idle in the arsenal at Quebec, ammunition was more valuable to the British Government than gold dollars. It was scarce and could not be procured. Hon. gentlemen will remember the battle of Mons, when General French, with his little army of 75,000 men and 250 guns, was forced to retreat until the Germans were almost knocking at the gates of Paris before they were turned back. Machine guns were scarce and ammunition was scarcer; everybody knew that. This was the case, and of course every member of the present Administration knew it. Yet all that time, while British soldiers were being shot in their tracks for lack of ammunition, our Government had 3,000,000 rounds of small-arm ammuniton packed away in the arsenal at Quebec and never offered to make use of it.

What would you expect the Government to do, Mr. Speaker? If you had been Minister of Militia, I know what you would have done. The first thing you would have done would be to send a cable message across the ocean to the Admiralty, saying: We have here in Canada three million rounds of ammunition; can you make use of it? If you can

you are welcome to it for nothing. That would be the kind of message you would send. No such a message was ever sent, but instead of that the ammunition was kept in the arsenal at Quebec for several months, badly as it was wanted on the other side, and then it was sold privately to a friend of the ex-minister for the sum of $20 a thousand rounds. What excuse was given? One was that the ammunition was defective. Was the ammunition defective? I doubt it. There is evidence the other way. It turns out that the ammunition was used by the army, and so far as I can learn, it was good ammunition; but I do not care whether it was defective or not, the skirts of the Government cannot be cleared in that way. If the ammunition was defective, then it should not have been sold at all, because it would be a crime to put defective ammunition into the hands of any one from whom it would find its way into the hands of the British soldiers. If the ammunition was not defective it should have been sent direct to the British Admiralty without the intervention of Allison or any other boodler.

The question of the extension of Parliament has been referred to in the speech from the Throne. It is not necessary for me at this stage to deal with that question at any length, but an extension ought to be preceded by an accounting on the part of the Government. At the last session Parliament voted $270,000,000 of expenditures. Would it not be reasonable that the Government should tell us something of what they did with all that money before they ask for a second lease of power? I confess that I do not like the manner in which the application for this extension was announced by the present Minister of Militia (Mr. Kemp). The decision appears to have been reached at a meeting of the Cabinet some weeks ago, and the present Minister of Militia, when he had the Cabinet committed to apply for another year, immediately gave the announcement to the Toronto newspapers, and in the announcement he said that if the Liberal party did not agree unanimously to the proposal there would be an election. As we have been living under the threat of an election for a good while, of course, that did not affect us very much. The example of Great Britain has been referred to, and it was alleged that extensions of Parliament have been made there, but the example of Great Britain cannot be quoted as justification in this case. If any one will look into what has happened in Great Britain he will see that they have had a coalition Government, all parties being represented in that Government. If any one political party in Great Britain had attempted to run the Government of that country on party or patronage lines, as the Canadian Government has been doing here, that political party would not have lasted for three months.

Again, the Government say that it is a patriotic duty on our part to agree to this extension. The question is: Are they sincere about this? To me it looks a little like an invitation to walk into their parlour. What is the Minister of Inland Revenue saying about this? He made some reference to it the other day in one of his speeches in Dorchester county. He said that when we agreed to this extension last year, we all stultified ourselves. That is the view he takes of that matter. Let me quote a paragraph from the speech of Mr. Sévigny, delivered at St. Justin:—

> Mr. Cannon pretends that the Conservatives are corrupt, Mr. Sevigny went on, but what happened at the last session? The Conservatives asked the Liberals if they would allow them to go on for another year, and the Liberals said 'All right, go ahead, we have no objection,' and that is the corrupt Government of which Mr Cannon speaks.

All I can say is that if by agreeing to this proposed extension I am to become responsible for the Yoakum scandal, the Allison scandal, the motor truck scandal, the Garland scandal and the Foster scandal and all the other numerous scandals, then I shall be compelled to vote against the extension. I do not see why we should ignore the Constitution altogether unless some arrangement is made by which all parties can be represented. The electors of Canada, if permitted, would settle this question in twenty-four hours; an election would clear the atmosphere, and if the Liberals should win, as I think they would, it would bring about certain very important things. This Government had its human weaknesses before the war started at all, and we all know that no saints or archangels have been added to it since that date. Those people who object so strongly to an election ought to be reminded that it is for free institutions that the people of Canada and the people of Great Britain are fighting. A certain Conservative newspaper and two or three windy orators of the baser type have been saying that it would not be safe to entrust the administration of this country to the Liberal party, but I do not pay much attention to what men of that stamp say. They are the pole-cats of public life,

and I hope that their influence, if they have any, will not be felt outside of a few back concessions in the province of Ontario.

While I believe in a change, I do not say that these gentlemen across the way are all bad. There is a mixture of bad and good, but I am afraid that the bad predominates. The activities of the patronage hunter, the greed of the grafter, the zeal of the political heeler and the hopes of the Godly, are all so inextricably tangled up together, and it is pretty hard to do anything with a combination like that. While these gentlemen retain power they do pretty much as they please, as they are not subject to any law but themselves, but it is our duty on this side of the House to remind them that the ten commandments are still in force in this country.

Now, assuming that an election comes, and the Liberal party wins, it would accomplish several things:

1. It would give to the country a vigorous government fresh from the people with a mandate to carry on the war, not in a half-hearted way as at present, but with the whole might of the nation enlisted in the task.

2. It would give us a trade policy that would make for expansion and development and would place the country in a position to grapple with the conditions that are certain to arise after the war.

3. It would bring the Liberal policy of British Preference again to the front and free Canada from the reproach of having increased the taxation against British goods at a time when the old land was engaged in a life and death struggle with the greatest military power in the world.

4. It would give Canada a naval policy that would at least restore her self-respect and place us in the same class on the sea as the Commonwealth of Australia.

5. In short, it would give us clean, honest and progressive government, and cut the claws of the grafter.

Mr. Speaker, when one looks over the political history of 1916 one is not surprised that hon. gentlemen opposite prefer an extension to an election. Look, for example, at the defeats suffered by the Conservative party in the provincial arena during the past year. There have been four provincial general elections. In Nova Scotia 30 Liberals and 13 Conservatives were elected; in Quebec, 73 Liberals and 6 Conservatives; in Manitoba, 44 Liberals and 4 Conservatives, and in British Columbia 32 Liberals and 10 Conservatives. The Conservative press takes the ground that a general election would be a calamity. Perhaps it would be a calamity to them, but I submit it would be the dawn of a new day to the people of Canada.

I should like to point out that the defeat of the Liberal party in 1911 was brought about by means that cannot be repeated in 1917. What hon. gentleman opposite is shouting to-day: "No truck or trade with the Yankees?" We do not hear a word of that to-day. Who over there is demanding the repeal of the Ne Temere Act? Even the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) is quiet at the present time. Who is claiming to win ten seats, or even one seat, in the province of Ontario on the issue of the Farmers' Bank? You never hear of it. Who is boring holes in the flag or cursing Laurier because he is an English imperialist? Who is pledging himself to repeal the Naval Service Act, or promising free medicine for the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces? Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of pride to us on this side of the House that while those bogus issues that won seats for the Tory party in 1911 have all gone to the limbo where they belong, the two great issues on which the Liberal party stood in 1911 are as good to-day as they were then. I refer, Sir, to the Canadian navy and to reciprocity with the United States. That is the reason why we on this side of the House are willing to carry on and to strive for the ideals of our party. We are proud of the Liberal party, proud of our leader, proud of the past history of that party and of those watchwords of duty, freedom and manly effort that have made it great in the past and will alone keep it great in the future.

Mr. ARHTUR B. COPP (Westmorland): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address myself to the House for a short time, and as it is now late in the evening and it is not my desire to keep the House too late, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

Friday, January 26, 1917.

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

REPORTS.

Report of the Minister of Agriculture for the year ending March 31, 1916—Hon. Mr. Burrell.

Report of the Department of Public Works for the year ending March 31, 1916 —Hon. Mr. Rogers.

DOMINION LANDS ACT—PROPOSED AMENDMENT.

Mr. George E. McCraney (Saskatoon) moved for leave to introduce Bill, No. 12, to amend the Dominion Lands Act. He said:

The proposed amendment is to insert a new section, 30A, as follows:

30A—The Minister may issue letters patent to any entrant for a pre-emption or to any entrant for a purchased homestead who has complied with the requirements of Section 27 or Section 28 of this Act as the case may be, except as to the payment of moneys due in respect of the said pre-emption or purchased homestead. The said letters patent shall be issued pursuant to regulations to be made by the Governor in Council and the lands patented under this section shall remain charged with the moneys due to the Crown until satisfied according to law.

The purpose in view is to enable the Minister of the Interior to issue patent to pre-emptions and purchased homesteads, subject to the payment of the moneys due to the Government, in cases where all the other requirements of the Act, including residence and cultivation, have been complied with. It frequently happens that a settler has done all his duties except that of paying the balance of the purchase price of $3 per acre due to the Government. He wishes to borrow money on his land, and the usual advance by mortgagees in such cases is in the neighbourhood of $1,000, but he is unable to give the mortgage because of the balance owing to the Government, which must be paid before patent can issue. He is forbidden by the Dominion Lands Act to pledge his rights in the pre-emption or purchased homestead, and rarely has other security. In the case of moneys owing to the Government for seed grain, patent issues subject to a lien for the amount. It is proposed to permit a similar practice regarding pre-emptions and purchased homesteads.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

WESTERN COAL MINING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MACDONALD: I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Labour to the following telegram which I have received from the miners of Coleman, Alberta:

Coleman, Alta., Jan. 25, 1917.

E. M. Macdonald,
Ottawa, Ont.

The following resolution was unanimously passed at a full meeting of Carbondale Miners' Union:

"That in the opinion of the miners of the Carbondale Miners' Union at a meeting held to-night, we consider that the action of the Government relative to the bonus of nine and one-half per cent., according to the finding of the Commission re high cost of living is unwarrantable and unjust, and calculated to be an incentive for the men to strike.

"That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Premier Borden and E. M. Macdonald."

We earnestly desire your good offices in this matter.

J. A. McDonald,
George E. Hogan, Secretary.

I may explain that this telegram was sent to me by virtue of the fact that a number of miners from my constituency have been working in the vicinity from which this telegram comes. I ask what action the Government has taken in regard to the bonus of nine and a half per cent which is alleged in this telegram to be objectionable. I ask also for information as to the exact situation of matters at Coleman.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): I have had no information directly from Coleman, and cannot say anything beyond what I said the day before yesterday. Negotiations are in progress which, I expect, will result in a satisfactory settlement within the next few days. I do not think it would be in the interest of any one concerned to go into the details of those negotiations.

Mr. MACDONALD: I think the hon. minister should tell the House what the action was which was taken by the Government and to which the telegram refers.

Mr. CROTHERS: Several of the officers of the Union at Fernie and other points in that district—District No. 18—came here in November last and submitted their desire either for a second war bonus of twenty-five per cent or an investigation as to what had been the increase in the cost of living between certain dates, and an undertaking that this increase should be paid in addition to the increase of ten per cent that had been given them on the 15th of August. They were quite satisfied with the gentleman who was appointed to investigate the question of the increased cost of living; in fact, I think they themselves suggested his name. This gentleman carried on the inquiry and reported that the increase in the cost of living within the period named had been nine and one-half

per cent. This is the first time that I have heard any objections to that finding. The only question that has come up since the finding was made is as to how it is to be carried out.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. G. C. Wilson (Wentworth) for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Thursday, January 25.

Mr. ARTHUR B. COPP (Westmorland): I should like to say, Sir, if you are not already overburdened with the congratulations that have been showered upon you by hon. gentlemen who have taken part in this debate, that it gives me the greatest possible personal pleasure to congratulate you upon the position that you have attained as Speaker of this House. Your constituency and mine lie side by side; we are very near neighbours at home, and we were brought up together. Knowing you personally so well and so favourably, I feel that I cannot allow this occasion to pass without expressing my pleasure upon your attaining your present high office. The only regret I have is that, inasmuch as the Speakership is controlled by the party in power, I cannot hope that you will hold that office for any great length of time. In that you will hold it for a time, however, I offer you my most hearty congratulations.

I regret exceedingly, Sir, that during the course of this debate, comparisons and contrasts have been made between the two great peoples of this country with regard to recruiting. I do not say how much foundation there is for the attacks which have come from the other side of the House as to the slowness of recruiting in the province of Quebec or the reasons therefor, but as a Canadian citizen and as a member of this House I regret that any such acrimonious remarks should be made or that contrasts should be suggested or comparisons instituted between the two great races that go to make up the greatest colony of the Empire. I say that I regret this, and cannot understand why it should be so. The constituency which I represent in the province of New Brunswick, the county of Westmorland, is composed of people of the two great races, and I want to say that my French Acadian friends in that county have in this crisis stood nobly by Canada and by the Empire. They have done their full part in the matter of recruiting and of subscribing to the different funds which have for their object the carrying on of this war. While we have in my county two races, two creeds, two nationalities, we do not look upon each other as different races; we are not pulling apart; on the contrary we are united and are becoming more united day by day and year by year. I want to say to the credit of the Acadian people that they have done their part willingly and in a straightforward manner. The clergy representing the Acadian people have taken the same platform with those of other denominations throughout the county of Westmorland and have done their part in urging, exhorting, almost imploring the people to do their duty. The people have done their full part, and I am glad to pay this tribute to my friends in the county of Westmorland.

In the Address with which His Excellency has been pleased to open this Parliament, there are not many subjects for consideration. There are three in particular, those referring to the organization of national service, the fiftieth anniversary of Canadian Confederation, and the extension of the term of Parliament. I am sure that every one of us subscribes earnestly and sincerely to the words spoken in regard to the valour of our Canadian troops and the manner in which they have acquitted themselves at the front. No one would question the courage, bravery, and resourcefulness of the Canadian boys who have gone to fight for their country. We knew from the history and traditions of the people of Canada that they would do their full part when the opportunity came, and the whole country must realize that they have done their duty nobly and well; that they are doing it now, and will continue to do it until the termination of this great struggle.

The number of men who have gone to the front is mentioned in the Address as being, roughly, 400,000. We are very glad to know that that number of our Canadian boys have donned khaki and gone to the front to do their bit. On the first of January, 1916, the right hon. Prime Minister stated that 500,000 troops would be raised in Canada. We must realize that that promise meant the enlisting and sending to the front of 500,000 troops, as well as the recruiting of many men in addition to that in order to supply the wastage from the 500,000 and in order to keep the Canadian army up to that strength. I quite agree with the view expressed by a number of hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House, that we require men not only at the front but in the

munition factories, on the farms, in the forests, and in other lines of work which are being carried on in Canada. But, Sir, like the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) who addressed the House yesterday afternoon, while I realize the importance of carrying on the country's industries, I believe that more honour and more responsibility rest upon the man who leaves his home and family, goes to the front and shoulders a rifle in order that he may do his part in the trenches. It is there that the war is being actually fought, and the quicker the men are in the trenches the quicker the termination of the war will come—and an early termination of the war is the one great desire of the people of Canada.

Another clause in His Excellency's speech draws attention to the fact that we are on the threshold of the fiftieth anniversary of the birth of the Dominion, and suggests that some suitable ceremony should be held to commemorate that event. I quite agree that that would be a most noble and a most proper thing for Canadians to do. I regret that we cannot hold out the hope that we will be able to commemorate that event by a celebration because of the termination of the war. But while that seems to be beyond the bounds of probability, I sincerely trust that the Government will take into consideration a suitable commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the natal day of our Dominion, of which we are all so proud. I associate myself with those who have suggested that we should not hold any celebration that would be attended with any large expenditure of money. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) made what I thought an excellent suggestion; that is, that the event be commemorated by the erection of a memorial hospital to be used by returned disabled soldiers. Some measure of that kind might well be taken into consideration, and I believe it would meet with the full approbation of every person in the Dominion of Canada.

While we realize that Canada will soon pass the fiftieth milestone in her history, we might for a moment refer to the fact that during all that time the Government of this country has been carried on very largely, if not wholly, along party political lines. To-day there seems to be a whisper in the atmosphere, murmurs here and there, that the time has arrived when the people of the Dominion could very well lay aside their party differences and work together more harmoniously than under the party system, in the interests of the country. That suggestion has been referred to even on the floor of this House. It has been mentioned by many newspapers throughout Canada. It has been discussed, and resolutions have been passed upon it in Boards of Trades, Trade and Labour Council meetings, municipal council meetings, church organizations and other organizations that have the welfare of the country at heart. But I am forced to stop for a moment and ask myself, as I believe the people of Canada are asking themselves, why is this proposal made? Why is the suggestion now thrown out that we should have a different form of Government from what we have had in the past? It seems to me, speaking from my experience and knowledge of conditions in my own province, that the men who are asking, yea demanding, that we should have a different form of Government, that we should have a national Government or a coalition Government, are members of the Conservative party in the different provinces, and that they realize that their own party, which has been in charge of the affairs of this country for the past five years, has been weighed in the balance and found wanting; that it has made a miserable failure of the management of the affairs of Canada. That is the situation. I am quite willing to give to my hon. friends all the credit due them in regard to what they claim to be the awful burden that has been cast upon them by reason of this war. I realize that, Sir. But that is no proper reason to give to the country for their failure to conduct its affairs properly. It simply shows that they have been unable to rise to the occasion and deal with the extra burdens thus thrown upon them. Their friends throughout the different counties and provinces are now asking that we should no longer have party government; they say that they want men taken into the Government who are able to take over the burden of administration, and give them assistance to carry on the work which they have been unable to perform. I am not at all opposed to what may be called a national Government. I am of the opinion that some change must take place. But what is this national Government that is being talked about in the press of our country? What is the national Government that the Trades and Labour people want? What is the national Government that the Board of Trade of the city of Winnipeg wants? I see in the Citizen of to-day a despatch which reads:

At a regular meeting to-night the Winnipeg Board of Trade passed a resolution favouring a national Government.

Before I would feel like committing myself to a national Government, I should like some information as to what this national Government would be and what class of me would be called to its councils.

An hon. MEMBER: Tories.

Mr. COPP: Some one suggests Tories. That would not bother me if they were Tories of sufficient calibre and ability, and if their whole desire were to do what was best for the country. I am perfectly willing to listen to my friends from Winnipeg or elsewhere in the Dominion who insist upon a national Government, but how are we going to get this Government? There are only two ways that I can see. The first way of securing a national Government is for this Government to resign and give way to others. Then who should take their places? That seems to be one way of getting a national Government. Another way, the only other way and the constitutional way, is that when the time arrives, our friends opposite should give up their places and appeal to the people. The last jury and the only proper and constitutional jury to decide questions that come before the people are the people themselves, and if the people to-day, as expressed in repeated resolutions from the different places throughout the Dominion of Canada, are satisfied, as apparently they are satisfied, that the present Government is not a national Government, that the present Government is not composed of men who are equal to the tasks and burdens that are thrust upon them, then they must do only one thing, and that is to defeat the present Government. But when this Government is defeated, as defeated it is sure to be, then His Excellency the Governor General will call upon some one else to form a Government. Then a national form of Government might very well be inaugurated; and I have no doubt that the right hon. the leader of this side of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), when he accepts the mandate from the people in the near future and walks across to the other side of the House, will surround himself, as he did in 1896, with men of national character and national reputation who will do the best that is possible for the country, now as they did in 1896, and as they continued to do for fifteen years while Sir Wilfrid Laurier had charge of the affairs of Canada.

One of the many reasons why the people are becoming tired of the present Administration is that it has paid too much attention to party politics. There was not much fault found with that until the outbreak of the war, but upon the outbreak of the war the people expected, and reasonably so, I think, that the party in power would drop for a little their party schemes and undertakings and work for the interests of the people generally, and not in the interests of party or political friends. We find that party preferment has been going on. That has been the attitude of the Government during its whole regime, and it is no wonder that the people generally are resenting it and are becoming anxious as to the results throughout the Dominion. The Government during the past year has been trying to get the people interested in recruiting in order to make good the promise made by the right hon. the Prime Minister a little over a year ago. One of the reasons why recruiting has fallen off during the past year is that the people are uneasy and restless in regard to the conduct of the war, and particularly in regard to the expenditures of public money voted for that purpose. They are beginning to realize that all has not been right. They realize that money has been wasted, and that extravagance has been practised on every hand. We are now in the third year of the war, and this terrible extravagance and waste and graft, which have been going on since the beginning of the war, still continues. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem able to stop the leakage and the waste.

Yesterday, or the day before, in this House, one hon. member on this side of the Chamber made reference to the fact that politics were rampant in military appointments, and an hon. member on the opposite side of the House, who followed, declared that in his county there was no party preferment and that party politics were not considered. We are bound to accept the statement made by an hon. member of this House in regard to anything that takes place in his own constituency, and I am not here to dispute any such statement made by hon. gentlemen opposite; but it is folly, it is absolutely beyond reason to expect that such statements will be believed by the people who know that political preferment in the matter of appointments has been practised from the inception of the war. I do not say that during that time we have not had Liberals appointed to offices; they have been

in exceptional cases. We could not expect anything else; but, generally speaking, we know that, down to the smallest office, everything has been done through party patronage. I know that it has been so in the province of New Brunswick, and in my own county; and every man of common inteligence knows that it has been so from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Go down to the province of New Brunswick and look at the men who have been selected as recruiting officers. Liberals and Conservatives alike, to do them credit, have thrown aside their party feelings to enlist in the service of the country; but go down to the province of New Brunswick, go where you will throughout the Dominion, and you will find that it has been the exception for any one who is not a strong Conservative to be appointed to a position, particularly when there is a good salary attached to it. Why, Sir, we find the recruiting meetings in the county of Westmorland being used—perhaps I should not use that expression—but you find the men in charge of those recruiting meetings selected because of their party affiliations. That is the condition of affairs, and it is no wonder that the people are becoming disgusted and ashamed of the Government in regard to recruiting and other matters connected with the war.

The people, too, are beginning to realize the terrible waste of public money in connection with the war. They realize that not only are we voting money, and borrowing it, and spending it, but that individuals, municipalities and towns throughout the Dominion, from one end to the other, are being asked to contribute to the various funds. Even the little children are asked to empty their banks for patriotic purposes. And yet, while that is going on, we know that not thousands, nor tens of thousands of dollars, but millions of dollars, are being absolutely wasted because of mistakes somewhere on the part of somebody that should not have been made. I picked up a newspaper this morning which states—I do not know whether the article is to be accepted as true; I do not vouch for its truth—that in England there are two hundred lieutenant-colonels from Canada who are doing nothing, and who have done nothing since the war started. I read a little farther and find that the daily cost of the upkeep and maintenance of these lieutenant-colonels amounts to $2,500 per day. Multiply that amount by 365 and you find that it is costing this country practically one million dollars a year for not one dollar's worth of advantage, so far as the war is concerned. That is the condition of affairs, and people are branded as disloyal, forsooth, because they call the attention of the people to the conduct of the Government in carrying on affairs of the country in this critical period of her history.

Mr. CARVELL: You can double that in Canada.

Mr. COPP: Yes, and not only is it true in regard to the colonels in England, but it applies also to majors, captains, and the subordinate officers. This article goes on to say that to-day in England alone we have at least 4,000 men in the Records Office. What about New Zealand and other dominions which have officers there? It is costing these dominions a mere bagatelle compared with what it is costing the Dominion of Canada for the upkeep of officers. I have no fault to find with a man being a lieutenant-colonel, or drawing the pay which is attached to his office, but if a lieutenant-colonel has nothing to do, and if he is not willing to take the rank of lieutenant, or some other subordinate position, and go to the front, he should resign and the remuneration that is being paid to him should be stopped, and he should come back to this country and assume the role of a private citizen as the rest of us are doing. I could go on and illustrate by a thousand and one instances how money is being wasted in Canada along this very line. The time has arrived when those who are in charge of the affairs of this country should call a halt, should clean house, and take the people of Canada into their confidence and give a strict account of their stewardship. Let me say to the First Minister that that is his first duty. He not only represents the Conservative party, but he, as the Premier of the Dominion, represents the people of Canada, and the people are clamouring, they are demanding, that they should have a full, frank and honest disclosure of what has taken place in the past and what he is going to do in the future in regard to the conduct of this war.

We all remember with what great satisfaction the Conservative newspapers—and I am bound to say a number of the Liberal newspapers and Liberals as well—throughout the Dominion, regarded the fact that when this war broke out it was the good fortune of Canada to have as Minister of Militia a man of the enthusiasm, energy and experience of the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes). I am

bound to say, Sir, because I want to be honest and frank about it, that I never looked upon the ex-Minister of Militia as being any better than the friends with whom he was associated. I looked upon the Government as a whole, and I felt that the whole Government were responsible for the administration of the affairs of this country, and particularly with regard to the affairs appertaining to this war. Public newspapers, particularly newspapers supporting the Government, would come out day after day and week after week and tell us what a wonderful man the ex-Minister of Militia was, and what a fortunate thing, what an admirable thing it was, that we had such a man administering the military affairs of the country. Yea, in different places, he was referred to as the Kitchener of Canada. What has taken place? If the ex-Minister of Militia was entitled to the praises which were so lavishly bestowed upon him during the past two years and until very recently, what do these same newspapers have to say now? You take up a newspaper since the resignation of our genial friend as Minister of Militia, and what do you find? You may find one line in the whole column referring to the energy he displayed, but the rest of the column will be devoted to the many weaknesses he showed as a member of the Government.

I now propose to take up in some detail the correspondence that has passed between the ex-Minister of Militia and the First Minister. I contend that this correspondence which has passed between two members of the Cabinet requires more than a passing notice. It seems to me that it cannot be answered by the right honourable the First Minister as he attempted to answer it the other day when, following my right honourable friend the leader of the Opposition, he rose in his place and said that he did not propose to discuss the question of the resignation of the Minister of Militia and Defence. I suppose that may be privately his right, but I contend that the Premier of this Dominion owes it to the people of the country to enlighten them as to what has taken place in regard to this matter. The letters that were written by the ex-Minister of Militia to the First Minister contain the most glaring charges that were ever levelled against the Prime Minister or the responsible head of any Government in this Dominion and yet no attempt has been made to answer these charges. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have referred to the matter and it has been passed by; not a word has been uttered to give to the people of Canada any just or cogent reason why the ex-Minister of Militia is to-day out of the Cabinet. No excuse is offered, no defence is made against the awful charges that the ex-minister has made against the First Minister in regard to this matter. I want to refer to this correspondence. I want to read some paragraphs from the letters that passed between these gentlemen and to comment upon them after I read them. The first I want to read is a paragraph from a letter from the ex-Minister of Militia dated October 23, 1916, in answer to one from the Premier, and it is as follows:

> Regarding your letter and memorandum, permit the following: From the outset I strongly objected to the fact that practically the entire management of our force, our supplies, our equipment, our transport, etc., had been taken completely out of our hands, and was controlled by the British authorities, we, notwithstanding, paying the bill.
>
> In October, 1914, in conversation on the subject with the late Earl Kitchener, he pointed out that the Canadian High Commissioner had intimated to him that it was the desire of the Canadian Government that these troops should be regarded as purely British, and that Canada should have nothing to say in their management while in England or at the front.

I think that is a most significant sentence. He says that in October, 1914, this trouble had taken place. Back as far as October, 1914, there was dissatisfaction, bickering and cleavage in the minds of the members of the Cabinet. The war broke out in August, 1914, and in October, 1914, the trouble had already commenced in the Cabinet. I have no reason to doubt, Sir, that in any Cabinet there must be differences of opinion. Men do not always see alike on many great public questions, but I contend, and I think I am only contending for what is a sound constitutional doctrine, that when the Cabinet takes up and threshes out the matters that come before them, their decision must be presented to the public as a united and unanimous one and they must work together harmoniously and unanimously in the interests of the whole country.

Further we find this statement:—

> I drew his attention to Section 177 of the Army Act, and to the spirit and principles of the Constitution, but he again intimated that he understood it was the desire of the Canadian Government that the troops were to be handed over to them absolutely as British Regulars. To this I objected, and pointed out that I fully believed that our force under officers of our own selection should, at the front, be under the command of the British Comander in Chief; yet the appointment of officers at the

front and the control of everything in connection with the force while in Britain, should be entirely with Canada; but I further stated that I felt in such a great struggle where each was actuated by proper motives, there should be no need of friction.

Then he says:—

I do not know whether the Canadian High Commissioner had the authority of the Canadian Government or not.

That means that, although he was a member of the Cabinet, he did not know what authority Sir George Perley had as High Commissioner. He goes on to say:—

But a day or two later that gentleman of his own initiative strongly spoke to me and briefly said, "You do not pretend surely to have anything to do with the Canadian soldiers in Britain." I suggested that he might be well advised to study not alone the Canadian Military law, but the British Army Act, as well as comprehend the spirit of the constitution. I felt then, as I feel to-day, and as I am pleased to say the entire British Government and the War Office officers also realize to-day that our officers and men being in the pay of Canada, Canada should absolutely control them in Canada and in Britain, excepting in so far as securing camping grounds is concerned; and at the front for everything excepting the command and general administration under the command. However, for the first ten months our suggestions were practically ignored, our equipment, stores, supplies, armament, everything provided by us was set aside.

That means that the ex-Minister of Militia attaches his signature to a statement that ten months after the outbreak of the war all the supplies provided by Canada, all the trucks, all the equipment, everything—and we know that it amounted to millions of dollars' worth—were set aside and scrapped in England, and we, the people of Canada, are called upon to pay this enormous wastage and extravagance on the part of the Government because of their bickerings and their incapacity, because they were unable to grapple with the question and make prompt and definite decisions for the benefit of the country. He goes on to say:—

The pay department was found to be absolutely chaotic; the medical service modelled on the British, lacked system, efficiency and comprehensiveness.

There is another charge in regard to which it seems to me the people of Canada, the fathers and mothers of the soldiers who have gone to the front, are perfectly within their right when they not only ask, but demand in a respectful but in a most emphatic manner, that they should be given some explanation. In that sentence the ex-Minister of Militia implies a great deal more than he says. The phrase about the medical service lacking efficiency tells the fathers and the mothers of the boys at the front that when their kith and kin and flesh and blood are wounded or taken sick and are brought to the English hospitals, they are not given proper care and attention. Could anything be more detrimental to recruiting in the Dominion of Canada than that very statement. And yet that has been published, not by a Liberal newspaper, not by a Liberal on the hustings, but by one of the sworn members of the Cabinet, who has since resigned his seat. The time has arrived when we, as independent people of this country, should and do demand some explanations in regard to the matter. I cannot understand so many right-thinking, honest Conservatives throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion sitting quietly by and humbly following their party when we find one of their own Cabinet ministers making such an outrageous charge against the Government in regard to this matter that is uppermost in the minds of our people. The ex-minister says:—

The pay department was found to be absolutely chaotic.

We know that from experience. I doubt if there is an honourable member in this House who has not had letters and telegrams, who has not been personally and privately communicated with in regard to this very subject, in reference not only to the Mother Country, but to Canada. I have here letters and memoranda from scores of women from my own constituency who have been unable to get their separation allowance or their assigned pay from their sons and their husbands properly adjusted. I know one case in my own town where a woman had a son at the front and had been receiving from Ottawa his assigned pay for fifteen months, month by month. All at once this pay stopped. She wrote a letter to the department here, and when she got her reply, she could not understand it and brought it to me. The answer was that they had not this young man's name on their records at all. She thought of course that something had happened to her boy and that his name had been cut out, that he had been killed and she had not been advised. I wrote to the department pointing out that there was an error somewhere, because I enclosed one of the printed circulars that are sent with the cheques, and that the boy's name must be on the record. They then changed their answer and wrote in reply that the boy's name was there but that they would have to

4 p.m.

communicate with the pay office in London before the matter could be rectified. That is an illustration of what is taking place. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) smiles. He takes so little notice of people who are looking to him and the Government to take some interest in their affairs that he sits here and smiles and laughs in the face of members when they bring to the attention of this House some of the rights of the common people of this country. It is not becoming to the Minister of Labour to do that. Every one knows that he has never taken an active interest nor spent a serious moment in his life in looking after the interests of the people whom he is supposed to represent.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. gentleman is going a little too far.

Mr. COPP: In what way, your honour?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think, when the hon. gentleman sees his language in Hansard to-morrow, he will be the first to admit that he is going entirely too far.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The language used by my hon. friend is not unparliamentary. Although it may be that he has diverged a little from the subject with which he was dealing, and he has a right to do that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman made the statement that the Minister of Labour was supposed to represent certain people in this House, the imputation being that he did not represent them. I say that the hon. gentleman's statement in that respect is out of order, and I so rule.

Mr. COPP: I shall be glad to retract any statement I have made that is unparliamentary because I have no desire to infringe on the rules of the House. If I say "the party that he, because of his office, is entitled to represent," will that be parliamentary? He has made a dismal failure of it.

Further on in this letter, the ex-Minister of Militia writes to the Prime Minister:

I spoke to you at the time about the rejection of all our stores and supplies of every description and proved to you that the excuses of the British office were totally without foundation.

You have my memorandum at the time proving the utter falsity of their bogus excuses regarding our wagons, etc.

Here we have the statement, on the authority of one who was then a minister of the Crown, that our supplies provided by the Government were being thrown aside. Yet those supplies were being manufactured, taken possession of by the Government, paid for by the people, and sent to England—only to be scrapped. And this went on month after month. He says further:

Your suggestion then was that as the changes had been made we should abide by the decision of the British officers. However, I did not wish to raise any trouble in the matter but I determined that Canada was not to be treated as a Crown colony, and that as we paid the bill and furnished the goods, which in nearly every instance were better than the British, I would act. I ordered muster parade of our men and tried to lay plans to stop the scandalous neglect going on in the pay department.

Here is a charge of "scandalous neglect"; not the waste of a few wagons, not the throwing aside of a few Oliver equipments, not the loss of a few days' munitions or supplies furnished by the Dominion of Canada, but "scandalous neglect" which the ex-minister felt called upon, to take means to bring to an end. And he goes on:

I had to accept under protest for the first year—

Why had he to accept? There can be no reason except that the other members of the Cabinet forced him to do so.

—I had to accept, under protest, for the first year, this management of the Force in Britain. The anomaly of such a state of things is apparent. The Canadian soldier in the trenches must voice his complaint, if any, through the Parliament of Canada and the Minister of Militia and Defence must accept responsibility.

This is a most cogent and convincing reason why the affairs of our soldier boys should be controlled in Canada—that any complaints they had in regard to the administration of affairs must be voiced through the Parliament of Canada and not through the Parliament of Great Britain. But the quotations I have already made show the position of the other members of the Government in regard to these matters. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) for instance, went quietly on just as though the boys at the front did not matter. And to-day the Government treat the whole people of Canada with silent contempt when asked what they have done to give the boys at the front a fair and square deal. I will say this for the ex-Minister of Militia, that, though he may have lacked judgment at times, he did show a very strong and earnest interest in the boys who went to the front. But his colleagues were not willing to give him the same latitude in the matters of his department that they gave to the other ministers in the affairs committed to their control. He goes on:

How could the Canadian soldier obtain redress through the British House of Commons? Kipling's lines hold good:

"Daughter in her Mother's house,
Mistress in her own,"

as well as another standard maxim "Taxation implies representation and brings responsibility."

And in this letter there is this further striking passage:

During the last year's management we have introduced a new system of convalescent control upon which the British are now modelling.

In a previous passage of this letter he shows that there was inefficiency in the management of the British convalescent homes and hospitals. Apparently, the need of improvement was established, because the British authorities began to model their convalescent homes and hospitals upon the lines of those carried on by Canada. And the advantage of the Canadian system is shown in this very practical way:

We returned a much higher percentage to their battalions trained and fully fit for service, and saved to Canada the sum of upwards of six millions of dollars.

When hon. gentlemen opposite speak so glibly of the tens and hundreds of millions of dollars that are being expended, a saving of only six millions seems very little. Still, here is the statement of a former minister of the Crown that in this one matter alone he had been successful in saving $6,000,000 of our money. Is it not reasonable to believe that if the Government were wasting $6,000,000 in one year on convalescent homes and hospitals, they were wasting ten times that amount in the hundred and one other avenues of expenditure made necessary by the war? These charges are a most serious reflection upon the Government and their management of affairs in this crisis.

I turn now to another letter, that of October 31, in which the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence says:

Dear Sir Robert: In conformity with the suggestions made this morning, permit me to briefly summarize the situation. During the first year of the war, the plans adopted for the force in England were modelled on the British War Office, but I had nothing whatever to do with them. The Canadian High Commissioner seemed to be the one dominating as witnessed in the contract made for officers messing, etc., at Salisbury, for the British system in regard to pay department and the British system in regard to the medical department. From the outset I objected to these women's organizations in Britain in the shape of V. A. D. hospitals, etc., but the Canadian High Commissioner seemed to favour them. The appointments in the force were also based on two avenues of supply, one was British officers connected with society people, and the other Canadian permanent corps officers with their usual pull. In justice to a limited few of each class who were worthy, the majority of them were not up to the average of capability. Since a year ago Canadian control through the Militia Department has been, more or less, with the full consent of the British War Office, gradually recognized to the great advantage of the force.

Mr. Speaker, what does that mean? It means that, according to the charge made by the ex-Minister of Militia, these favours were being parcelled out through a man representing this Government, Sir George Perley, the High Commissioner in London, to those of social standing and to those who had the pull. What pull could he refer to but political pull on the part of the Government? That was the condition of affairs affecting our soldier boys at the front during the first year or two of the war.

On November 1 another letter was written by the hon. ex-Minister of Militia in answer to one written by the First Minister on October 31. After acknowledging receipt of the Premier's letter, the then minister went on to say:

I do recall my visit to Great Britain in the autumn of 1914. I did expect both under the statutory law of Britain, and under the law of common courtesy, that I would have been permitted to exercise some "control and direction" over our gallant Canadian boys in the way of organization.

While he does not expressly say it, the hon. gentleman implies that he was not allowed to exercise any control over the Canadian boys in the way of organization. I hold no brief for the ex-Minister of Militia, but irrespective of my opinion of the ex-minister's capabilities, nothing appealed to the fathers and mothers of the boys of my county who were going to the front more than the interest which Sir Sam Hughes was taking in them. I will say at least that much for the ex-minister. The ex-minister, then, was not allowed to have any control in the organization or care of Canadian troops who went to the front. In the same letter he goes on to say:

But there had evidently been some communication to the effect that "control and direction" of this magnificent force should be under the British Government direct. The then Mr. George Perley, acting High Commissioner, implied such in the following words: "You do not pretend, surely, to have anything to do with the Canadian soldiers in Britain?"

I read these extracts from the correspondence to show that the ex-Minister of Militia was shorn of power by another member of the Cabinet, without his receiving any notice from the Prime Minister. In the same letter he makes use of the following language:

Further, had I ventured to conduct this force on the basis of formal orders in council, the First Division would not have left Valcartier yet, and you know yourself by technicalities the Second Division was held up for four months through little petty haggling on the question of motor trucks, etc., etc.

The second line of your memorandum says: "So far as I am aware you exercised the same control and direction over the forces in Great Britain during the first year as subsequently."

Sir Robert, no one knows better than you that this statement, is incorrect. This last year, with the full concurrence of the War Office, our management and direction have been given every consideration, and by their request.

In these two paragraphs we find a series of charges—not merely suggestions or fault-finding—against the First Minister himself. The ex-minister says that had he waited for the Government to pass orders in council, the first contingent would be at Valcartier yet. I give due consideration to what may possibly be an extravagant statement on his part; yet these words prove beyond peradventure that there was a great holding back; that the troops were delayed in going to the front. And why? According to the statement made by the ex-Minister of Militia, because a few political friends, a few high and holy patriots, were haggling over the prices of trucks and munitions of war so that some of their friends would get a rake-off on the purchase. In respect of this charge made by the ex-Minister of Militia, no denial or defense has been vouchsafed by any member of the Cabinet or by anyone on their behalf. I quote another sentence from this letter:

One other point, and I am through. It might be implied from your memorandum that my failing to secure authority by order in council for this sub-Militia Council impelled you to the course you are now pursuing, regarding Sir George Perley. May I be permitted to say that both you and I know to the contrary. I knew early in August—

this was in November.

—that Sir George Perley had planned something along these very lines. You have, also, admitted that as early as the first week in September you had this matter under consideration. I understood that it was under consideration by you and Perley earlier. You incidentally remarked yesterday that you had not consulted any of your colleagues. Of course, when I drew your attention to the statement, you corrected yourself.

This language, which is now familiar to the people of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific, indicates what had been taking place in the Cabinet during the first period of the war. At a time when our people were asked to send their sons to the front to fight for the Empire, a few gentlemen who should have been bending their energies towards the prosecution of the war were haggling and bickering over small matters connected with the purchase of motor trucks and other war supplies.

On November 11 another letter was written by the ex-Minister of Militia, in which I find the following:

Moreover, it is difficult for me to recall where you have actively supported me in the passage of any order in council concerning the upbuilding of the Militia, when opposed by two members of the Cabinet, usually antagonistic to anything proposed by me.

Further on he says:

As you, are aware, it took up four months in the first of this great war to fight through the principles of purchasing for the Second Division trucks at the lowest wholesale prices, instead of allowing large commissions to local agents, who would have nothing whatever to do with securing the order.

Again he says:

You will pardon me, but I can recall but one instance, namely Secret Service.

That is in answer to the Premier's statement that he had asked him always to have orders in council passed.

I do remember you asking me, on one occasion, to submit orders in council, where possible before incurring large expenditures, but the reason you assigned was not protests from my colleagues over my action, but that it was to set an example so as to assist you to control others. You instanced the Post Office Department, the Railway Department, and the Public Works Department, where projects had been undertaken without authority by order in council; and I remember distinctly you stated that some boats had been purchased and other large expenditures incurred, without your knowing anything about it, and without any order in council.

In answer to what the Premier writes to him, he replies by saying: "I remember you speaking to me and saying that I should have orders in council in regard to expenditures in my department." But it was not because he had any fears of the ex-Minister of Militia going beyond what he was entitled to do, it was simply because he wanted some excuse and reason for keeping his other ministers in check, namely, the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Public Works. And, Sir, what did the ex-Minister of Militia mean, and to whom does he refer, when he says that two members of the Cabinet were antagonistic to him? I say that members of this House and the people of Canada are entitled to know what members of the Cabinet were antagonistic to assisting the ex-Minister of Militia to carry out the promises that he made to the people of Canada, when he

asked the mothers and fathers of the boys to allow them to go to the front to fight the battles of the Empire.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Perhaps the Minister of Labour will tell us when you get through.

Mr. COPP: Perhaps he will be able to, but if he is not more interested in this than in matters pertaining to his own department, I have little faith that he will be able to do much more in the interests of our soldier boys.

Mr. CROTHERS: I think I should give my friend a little light. I want to assure him that I was not smiling at any facts with which he was dealing—because he does not deal with facts—

Mr. PUGSLEY: Order.

Mr. CROTHERS: —but I was smiling at his bombastic manner.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Order, order. The Minister of Labour will have a chance when the hon. member for Westmorland gets through. The minister rose to a point of order.

Mr. CROTHERS: No, I did not.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then what did he rise to? My hon. friend is too good a parliamentarian not to know that he could not rise to anything else.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I understood, the Minister of Labour interjected a remark with the assent of the hon. member for Westmorland.

Mr. PUGSLEY: He did not ask the permission of the hon. member for Westmorland.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understood that he asked it and secured it, because the hon. member for Westmorland resumed his seat and yielded the floor to the hon. minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY: He proceeded to say that the hon. member for Westmorland was not stating facts.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, there is no point of order before the House.

Mr. COPP: I am very glad to have the Minister of Labour rise, even if it was just to show that he has life enough to stand up.

Mr. CROTHERS: I cannot make as much noise as you.

Mr. COPP: He has not made as much—no, he has made too little noise in the interests of the people he represents. Now, Sir, my hon. friend says I do not deal in facts. I am very glad to have my hon. friend make that statement, because the statements I have been making for the last hour are statements made by the hon. the ex-Minister of Militia, Sir Sam Hughes, his own colleague in the Government until recently; I have been reading, letter by letter and word by word, all the charges he has made against his Premier; and when the hon. Minister of Labour says that I am not stating facts, he tells his ex-colleague that he has not stated facts in the letters he has written to the First Minister. I ask him if he still wants to insist that I have not been giving facts when I have been reading the letters of the ex-Minister of Militia.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Let the hon. member state in what respect you have not been stating facts.

Mr. CROTHERS: Oh, no, I am not rising to a point of order.

Mr. COPP: When he says I am not stating facts, I ask him to name a statement I have made this afternoon that is not a fact.

Mr. CROTHERS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member some time ago referred to a lack of interest in the soldiers on my part and so on, and he was also saying that I was smiling because I had no interest in soldiers. When I spoke about his not dealing in facts, I was referring to what he said at that time.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend the Minister of Labour is skating on very thin ice indeed. I can tell him that if it takes him as long to consider any question that is brought before him by the labour men of this country as it has taken him to consider a question that I brought up something over three-quarters of an hour ago, which he has just come to understand, and with reference to which he says I did not state facts, I do not wonder that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction with his administration on the part of labour men.

I want to read one or two other letters written by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia. In his letter of resignation dated November 11, 1916, Sir Sam Hughes says:

> You state "I conveyed to you on the 31st of July a clear intimation that upon so important a proposal involving considerations of the gravest moment, the Cabinet must be consulted before action was taken. All the Members of the Government have full and direct responsibility in respect to the very important matters which the proposed Council would advice upon

and direct. The intimation which was given to you in my telegram of 31st of July should not have been necessary. As soon as it was received you proceeded to disregard it."

The first sentences of this quotation are absolutely true; and it is my belief that had you been actuated by the best interests of the Force, instead of favouritism, that cablegram would not have been dispatched.

The ex-Minister of Militia says that if they had been actuated by the best interests of the force, this cablegram would never have been dispatched. What does that mean? It certainly is an indication that the attitude of the Government was not in the interest of the forces at the front, in so far as they appealed to the intelligence and understanding of the responsible Minister of Militia at that time. Sir, the different paragraphs in the letters and in the correspondence go to bear out all the facts that I have alleged and have read from the statements made by the ex-Minister of Militia, and if they are not correct, if these statements are not facts, as my hon. friend the Minister of Labour says, let him say they are not facts, and show to the people of this country that they are not true. I say that not only is it his privilege, but it is a duty devolving upon the Government to show to the people that these statements are not true, because if they are not true, and they have gone unchallenged so far in this House and in this country, they should be controverted, and the people should be set right in regard to this very important question. I consider them of the very gravest importance to the people of this country, irrespective of whether they are supporters or opponents of the Government.

While the actual statements made by the ex-Minister of Militia could not possibly be known by the public but for the publication of this correspondence, it has been practically known and understood by the people of this country that there were grave differences in the Cabinet, and that very thing alone has been one of the biggest forces working against recruiting, working against the Empire, that could possibly exists. The trouble in the Cabinet, then and since has been very largely responsible for the falling off in recruiting throughout the Dominion during the past year:

That brings me to the clause in the speech from the Throne which refers to National Service. That is a subject of great importance to every Canadian, who, I believe, is interested in the carrying on of this great war. Much has been said in this House during the past week in regard to National Service. The first question which arises in one's mind is, why was it necessary to institute this National Service Commission? I presume, Sir—I do not think I am taking too much upon myself to presume—that it was because recruiting had fallen off, and that we were not likely to get the 500,000 men that were promised by the right hon. Prime Minister and that we all hope to obtain so that Canada may play its proper part in the war. If that is the purpose of the National Service Commission I agree with it up to the very hilt. I am willing to subscribe to it and to do anything that can be done in the interests of national service. I do not say that I will do nothing, or that I will not give it support until I see what is actually to become of it. I am willing to go into it a little blindly if it is along the line of being of advantage to the country generally, and in the interests of the war. Criticisms may be made in regard to the wording of the National Service cards, and in regard to other details; but whenever I have been consulted as to the filling up of the card I have advised my friends to fill them up, and have done everything possible, as I am prepared to do everything possible to assist the scheme in the hope, though possibly not with a great deal of confidence, that good may come out of it, and that the interests of the country will be better served through having a record of the man power, wealth and resources of the Dominion. I am willing to subscribe to anything that will help the mobilization of our troops and be of service in connection with the war; but we must realize that a number of people who are being blamed for not signing or returning their cards do not understand them. There are others who may not be able to fill up the cards, and therefore I think some latitude should be allowed. I believe that the great majority of the people have done their duty in regard to the National Service scheme, and I sincerely hope and trust that the results will be satisfying to the Government and to the people as a whole.

There is one other matter to which I would like to refer. I have referred before to the attitude of certain organizations throughout Canada towards the present Government, and I desire to bring to the attention of the Government a resolution that was passed a few days ago by the municipal council in my own county. We consider the county council of Westmorland one of the most important, if not the most important, municipal body in the whole

province of New Brunswick. It is a very strong council and conducts its affairs in a manner that would do credit even to the Dominion House of Commons. This council is composed of both Liberals and Conservatives who, however, set aside their political affiliations in the conduct of the business of the county. They are chosen because of their fitness to represent their respective localities. We have in that council a gentleman who politically is a very strong opponent of my own, a gentleman who has stood staunch and true to the good old traditions of the Conservative party. In view of that fact, Mr. Speaker, you will, I am sure, be glad to hear the statement he made in regard to matters touching the question that I am now submitting to the attention of the Government. I am sure, Sir, that you, if not other members of the House, will know the gentleman when I mention his name—Councillor Fawcett of Sackville, one of the leading farmers in that locality. At a meeting of the council a few days ago he moved the following resolution, and it appeared to me to be of such importance that I take the responsibility of placing it upon Hansard. It reads as follows:

WHEREAS, the Municipality of Westmorland County (including the towns in the County of Westmorland and the City of Moncton) has since the commencement of the war, contributed the sum of $86,000 for patriotic purposes which has been levied by a direct tax upon the rate-payers of the county, and

WHEREAS, it is anticipated that a further and larger amount will be required for like purposes during the year 1917, and which amount it will be necessary to raise by direct taxation, and

WHEREAS, the Municipal Council of said Municipality have become and are aware that enormous profits have already been made and are still being made in this county and throughout Canada by certain persons and companies engaged in the manufacture of shells or other munitions and products, by reason of the war, and

WHEREAS, in many cases the plant and equipment of such industries were paid in effect by the people of Canada—that is to say, by the Munition Board of Canada, giving to such persons and companies before they embarked in the business, a sufficiently large order for shells at very large prices, as would enable and which did enable such persons and concerns to pay out of the profits therefrom the whole cost of such plant and equipment, and provide a handsome profit besides, and

WHEREAS, the avowed purpose of the said Munition Board in giving such high prices, was to indemnify those who might engage in the manufacture of munitions against any loss in case of a sudden termination of the war, and

WHEREAS, the war has now continued for about two years and a half, and the persons and companies who went into the business of manufacturing war products have been allowed to retain substantially the whole of the profits derived from such business, and

WHEREAS, such persons and companies by reason of the action of the said Munition Board in paying such high prices in the first instance, received in full the whole cost of their plant and equipment from the profits of the first order, and they would therefore, thereafter, actually have no moneys of their own invested in the undertaking, and

WHEREAS such persons and companies have during the last two years accumulated great wealth from said war profits, to which it cannot fairly be said they would be entitled, their plants and equipment having been paid for out of profits, and all operating charges, expenses, and salaries having been also charged up against earnings, and

WHEREAS, the people of Canada will ultimately be called upon to pay the debt that Canada is rapidly accumulating by reason of the war, and such debt would be materially less if the profits now improperly going into the pockets of private individuals, were diverted into the treasury of Canada, and

WHEREAS, the Municipal Council of the said County of Westmorland feel that a great wrong and injustice will be done to the rate-payers of the County of Westmorland, in requiring them to face direct taxation in connection with the prosecution of the war, while other people are being provided with what in effect are large "gratuities" out of the pockets of the people.

Be it and it is therefore resolved that the Municipal Council of the County of Westmorland do and it hereby does most respectfully and earnestly urge upon the Government of Canada that it insist upon the payment to it. during the remainder of the war, of all net profits hereafter made by all persons and companies engaged in the manufacture of war munitions, and in respect of such persons and companies as have in the past been allowed to retain profits of the cost of their plant and equipment engaged in the business that they may be compelled to account for and hand over to the Government all such surplus profits.

That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Prime Minister of Canada, the Minister of Finance, and the Minister of Militia of Canada.

That is the resolution and the words of the gentlemen who introduced that resolution are so strong and so much to the point that I propose to read a few paragraphs from the statement which he made. In introducing this resolution Mr. Fawcett said:

Mr. Warden, while it is no doubt desirable to vote money to the Patriotic Fund, it is also desirable that this Council should make some emphatic protest against public moneys in the way of war profits being paid to private individuals instead of being appropriated by the Dominion Government for the purpose of prosecuting the war. That this is being done on a very large scale is now established beyond doubt. Protest should be made and that the facts may be placed clearly before the public. I know that Canada as a part of the British Empire is at war, and I am more proud of that Empire to-day than I have ever been before; I know that the young manhood of this country unhesitatingly sprang to arms at the bugle call for volunteers, and that they

gloriously fought and died on the plains of France and elsewhere. I know that the women and even children of Great Britain and Canada are performing heroic services for the Empire, either without any or very small reward; I know that the privately-owned railways of Great Britain, the coal fields of that country and most of the munition plants are in the service of the state. I also know that the few remaining private enterprises are being taxed to the hilt in order that no discrimination shall anywhere exist, and I am assured, that the self-sacrifice and patriotism that is now dominating the minds and efforts of all classes, throughout Great Britain, and which is the marvel of the world, is largely traceable to this fact.

All are sharers in the struggle, all are making sacrifices. But this is not the case in Canada. The munition factories and many other of the business enterprises of this country are getting rich and richer as the war progresses, out of and because of the war, while many people are perforce becoming poorer. The people know, as I have said, that nothing like this state of affairs exists in Great Britain, and they also know that it would not be tolerated in France or any other European country engaged in the war, hence it is, that it is beyond their comprehension that it should be allowed to continue in this country. I wish to here say that the public are fast becoming disheartened and embittered over this condition of affairs, and are not in a humour to remain silent. They are not in a mood to stand for partiality towards any class or special interests, and they are not prepared to see these people gobble up money that should properly find its way to the Public Treasury.

These are statements made not by a partisan, and not by a man who is supporting, or whoever supported, the Liberal party. They are made by a gentleman who has consistently and honestly supported hon. gentlemen opposite. But, realizing that the people are becoming disappointed and discouraged because of the condition of affairs he takes this stand. Therefore, it will be seen that I am not reading this from the standpoint of party politics. I would have very grave doubts whether he would change his party allegiance. Possibly he has taken this means of showing his friends the position of affairs as it appears to the people of that portion of Canada. He goes on to say:

"The people of Canada today," said Council-Fawcett, "are interested solely in a body of men who will rule and run the country affairs with fairness and **equality.**"

Councillor Fawcett substantiated his arguments by giving figures purporting to be the cost of construction of a munition plant, and of the profits made by the company. He gave details of the shell orders filled and of the profits in each shell.

He said that he was prepared to stand behind all his statements, and said further that he had been a strong Conservative all his life, but that he could not conscientiously see his way clear to stand for such conditions as existed in the Government forces today.

[Mr. Copp.]

That is the evidence of a gentleman who stands high in his community, who gives a great deal of careful study and thought to public questions and who occupies a very prominent place in the minds of the people of that portion of the county that I have the honour to represent. I have laid before you the fact that these charges have been made. It is not that I am making them myself but they have been made in other quarters and I am only reiterating what has been said elsewhere. They have been made by public bodies, organizations, and boards of trade independent of party, independent of what has taken place in this House, they must have very great weight with the Government and I trust that the Government will yet take time by the forelock and do something that will be more in the interest of the people generally.

The next matter I want to speak of briefly is the paragraph in the speech from the Throne that refers to the extension of Parliament. That is a matter that will come before this House by resolution. I do not know just what attitude Parliament will take in regard to it. I feel that it is a question that should be given the most serious consideration in the light of what would be best for the country generally and not for any particular party or body of men. I sincerely trust that when this resolution comes before the House the First Minister will be able to give very much better reasons for extending the present term of Parliament than he gave the other day when he addressed the House in answer to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition? The only reason that he gave the other day for saying that an extension of Parliament would be a proper thing was that if an election were called during the present year the probabilities would be that a very large portion of our population would be disfranchised because of the number of soldiers at the front. I was surprised to hear him admit the other day that it would be impossible to record the votes of our soldier boys at the front. When, something over a year ago, this matter was before the House and the Bill was passed giving soldiers the right to vote, there was evidence that the Government intended to appeal to the country at an early date. I understand that the ballots were prepared, shipped across to the Old Country and were practically placed in the hands of the gentlemen who were to have control of taking the soldiers' votes at that

time. But, what a change has come over the spirit of the dreams of my hon. friends opposite? The hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) who was in charge of the Bill, pointed out in the most emphatic language at that time that it would be absolutely reasonable and quite easy to take the soldiers' votes at the front. Now, a change has come about and they say it would be almost impossible and impracticable to take the soldiers' votes. They say that the soldiers should not be disfranchised and that is one of the reasons given for an extension of the term of Parliament. I am not here to say whether or not I would support an extension of the term of Parliament. The matter will come before the House in the regular way, and I sincerely trust it will then be given the importance that it deserves.

Another matter that has been brought to my attention very frequently, not only during the progress of this debate but during the past year, is the loyalty cry. I had hoped that this cry of loyalty or disloyalty from any political party was at an end, but still the cry is kept up. Our friends on the Government side take to themselves all the credit for being the loyal party in Canada. While I do not wish to detract anything from them in that regard, as one member of this Parliament who has spent some little time in public life and who has always conscientiously supported the party which I believe to be in the interest of the country, although I am not thin-skinned, I do not like to have it cast up to me day after day and time after time by my opponents or by the Tory press that I am disloyal to my King and country or to any portion of the Empire. I sincerely trust that this cry that the Liberal people in Canada are disloyal will cease, because the time is past when any party of any standing in the country should stoop to such low tactics. We have heard a good deal of talk in this House in regard to loyalty or disloyalty of utterances by certain persons in different parts of the country.

I wish to refer for a few minutes to the election which is about to take place in the county of Dorchester, P.Q. Much has been said, and much has been published in the daily press in regard to this election, and I have been somewhat impressed with the very active manner in which the campaign has been carried on by both gentlemen who are contesting the constituency. I was more than surprised —I was simply shocked, on picking up this morning's Citizen, to read the following:

> Ste. Germaine, Que., Jan. 25.—The Liberal organization here sprung a mine tonight when they announced that Hon. P. E. Blondin, who is working at Ste. Rose in the interests of Hon. Albert Sevigny, minister of inland revenue, had been uttering disloyal sentiments in meetings at Ste. Rose.
>
> The following affidavit was given out tonight by the Liberal chiefs:
>
> We, the undersigned, declare that we heard last night at Ste. Rose, January 24, 1917, the Hon. P. E. Blondin make the following declarations:
>
> 'As for the Allison scandal and others of the same nature, let us suppose that if these thefts have taken place it has not importance for the people of Ste. Rose, because it was English money that was stolen.'
>
> Speaking of the danger of conscription, Mr. Blondin declared: 'Even if conscription was put in force that would mean little to the people of Ste-Rose, because they had only to cross the frontier to get away.'
>
> "(Signed) Dorille Prevost, Valere Lamontagne.
>
> Sworn before me, Justice of the Peace, J. B. Cote, at Ste. Germaine, Dorchester, this 25th day of January, 1917.
>
> (Signed) J. B. Cote, Justice of the Peace.'

There we have a member, not only of this House, but of the Government, going into a constituency in the province of Quebec and making a statement of that nature.

Mr. ROGERS: I would just like to draw my hon. friend's attention to the fact that a few moments ago I was telephoned to from Quebec by Mr. Patenaude, who had been asked by Mr. Blondin, who had seen this statement to-day, to give it an unequivocal denial as being absolutely untrue, and to say that he will answer it himself when he comes into the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Perhaps my hon. friend has seen the answer which is given by Mr. Blondin and which is published in the Journal of this evening. I hope my hon. friend will read the contradiction.

Mr. ROGERS: It is not his answer.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, in the Journal.

Mr. ROGERS: No, it is not.

Mr. COPP: I have not seen the reply in the Journal of this evening. I was going on to say that that is a statement signed by two men and sworn to before a Justice of the Peace in the county of Dorchester. The hon. Minister of Public Works says that Mr. Blondin has given it an unequivocal denial. That answer I will read in order to have it placed upon Hansard, because I do not want to say anything unfair about any one. If, however, the statement in that affidavit is correct, that this gentleman (who occupies a position in the Government and who is in the service

of the country and has the secrets of affairs in connection with this matter) has made use of such a statement, it is no wonder that the member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) and the member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) pointed out last night how impossible it would be to expect recruiting to go on when one of the ministers of the Crown would go down to the county of Dorchester in the province of Quebec, and for the purpose of a little, cheap party advantage at an election to be held there on Saturday, would put it into the minds of his compatriots that, instead of signing the National Service cards and doing their part in the war, they should step across the border. Mr. Blondin says:

> Let us suppose that if these thefts have taken place—

He does not say the money was stolen, but by implication he comes very near to admitting that a great deal of the money was stolen; but he asks what difference does it make as it is the money of England. The matter should be taken up at once and some light thrown on it. I will now read the denial of Mr. Blondin.

Mr. ROGERS: Denial?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Alleged denial.

Mr. COPP: I am reading from the Ottawa Evening Journal of January 26:

> Hon. P. E. Blondin, through his lieutenant, Felix Durocher, has issued a reply to an affidavit, which purported to give a report of his remarks at Ste. Rose during a Dorchester county by-election speech on Wednesday night. The affidavit credited Mr. Blondin with contending that the Allison scandal was of no importance to Ste. Rose because it is English money that was stolen, while those who desired to escape conscription could do so by crossing the United States border. Mr. Blondin's explanation follows:
>
> "The statement which has been sworn to by certain Liberals with regard to my utterances are a distortion of my words. I never by any means intented to convey the meaning which they have attached to my speech. Mr. Cannon had been stating in his speeches that the Conservative party had been grafting from the Canadian treasury in connection with munition contracts.
>
> "In my speech at Ste. Rose I explained that, it was not true that the Allison scandal had to do with Canadian money pointing out that the money paid for the shells was the money of the British Government. I did not imply that Allison had done a worthy act, but simply corrected Mr. Cannon's mis-statement. In regard to the conscription matter I told the people of Ste-Rose that I did not believe conscription would be necessary because so many Canadians were eager to go and fight for the cause of liberty and humanity. I added that if any of them were afraid of conscription, if conscription should be passed and they did not want to go to the war, they had a remedy left. They could go across the United States line which is near Ste. Rose and escape military service."

What an exhibition on the part of a minister of the Crown, that when our friends are asking the people throughout
5 p.m. Canada to assist them in having the National Service cards properly signed and returned, he should go into a county where an election is to be held to-morrow and intimate to these people in that county that if they do not want to go to war, and if they fear that these cards will lead to conscription, they can easily step across the border to the United States and thus escape it.

I can well imagine the headlines that we should see in the Journal to-night if the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had made a statement like that, or if such a statement had been made by my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), or my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). Hon. gentlemen opposite would have raised their hands in holy horror, and would have gnashed their teeth in an effort to rouse and inflame race prejudice. But the Postmaster General (Mr. Blondin) is the man who makes these statements in the county of Dorchester. Frankly and honestly, I had hoped that in reading the paper this morning I should find that the hon. gentleman had cleared his skirts by making such a denial as the Minister of Public Works stated he had received by telephone. That denial may appear in this evening's papers; I sincerely trust it may.

Mr. PUGSLEY: He admits it.

Mr. COPP: He does practically admit it, from what I have read. Knowing the deep and active interest that the people whom I have the honour to represent have taken in the prosecution of this war, as shown by their self-sacrificing efforts and the utterances of their several organizations and institutions, I have felt it my duty to bring before this House the charges made by the ex-Minister of Militia that there has been bungling by the Government in matters connected with the war, and to demand in their behalf some explanation.

In conclusion, Sir, may I hope that the Government, notwithstanding their many and almost criminal failures in the past, will amend their course for the time they still have the control of Canada's part in the terrible conflict—be it long or short; that they will awake from their lethargy, tear asunder the party shackles that have

bound them hand and foot to the manufacturing and other monopolistic interests of this country, and sever the ties of that unholy alliance they have made with the Nationalists in their thirst for power, the most dangerous element that has ever been introduced into the political life of Canada, and that, before it is yet too late, they will show to the world at large, show to Canada, show to the thousands of our heroic sons who have gone to the front to do and die in the cause of liberty and civilization and for the memory of those gallant sons who have fought, bled and died that the flag we love shall still wave; show to the mourning fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, wives and children, who are left, that the Government of Canada, the public men of Canada, are able to rise above small party politics, and thus place our fair Dominion above and beyond further reproach, that she may maintain her position as the greatest of the overseas colonies of the British Empire.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia): I had hoped that when the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp) finished his address some hon. member on the other side would rise to continue the debate, and I waited for a moment before rising. But it appears that our friends opposite are not inclined to attempt to answer the arguments put forth from this side. This must be for one of two reasons; either they are not able to answer, or they are so anxious to get the debate finished and to get from under the accusations laid against them that they think their best policy is silence—least said, soonest forgotten. In my experience of twelve years in this House, I have never seen anything like this. However, if our friends opposite have nothing to say, we on this side have something to say as to the Government's management of the country's affairs.

In the speech from the Throne three subjects, and three only, are touched upon. One, is the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the life of the Dominion; the second, is the extension of the term of Parliament; and the third is the Imperial Conference. Some hon. members on this side, as well as some on the other side, who have spoken in this debate, have taken the position that we should do something in the way of celebrating this jubilee year of the Dominion. I find myself obliged to differ with those who take that view. Under ordinary conditions such a celebration would be most proper; but in view of the terrible circumstances of the country, with Canada and the Empire engaged in a tremendous struggle, with the end of that struggle not yet in sight, and no means of knowing what will yet be required of us in men and money, in my judgment the people of Canada would be making a great mistake if they undertook any large expenditure, or even a moderate expenditure, in celebrating even so important an occasion as the completion of fifty years of our national life as the Dominion. When this war is over and when conditions are improved, then, it seems to me, will be the time for us to celebrate. Then, I trust, we shall be able to celebrate a victory, such a victory that, for a hundred years at least, if not for all time, we shall be free from war.

I am aware that there has been tacitly more or less of an agreement that there should be no discussion on the question of the extension of the term of Parliament. I do not intend to take up very much time on that question, but there are a few reasons which cause me to believe that the term should not be extended, and those reasons I wish to give briefly. In the first place, there are to-day forty-three vacancies in this House. Nineteen seats are vacant through death or resignation. My right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has offered to the Prime Minister that all these vacancies caused by death should be filled by acclamation. My right hon. leader refused to agree that two members who had been read out of the Conservative party should, if they offered themselves for re-election, be elected by acclamation. He refused also to allow two vacancies in Manitoba which had been created for purely partisan purposes to be filled by acclamation. On that account the Government absolutely refused to accept the suggestion of hon. gentlemen on this side that vacancies caused by death should be filled by acclamation, the person elected being of the same political party as the deceased member had been. That is one reason why I am opposed to an extension. But the chief reason is that an extension would not be fair to the whole western country. Ever since 1911, the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia have been entitled to twenty-two additional seats. The representation of the provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia in the House at the present time is based on the census of 1901. Saskatchewan and Alberta are in a somewhat different position. Under the

Autonomy Bills of 1905 it was provided that a census should be taken in those provinces every five years, so that their representation is based upon the census taken in 1906. Notwithstanding the fact that there are 43 vacant seats in this House, hon. gentlemen opposite contend that there should be another extension of the term of Parliament. While it may be argued that the life of this Parliament should be further extended, any such extension should be made by the people of Canada. We are sitting in this House not as a result of the votes of the people, but through our own votes. A number of men are sitting in this House by their own vote who could not possibly get back to Parliament. Maybe I am one of those members, but if that is so, it is one reason why there should be an election. If I do not represent the views of the people of my constituency, why should I vote myself into Parliament for a second additional year? I am not prepared to say that there should not be any extension of Parliament; I want to hear the question discussed. I want to hear what additional reasons the Government can put forward why there should be an extension of Parliament. Last year we voted for an extension. After that certain investigations were held which did not redound to the credit of the Government or lend it additional strength. Nor do I think that the result of those investigations led any of the people to have increased faith in the men who are running the affairs of Canada to-day. Moreover, before considering the advisability of extending the parliamentary term, I want the Government to bring down information as to what they have done during the past year and as to what they purpose doing during the next year if an extension is granted. When our friends on the opposite side of the House bring down this information and the matter is discussed, they may be able to offer good reasons for an extension; but they will have to be pretty good to satisfy me that such a course is advisable. I do not believe that the outfit sitting on the treasury benches are fit to govern this country in times of peace, let alone in time of war. If the people of Canada by their votes say that they are, well and good; we on this side will have no objections to make. I trust that there will be an appeal to the people, so that it may be ascertained whether the majority of them are in favour of a continuation of what we have had during the past three years.

The Prime Minister gave as one of his reasons why there should not be an election the impossibility of taking the vote of the soldiers at the front. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers), who is now leading the House, practically chloroformed the right hon. leader of the Government two years ago when the Soldiers' Vote Bill was passed. What has caused the change of mind on the part of the Prime Minister? If the vote of the soldiers at the front can not be taken, why was that Bill passed? Why were the ballots printed and sent to England, all ready for the springing of an election at any moment? We on this side of the House felt that you could not fairly get the vote of the soldiers, but I said at the time the Bill was passed that if we could get the ballots properly delivered in the different constituencies, we would have no fear of the result. Judging from all the evidence, and particularly from letters received by parents of the boys who are at the front, if the soldiers' ballots are taken and properly delivered to the various constituencies, there will be a vote of three to one against the Government. That is why hon. gentlemen opposite have changed their minds; that is why they want to back out and avoid getting the votes of the soldiers. My genial friend the Minister of Public Works has told us in the House that if he does not know much else—I am using his own words—he knows how to win elections. My hon. friend did have that reputation, and for a while he made it good; but that reputation has been shattered since my hon. friend left a small province to assume a federal role. At that time the price he was paying to get into the Dominion Cabinet was an undertaking to turn over Saskatchewan and Alberta, bound hand and foot, to the Conservative party. Saskatchewan did not respond to his advances; Alberta did not respond to his advances, and even in the province of Manitoba, that he had trained and that he had controlled by the most diabolical political machine that ever had been in existence in the history of this world, even with that machine my hon. friend was not able to hold his own. My hon. friend took a part in the recent local elections in the province of Quebec. He won five seats out of eighty-one. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is five anyway, so we will leave it at that. I am not going to put any blame on my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works for what took

place in British Columbia, except to say that our friends in British Columbia, when everything was fine and the flag was flying and waving all the time in Manitoba, looked on him as a big man and a safe man to follow in order to win elections, and they duplicated his political machine in British Columbia, with the result that to-day in British Columbia the influence of my hon. friend and of his friends there has been practically wiped out. In all these provinces that I have referred to Liberal Governments are in power, and there are mighty small Oppositions of our Conservative friends. And that is what awaits my hon. friend and his followers and his colleagues on the treasury benches whenever the people of this country have an opportunity of passing judgment on the manner in which this Government has conducted the affairs of Canada during the past five years. I do not wonder that my hon. friends are anxious to have a further extension of time instead of an election. It is the most natural thing for them to do; if I was in their place I would be very glad to have an extension of time, instead of facing an outraged public. It is natural, but the question is, should it be allowed them? We hear a good deal to-day of a national government. Where is all that talk coming from? Is it coming from the Liberals?

Mr. ROGERS: Ralph Connor.

Mr. TURRIFF: It is coming from Ralph Connor? All right. Ralph Connor is a very good man.

Mr. ROGERS: A good Grit.

Mr. TURRIFF: He is a very good man, and a good man has to be a Grit; he cannot be a really good man unless he is. It is a credit to Ralph Connor that he is not able to follow my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. That redounds to his credit. That is why he stands so high in Manitoba and in the Dominion, that he could not see his way clear to follow the present Dominion Government. But practically all the agitation for a national government is coming from the ranks of my hon. friends opposite. And why should there be an agitation at this time for a national government? For a government of business men? Why, practically all the business men of the country are in either the one party or the other. Does my hon. friend mean to say that in a population of seven million or eight million people, half of them Conservatives, he could not pick out more than twelve or fifteen men in his own party if a business government were wanted? Or if a national government were wanted, could not my hon. friends opposite pick out from among their own friends enough men to make their Government a good government? But in order to make a business government, or a national government, or a decently good government, it would be necessary to replace fourteen of the fifteen members of the present Government by new men. Is it possible that I have come so near the truth that it pleases even my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen)? I have left that one so that each member of the Government can take it to himself that he is the man who should remain in the Government, and that fourteen others should be selected. I know that my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie naturally would feel that he was the one, and I will do my hon. friend the credit of saying that, leaving out little pecularities such as being a great word-splitting acrobat, he has the brains, and if he would only use them right, as his conscience would direct—that is if he has a conscience, which sometimes I doubt—then I think he might be the man who would select the fourteen to form a national government. What does this national government mean? I do not know whether my hon. friend who is now leading the House (Mr. Rogers) would be called upon to make the selection, but if he did, what would the national government be like? But taking it at its best, allowing that in the selection of a new Government, a national government, a business government, great care was exercised by my hon. friends opposite, it would be, in my judgment, neither more nor less than a government of the big interests of Canada. There is no question about that. We have heard mentioned some names of men likely to be called to a government of that description, and from what I can judge it would be a government whose chief duty would be to so place the taxation of Canada on the poor and the middle classes of Canada that the big business interests and the millionaires would escape. Have you noticed that the direct taxation legislation that was passed last year was so drafted that it hit certain men, hit them pretty hard, but left others scot free? I do not think the legislation that was passed last year providing for direct taxation hit one of the multi-millionaires sitting on the treasury benches. If you had a national government selected by some one of the present Government, you would have very much the same

result. Who is to select this national government if one is to be formed? There must be somebody in charge and, unless we have an election, it would have to be the party opposite, so far as I can see, and so you would simply get another party government. I do not doubt that you would get better men, because I think it is a moral impossibility to put in fourteen new men and not have a better government, I care not whether any care was exercised in the selection or not, it would be an improvement; there is absolutely no question about that.

But would it be the class of Government that the people of Canada want at the present time? Have the big interests done so much for the country during the past two or three years? They have been making money by the millions, the tens of millions, and the hundreds of millions out of the people of Canada. Have they been moderate in their demands for profits? Not to any extent. There have been one or two exceptions. We have had a few instances of what these men are making. Take the Montreal Ammunition Company. As stated by my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) yesterday, that company paid a dividend of 900 per cent for one year. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, the Government allowing any set of men to put in $100 for a share, and during one year take out $900 in dividends, and leave $600 more as a rest account, thus robbing the people of Canada and of Great Britain. Imagine this Government allowing them to do that, and not even taxing them any more than they tax the ordinary honest business man. Why should not these men who are making millions not be taxed as they are in Great Britain? The Prime Minister on his return from a visit to Great Britain stated that the whole resources of Canada in men and material would be devoted to the winning of the war, and in the face of that statement the Government are allowing a few of their personal friends to rake out money from the pockets of the people of Canada and Great Britain by the tens of millions of dollars, while they treat them exactly the same, so far as taxation is concerned, as they treat the ordinary honest business man who does a legitimate business.

Let us take another instance. A couple of years ago, a firm in Hamilton got a contract for shells. They filled that contract; they had a year's work at it, and they made a lot of money. The owner of the factory went to the Government and said: I have made as much money out of that contract as one man ought to have; I am satisfied, and am willing now to turn the factory over to the Government so that they may run it and supply the shells for the Canadian and British troops at cost. One would think that that was a pretty fair and reasonable offer, but did the Government accept it? No, they refused that offer. Why? Because, the Minister of Labour stated it was not in the interests of the country for the Government to go into competition with private industry. In order to allow their party friends to take millions of dollars from the people of Canada—because in this, as in everything else connected with the war, practically everything had to go to their partisan friends—the Government refused to take over that factory and run it. The result was that the gentleman who made that offer was compelled to continue the work, although he did not want to go on, and during the second year he made a profit of $750,000. As he had stated the year before that he did not want that money, he handed it over to the Government, but why should the Government allow any one to make money to that extent out of the agony of the people of Canada? Why does the Government not come forward now and take over a lot of this work, make the shells, fuses, and other munitions of war at cost price, and supply them to the soldiers of Canada and Great Britain at the cheapest possible price? That would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, to be the proper and business thing to do; but our hon. friends opposite have absolutely refused to move in any way at all, to do anything to prevent this extravagant waste of money, or to help out the Empire and Canada by supplying the munitions of war at a fair and reasonable price.

Mr. BURNHAM: Who sets the prices?

Mr. TURRIFF: Perhaps my hon. friend will tell me.

Mr. BURNHAM: I am asking you: You seem to know all about it.

Mr. TURRIFF: If I did not know more about it than my hon. friend I would not interrupt a speaker.

Mr. BURNHAM: That may be wit, but there is not much sense in it.

Mr. TURRIFF: Will my hon. friend tell me who sets the prices? He has been parading over at the front—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. TURRIFF: Well, he paraded in England, and paid a visit to the front, and he ought to be able to tell me who fixes the prices.

Mr. BURNHAM: You are making the speech; I am not.

Mr. TURRIFF: Then allow me to make it. I am trying to make the speech, but my hon. friend undertook to help me out.

Mr. BURNHAM: You are not succeeding.

Mr. TURRIFF: I think I am as capable of making my speech as my hon. friend is of helping.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. TURRIFF: Let me remind my hon. friend of what the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) said the other day about metaphysics. I should have thought that that would keep my hon. friend quiet for a little longer than two days.

Mr. BURNHAM: My hon. friend does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. TURRIFF: With the evidence before us of what these munition manufacturers are making, why does the Government not tax them? They tax the honest business man twenty-five per cent on all he makes over seven per cent or ten per cent, as the case may be; but these munition men who are making money by the millions and tens of millions do not pay any more. Why does the Government not come forward and do as they do in Great Britain, as Lloyd George has done; as the Republic of France has done, and say to these manufacturers: we will allow you a certain percentage and after that we will take fifty or seventy-five per cent. If these munition manufacturers, who are making tens of millions of dollars, had to give up seventy-five per cent of what remained to them over ten per cent, it would amount to a very large sum of money and would help to relieve the ordinary business man who is heavily taxed.

Let us take another concern that is making money hand over fist. The other day the hon. the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), who is not in his seat just now—I wish he were—made an interesting statement with reference to one of the big steel companies of Canada. He said that this company, which has tens of millions of dollars' worth of common stock, on account of which not one single cent of money ever was in the treasury of the company, in addition to paying their fixed charges in the shape of interest on their bonds, dividends on their preferred stock, deferred dividends, and dividends on common stock, were to-day piling up at least a million dollars a month as a reserve fund. That is all made by turning out material for the manufacture of munitions of war. Why should not a company like that be taxed. They were given bonuses to the extent of tens of millions of dollars by this country, and now they take advantage of the fact that the people are at war to charge such prices that they can pay all these dividends that I have mentioned and put by on rest account a million dollars a month. That is what my hon. friends opposite are allowing to go on, not only in reference to the companies that I have mentioned, but in reference to dozens and scores and hundreds of companies who are profiting in the same way. They will not lift a hand to make these men pay more than the ordinary business man is paying. Is it any wonder that the people of the country are tired of that kind of rule? It is to be expected, and in view of this fact I think it would be a mistake if this Government should be given any particular extension of time. What the country wants is a sharp and strict account of how the Government are conducting its affairs. My hon. friend (Mr. Copp), who has just taken his seat, has read some correspondence between the hon. ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) and this Government, in which the ex-minister has made some fifteen or twenty direct charges of malfeasance against his colleagues, and my hon friends on the treasury benches say nothing about it, do not answer the argument, have nothing to say. I think, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you will agree with me, being a pretty fair man, that this Parliament should appoint a committee of the House to investigate the charges that their own colleague has made against these hon. gentlemen.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. TURRIFF: Mr. Speaker, the subject that I wish to deal with now for a short

time is the deliberate attempt that is being made in the Conservative press throughout Canada to connect the Nationalist party and Messrs. Bourassa and Lavergne with my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, and I challenge the Government to bring forward one iota of proof of any occasion before or since the war began that my honoured leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, has ever been guilty of favouring any of the policies advocated by Mr. Bourassa and the Nationalists who are to day members of this Government. I defy my hon. friends on the Government benches to point out a single instance in which a charge of that kind can be truthfully made. In spite of that fact the Conservative press, throughout Ontario particularly and in some parts of the West, is trying to connect Sir Wilfrid Laurier with the Nationalist party. In order to make my remarks clear, as a large part of them will consist of extracts and editorials from the Nationalist and Conservative press, I am going to read those extracts and also what I have to say on the matter. Hon. members will remember that the alliance between the Nationalists and the Conservative party started over the naval policy of the Liberal Government, and that in the year 1909 the House of Commons, Conservatives and Liberals alike, agreed on a policy to build a Canadian navy, building the ships in Canada and manning them by Canadians. In the year 1910, the Liberal Government came forward with a naval policy, and let me remark here that the present Government is to-day advertising for men to man light cruisers. What for? To send over to Britain? No, to defend the Canadian coast. The advertisement is to-day appearing in the Canadian papers, and I have a copy of it on my desk. In 1910, however, there was a change, and gentlemen on the other side of the House had adopted a new policy, and in so doing they were brought into alliance with their particular friends, Messrs. Bourassa and Lavergne.

Mr. BURNHAM: They are your friends, then?

Mr. TURRIFF: I think my hon. friend from Peterborough wants another story, but I will not waste any more time with him to-night.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Send him over to France.

Mr. TURRIFF: What position did Mr. Bourassa take? This change occurred over the resolution of 1909 and the Act of 1910, and although various excuses have been made, no satisfactory reason founded upon sound public policy has ever been given for it. The actual cause for this change of heart is to be found in the close connection of Borden and Bourassa.

It would be indeed surprising were it not true, that, notwithstanding their professions of loyalty and devotion to the Mother Country, their professed willingness to sacrifice all for the flag, their burning zeal to consecrate themselves and everything else for the upbuilding and maintenance of the Empire, the hon. gentlemen who sit upon the Government side would seize the first opportunity to form an alliance with the very men whom now they pretend to repudiate and whose principles they now pretend to oppose in the most violent manner. What was it that caused this change of heart on the part of the Premier and his followers? There can be but one answer, namely, their alliance with Bourassa and the adoption of his views.

What were, and, so far as we know, are Bourassa's views? The following articles were incorporated in the platform of the Nationalist party, of which Mr. Henri Bourassa was the head and front, and were readopted at a meeting of the National League held at Eustache, Que., in July, 1910:

(a) No participation by Canada in Imperial wars outside her territory.
(b) To spurn any attempt at recruiting for British troops.
(c) To oppose the establishment in Canada of a naval school with the help and for the benefit of Imperial authorities.
(d) Control over our militia and military colleges in time of war as in time of peace and for the defence of our territory exclusively. Refusal to grant leave of absence to any militia officer in order that he may take part in any Imperial war.

Is this not strong and clear enough? Is there any doubt of the attitude of the Nationalist party? Can any one reading the articles of their Nationalist platform come to any other conclusion than that there was to be no mingling and no commingling with Great Britain in wars outside Canadian territory. Such then was the position of the Nationalists. What was and is the position of the party now in power? What does Mr. Bourassa say? Let me refer to his paper, Le Devoir, of May 29, 1913, in which issue Mr. Bourassa writes as follows:

During the session of 1910-1911 two leaders of the Conservative party requested that I meet them at the House of a mutual friend of ours. The envoys opened as follows:

The Nationalists say they are fighting, as we do, the Liberal Government, but their stand upon reciprocity embarrasses us, the Conservative party, to a great extent. Were we (the Conservatives and Nationalists) to unite our efforts primarily against reciprocity, it is quite possible that an understanding satisfactory to both parties could be arrived at on the naval question since we are one on the point of popular consultation. If you press the naval question in Quebec it may provoke a display of loyalism in the extremist wing of our party. If reciprocity be but a subordinate issue with you, the difference between us might broaden still more, for the sole benefit of the common foe. At the time of a general election candidates will come forward who, while opposing the naval law will support reciprocity; yet others indifferent about reciprocity will come out against the naval policy of both parties.

This would be a puzzling situation for us. If we support the independent candidates, we shall be open to the charge of playing a game. On the other hand if we bring forward a third man—a straight Conservative—the Government candidate will get in between.

Mine was a decisive answer. Mr. Monk and his group have had support because of their pledge to oppose the naval policy of both parties until submitted for the peoples' verdict. Since Drummond-Arthabaska, Mr. Borden has come nearer Mr. Monk. He has practically endorsed his plan of a plebiscite. This is the only ground upon which we can meet. Not being a party we will not bring forward any candidate, but we will heartily support any man whether Liberal or Conservative, pro-reciprocitist or anti-reciprocitist, provided he pledges himself to resist any plan of direct or indirect participation in Imperial wars outside of Canada, or at least oppose such measure until submitted for popular verdict by way of a plebiscite; the welfare of either party is for us of no moment. It is up to Mr. Borden and his lieutenants to decide whether to secure the seat for a ministerial (Liberal) candidate by entering a three-cornered field, or suffer the election of the candidate whom we shall support.

I have no doubt that the High Priest and Sanhedrin accepted the situation, since the fight was carried out according to our terms.

This is the story as told, so far, by Mr. Bourassa, and he is the one to know. He was the leader of the Nationalists, exercising great influence over certain of his fellow-citizens, recognized by the Conservative party as an important factor in a general election, and as one whose support was worth securing. We have had in this Parliamentary term many instances of peculiar deals—horse deals, boot deals, shell deals, etc., etc.—but while these are bad, while they cause us to wonder if this Government has lost all sense of rectitude in administration, is it not, after all, a more serious, a lamentable, state of affairs to see a gang of conspirators bartering away the principles of a party for the sake of power?

But Mr. Bourassa is not through yet. In his paper, Le Devoir, of May 30, 1913, he continues:—

As elections drew nearer we have ample proof that the Conservative leaders were quite satisfied with the situation which the Nationalist campaign had forced upon them. The Monk group came out as the "Autonomist" party with its complete organization, headquarters and committees distinct from the Conservative party proper.

The Tory General Committee allotted the Autonomist party most of the ridings in the province of Quebec, saving for themselves the English-speaking counties of the Eastern Townships, besides Pontiac, Argenteuil and three Montreal divisions, St. Antoine, St. Anne and St. Laurent. It was distinctly agreed that with these exceptions, Mr. Monk had exclusive charge of the whole province with the right to accept or refuse prospective candidates; with the understanding that such candidates as were approved of must fight as best they could the Naval Law and the "No less nefarious policy" of Mr. Borden; that on reciprocity they could take whatever stand they chose, and that they should nevertheless receive from the Conservative party their wholehearted support. The Conservative party made use of its funds, and indirectly fostered the chances of such candidates as had declared themselves opposed to both policies.

On June 2, 1913, Mr. Bourassa, in his paper, states:—

The most obvious proof that the Conservative party had surrendered to Nationalist sentiment was to be found in the Eastern Townships. Throughout that district, with the exception of Drummond-Arthabaska, no Nationalist or "Autonomist" candidates had been brought out. He took no part in the fight. Local committees and the electors generally took upon themselves to spread our principles. Such favour had Nationalism gained in public opinion, that Conservative candidates, both English and French, had seen fit, willingly or not, to grant our doctrine considerable sway.

Such was the bargain. How was it carried out, according to the disclosures of this unholy alliance? According to Mr. Bourassa a manifesto was issued, which was eventually signed by all the Conservative candidates. This peculiar document is as follows:—

I declare that if elected on the 21st of September I shall oppose and vote against any Prime Minister of whatever party who will endeavour to maintain the Naval Law as adopted in 1910, without beforehand giving the people of Canada an opportunity to express their opinion thereon by means of a special referendum. I shall, if elected, see to it that the rights of the French-speaking Catholic minority are recognized and respected everywhere as are the rights of the English-speaking minority in the province of Quebec. I endorse separate schools, recognition of the French language, etc., and etc.

One wonders how such declaration on the part of their fellow-Conservatives will appeal to the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), the member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), the member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie), and to many others of the same fraternity. But it ap-

pears that the kindly offices of Mr. Bourassa were not to be confined to Quebec. He was invited, so he alleges, to deliver some addresses in Ontario and by no less a person than the Hon. Frank Cochrane, the present Minister of Railways and Canals. In order to make sure that his visit to Ontario would not be unwelcome and that the invitation was made in good faith and endorsed by what he considered to be responsible parties, Mr. Bourassa received exceedingly strong endorsations of his Nationalistic policy. From two Ontario gentlemen who were elected on the 21st of September, 1911, the following messages were received:—

Mattawa, Ont., Sept. 8, 1911.

Chas. McCrea,
Sudbury, Ont.

I certainly am opposed to reciprocity and will support request for repeal of Naval policy and a referendum to the people no matter who is Premier.

George Gordon.

Providence Bay, Sept. 8, 1911.

Chas. McCrae,
Sudbury, Ont.

I am opposed to Reciprocity pact. I am opposed to Naval policy of Liberal Government. I will support request for repeal of same, and referendum to the people on Naval question no matter who is Premier.

W. R. Smyth.

Fortified by these assurances of the fellow-feeling that existed so far as these two gentlemen were concerned, Mr. Bourassa visited Northern Ontario and when in the district of Nipissing received from Mr. Gordon the following effusive welcome:—

The Liberals are blaming us for bringing the Nationalist leader here. I am willing to take full responsibility and to express my full admiration for Bourassa. I have no use for the Navy and think Reciprocity is a baneful policy. I give Monsieur Bourassa the keys of the district.

So successful had his mission been in Ontario that even Mr. Cochrane, so Mr. Bourassa tells us, "usually very shy of his compliments, has since done me the honour of telling me that my arguments had made a deep impression, deeper still among English-speaking than French-speaking people." It is stated also by Mr. Bourassa that:—

One of the prominent members of the Conservative party came to his office carrying under his arm the voters' lists of all the Eastern Townships. He paid into our hands subscriptions to Le Devoir for thousands and thousands of electors. We asked nothing but the regular subscription price, deducting therefrom the ordinary subscription paid to agents. We thus enjoyed the satisfaction of using Tory money to circulate the good Nationalist gospel everywhere.

[Mr. Turriff.]

It will be interesting to know the name of his prominent Conservative, who, out of the intense love for the principles of Mr. Bourassa and the Nationalists, poured out his treasure for the circulation of this so-called valuable Nationalist literature. One wonders whether the member for St. Antoine Division, Montreal (Sir Herbert Ames) has any personal or other knowledge of this. He should know. Having established himself as a magic-lantern artist, a dispenser of patriotic funds, and a contributor to the boot and shoe supplies for the Canadian soldiers—surely he can tell us something about the circulation of Bourassa's Nationalist paper.

The campaign of 1911 resulted in the return of a large number of Nationalists from Quebec, and three from Ontario, namely: W. R. Smyth, the present member for East Algoma; Geo. Gordon, for Nipissing, and, following Mr. Gordon, who was transferred to the Senate, Hon. Frank Cochrane, now Minister of Railways and Canals.

In the ordinary course of events the present Prime Minister chose his ministers, and upon the formation of the Cabinet the light is thrown by the Toronto Telegram, certainly not very hostile to the present Government—in the following language:—

The process of Cabinet-making was in the final stages of its completion when the Nationalists proceeded to tell Canada's Premier "who's who and what's what."

The Nationalists' demand, with all the weight of Henry Bourassa's authority behind it, was, briefly:

Department of Public Works for F. D. Monk.

Department of Inland Revenue for W. B. Nantel.

Portfolio of Postmaster General for L. P. Pelletier.

No Quebec Protestant to hold a portfolio in the Cabinet.

The ultimatum failed to bend R. L. Borden to the purposes of the Nationalists. The Premier suggested that he would complete the making of his Cabinet in the spirit of justice to everybody. Whereupon the Nationalists departed, supplementing their ultimatum with words to this effect:

"You will either meet the demands of our ultimatum, or you will meet Parliament with a majority of eight to nine, the reduction being due to the nineteen Nationalists voting with Laurier."

The Nationalist gloatingly betrays the truth that the Nationalists were sent for on behalf of R. L. Borden, and they got everything they asked for in the allotment of portfolios, because the Premier of Canada weakened under the pressure of a pale bluff that the Quebec Nationalists would have never dared to make good.

Whatever influences prevailed upon the Prime Minister in the selection of his colleagues may never be fully known, but at any rate very positive statements have been

made by Mr. Lavergne that he was asked to name the French-Canadian representatives in the Cabinet. Suffice it to say that three pronounced Nationalists were chosen, Monk, Pelletier and Nantel, as well as the sub rosa Nationalists, the present Minister of Justice and the overseas Minister of Militia.

As a result of the disagreement with his colleagues on the $35,000,000 ship-building proposition submitted by this Government, Mr. Monk resigned. His place was taken by Mr. Coderre, a pronounced Nationalist. Mr. Pelletier, through ill-health, it is alleged, resigned and went to the Bench. Mr. Nantel departed this life as a public man and became a member of the Railway Commission. Mr. Coderre, evidently tiring of the troubles and manner of departmental life, found a haven of rest in the calm and serene atmosphere of the judiciary. The vacancies so created were filled by the Hon. Mr. Blondin, Hon. Mr. Casgrain and Hon. Mr. Patenaude, two of them pronounced Nationalists. The recent death of the late lamented Mr. Casgrain created another vacancy, and this has been filled by the translation of the Hon. Mr. Sevigny from the Speakership to the Department of Inland Revenue. Throughout all of these appointments, amid all the Cabinet changes since 1911, the Nationalists have been recognized without fail.

Now then let us deal with the present Nationalist representatives in the Government. What is Mr. Blondin's record? Speaking at St. Louis de Blandford on 25th of October, 1910, he said:

> You are intimidating the people in waving the English flag and adding that we must contribute always and everywhere to the defence of that protector of our constitutional liberties; but we will not be made to forget that in 1837 it was necessary to bore holes in it in order to breathe the atmosphere of liberty.
>
> The English have never done anything for the French-Canadians. We do not owe them anything. French-Canadians have nothing to care about the opinion of the other provinces upon this naval question. They can and must settle the questions which concern them without consulting others. Those very ones who disembowelled their forefathers on the Plains of Abraham ask of you to-day to be slaughtered for their sake.
>
> England has gone so far as to grind down the colonies as did Imperial Rome of old.
>
> The only liberties which we enjoy have been snatched. England has not conquered Canada for love or to plant the cross of Christ as did France, but to establish trading posts and make money. She has so wed the world with hatred, quarrels and wars. We have had enough of England and the English.
>
> Those who butchered your forefathers on the Plains of Abraham ask to-day that you sacrifice your lives for their sakes. We have had enough of England and the British.
>
> Our liberties, we have wrested them from England, and we owe her nothing.
>
> Canada owes nothing to England. The British did not conquer us for love, nor to plant the cross of Christ, as did France; and we are kept under her flag for the advantage of the trade. She benefited by her colony of Canada. What do we owe her?

Mr. Patenaude, now Secretary of State, was chairman of the meeting when the Nationalist party was formed, and at St. Remi, in the province of Quebec, he declared:

> We (the Nationalist party) hold nothing in common with either of the political parties.

And last, but not least, we have the latest acquisition to the Government, the Hon. Mr. Sevigny, Minister of Inland Revenue, declaring:

> The Laurer Cabinet is a Cabinet of Imperialists who want to sacrifice Canada's interests and plunge us into wars with which we have nothing to do. The Navy Bill is an attempt by Ontario and the provinces of the West to coerce Quebec and enslave our people forever. What has England ever done for you? She has no need of your help. She is strong enough to defend herself. Laurier's ideal is to make you the vassals of the majority in the West. You must protest against helping England in her wars; unless you do, conscription will come next.

This, then, is the record of the connection of the Conservative party of this country with the Nationalist party. Examine it as you may, turn it as you will, you cannot get away from the outstanding fact that throughout the whole chapter there was a pre-arranged plan, that no matter what form the action took these two parties were to coalesce and work together for the one common object of destroying the Liberal party and the Liberal leader. But at the same time the Nationalist party had to save the situation as best they could on the naval question, and, though it was with a great deal of reluctance, as Mr. Sevigny is reported to have said recently, it was decided to drop the Laurier Naval Act of 1910, cease working for a Canadian navy, and in its place adopt the makeshift of a $35,000,000 contribution to Imperial defence.

Something has been said about the lack of recruiting in Quebec. How can you expect recruiting when practically every member of the Quebec representation in the Cabinet is pledged against assistance to the Empire outside of Canada? How can you expect this Government to assist materially in winning this war when from one-third to one-half of the Cabinet are opposed in principle to participation in the Empire's wars such as we are engaged in at the present time? Let the Conservative

party, if it aspires to be credited with the loyalty that it claims, purge itself of these un-Canadian alliances and strike out on higher and better lines.

That, Mr. Speaker, is an account of the arrangement made between the Nationalists and this Government, set out in sequence and in proper chronological order. In view of these facts, one wonders at the temerity of the Conservative newspapers throughout the country which are trying to make the people believe that the right hon. leader of the Opposition is a friend and associate of Bourassa and the Nationalists. I challenge the Government or any member of it to produce one tittle of evidence that such is the case. That policy is being pursued in the province of Ontario but, thank God, it does not cut much ice in the West. People there know better; they are too broad-minded for that. Whatever faults may be attributed to my right hon. leader, you do not hear the people in my province saying that he should be voted against because he is a Frenchman or a Roman Catholic. You do not hear much of that in the province of Saskatchewan. Of course, that policy may work in some places, but I would be sorry to think that many men in any part of Canada would say that a man against whom nothing can be charged along those lines should be kept from coming back to power simply because he was born of French blood and that his parents are Roman Catholics. That is something that we all ought to frown down upon. Any man who has the ability to occupy a public position has a right to come forward and do so. I challenge hon. gentlemen to point to anything that reflects on the right hon. leader of the Opposition, either in respect of his position as leader of the Government for fifteen or sixteen years, or as leader of the Opposition for many years before he came into power and during the last five years since he went out of office.

It may be said by some that this alliance to which I have referred between Bourassa and Lavergne and the Nationalists generally, and the Conservative Government now in power, is a matter of ancient history; that it happened four or five or six years ago. That is true, but the connection has been close ever since; the Nationalists are still Ministers of the Government, and they sit on the treasury benches to-day. But let us see if the connection has ceased altogether. Let me give something that has occurred within the last two or three days that surely brings it up to date. In Thursday's issue of the newspaper L'Evenement, the chief Government organ in the Quebec district, we find that the front page displays in large type various quotations from Le Devoir signed by Henri Bourassa, touching on Sir Wilfrid Laurier's attitude towards participation in Great Britain's war. For instance, there is printed the quotation which Mr. Bourassa gives from one of Sir Wilfrid's speeches as follows:

> If England were, I will not say in danger—these are the words of Sir Wilfrid—but simply at grips with one or two or several of the great powers of Europe, the Prime Minister could demand, not thirty-five millions, but two, three, or four times thirty-five millions. We would put all the resources of Canada at the disposal of England; there would not be a single discordant voice.

What does Mr. Cannon think of that?—asks L'Evenement. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that neither Mr. Cannon nor any other Liberal, and mighty few Conservatives in the whole Dominion of Canada, will raise one word of objection to what my right hon. leader said on that occasion. The words I have quoted of my right hon. leader I am proud to quote, and I am proud to stand behind the man who uttered those words at the time he uttered them, and who has stood by those words from the first day he entered public life until this moment, and has never gone back on them.

Just let Great Britain leave things as they are in Canada. We do not want to be tied any closer to the Empire. Could you have Canada do any better than she has been doing? If we are doing all right, why try to make changes? But there is the policy enunciated by my right hon. leader, and now Bourassa comes forward in L'Evenement in support of Sevigny, who is appearing before his electors to-morrow and who charges the Liberal party and my right hon. leader with being loyal to Great Britain, and asks the people of Dorchester to vote against Mr. Cannon because the Liberal leader has said that he stands by Great Britain, stands by the Empire, and is ready to put up every bit of the resources of Canada to keep the Empire intact, to keep Canada a portion of the British Empire, and to preserve the freedom not only of the British Empire, but of every small nation in the world besides.

Why was this alliance made between the Government and Bourassa? Why is it being kept up at the present time? Now, Mr.

Speaker, what I am going to say now I say feeling the responsibility of my words, knowing what I am talking about; and I make this charge against this Government, and I make this charge more particularly against the Prime Minister who is the responsible man, that this alliance has been kept in force, that three Nationalists have been kept in this Government, deliberately, on purpose, and for the one and only purpose of preventing recruiting in the province of Quebec. I make that charge against the Government. In order that there may be no mistake I charge the Government with deliberately maintaining—

Mr. WRIGHT: Shame.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Shame on your friends.

Mr. TURRIFF: Shame on you (Mr. Wright), you are perfectly right, you ought to be ashamed and I am glad you are.

Mr. WRIGHT: You ought to be ashamed

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must remind hon. gentlemen that there is only one method of address permitted in the Chamber, and that is through the Chair.

Mr. TURRIFF: I say that for no other purpose, the Prime Minister has kept in his Government these three Nationalists—disloyal Canadians, disloyal Britishers—simply and solely and purposely to hinder recruiting in the province of Quebec. Why, Mr. Speaker? Simply because my hon. friend who is leading the House (Mr. Rogers) and my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) know that they have no possible chance of being returned to power on their record as the administrators of the Government of Canada, and secondly that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister and his minister of elections know perfectly well that on their administration of Canada's part in the war they have no possible chance of being returned to power; and therefore they had to seek about for some other means that would bring them to power; and they have kept up this Nationalist arrangement, as I said a moment ago, for the sole and only purpose of being able to carry on the next election as a racial fight, bringing into line, so far as they could, all the English-speaking provinces in Canada, the eight English-speaking provinces, bringing them up and making the fight English against French in the province of Quebec. That is what I charge against the Government, and that is what the Government will have to clear themselves from. Why, Mr. Speaker, look at the Conservative press throughout the province of Ontario. They openly advocate it. You cannot talk with half a dozen Conservatives in this city or any other place that three, four or five of them will not tell you that is going to be the next fight. They make no bones about that, they do not hide it. They simply say: The bilingual question; Quebec is not recruiting—and that is going to be the bone of contention during the election.

Mr. Speaker, I was born and brought up in the province of Quebec. I am proud of the province of my birth. I am not here to defend the French people of Quebec; they are well able to defend themselves. I am not here to say that they have recruited in as large numbers as they should, but, in the name of Heaven, how can they be expected to recruit in the face of what I have brought forward in this House tonight, in the face of what has been said by my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil); in the face of what was said only last night by my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux)? How could you expect recruiting to be good in the province of Quebec under the leadership it has had, and under the circumstances, and in view of what has been done to prevent recruiting. It has been said that Quebec has not recruited as largely as Ontario, and that is made a terrible crime against Quebec. As I said a moment ago, I think they should have put up more men; but you might as well say that Ontario has not recruited as largely as Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta or British Columbia—and she has not, not by any manner of means. Is that a particular crime?

I will tell you why Ontario has not recruited so well as the western provinces. The reason is that we have more men of British birth, Englishmen, Irishmen, Welshmen and Scotsmen in these provinces than in Ontario. We may laugh sometimes at the young Englishman who comes out to this country, and who knows nothing about it, but I take off my hat to the remittance man for what he has done since the war began. The moment hostilities broke out he did not stand on his going; he immediately went to the nearest recruiting place and enlisted. The reason why the proportion of recruits has been so big in Saskatchewan, in Alberta, in Manitoba, and in

British Columbia, the reason why it has been longer than in the province of Ontario is that in these provinces there is a larger proportion of British born people. I say, Mr. Speaker, without fear of successful contradiction, that if you take the rural population of Canadian born people you will not find so much difference in the number of recruits in the different provinces. Do not misunderstand me. I say that if you could separate the Canadian born men in the English-speaking provinces the proportion of recruits would be larger, I know—and I am glad of it—but at the same time the difference would not be nearly so great as a good many people on both sides of politics seem to imagine. I do not want to defend Quebec; I do not need to do so, but I want to put the matter fairly and reasonably.

I am going to say something else that, perhaps, my hon. friends on the other side of the House may not like. I am sorry to say it, but I am going to say it all the same, because I believe it to be true. We hear a good deal to-day about what has been said down in Dorchester by a hot-blooded young Irish French-Canadian, and it has been twisted and distorted in the Tory papers until I believe very little of it. However, we are going to have that young man here next week, and he will make his own explanations.

Hon. Mr. ROGERS: No chance.

Mr. TURRIFF: This young Irish-Frenchman says he is a true Britisher through and through. We have heard a good deal of what he has been saying, but we have not heard anything from the other side of the House about the intimation made by the Prime Minister, the right hon. Sir R. L. Borden, last spring to the representatives of the Ontario Recruiting Committee, that if he had his way there would be no more recruiting in Canada, and that the attention of the Canadian people should be turned to the development of their industries. That intimation, Mr. Speaker, was followed by a direct falling off in recruiting from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Who does the hon. gentleman say used these words?

Mr. TURRIFF: I will say it over again for the benefit of my hon. friend, because I want to make it absolutely clear. I said that we had heard a good deal about what a young Irish-Frenchman, Mr. Cannon, had been saying, but that we had not heard anything from hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House about the intimation that had been made by Sir Robert Borden. I want to get this correctly. We have not heard about the intimation given by the Prime Minister last spring to the representatives of the Ontario Recruiting Committee in Toronto that if he had his way there would be no more recruiting in Canada, and that the attention of the Canadian people should be turned to the development of their industries. That was followed by a direct falling off in recruiting from one end of Canada to the other.

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman give his authority for ascribing these words to the Prime Minister?

Mr. TURRIFF: If my hon. friend, who is a Minister of the Crown, will appoint a committee I will give my authority and bring him forward, and I will make it good.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Come on.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does the hon. gentleman really think—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BURNHAM: Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. TURRIFF: Certainly.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does he really think it fair to make that charge; is it his code of ethics to refuse to give his authority?

Mr. TURRIFF: I have offered my hon. friend the Solicitor General, that if he will appoint a committee I will bring forward my authority. What more can my hon. friend from Peterborough want?

Mr. BURNHAM: A committee on lunacy.

Mr. TURRIFF: What more can my hon. friend want? The Government now know how they can get the authority, and they can act accordingly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why will the hon. gentleman not give it now?

Mr. TURRIFF: Simply because I do not choose to satisfy the curiosity of my hon. friend at this moment; that is all. Let my hon. friend, who is one of the big men of the Government come forward with his committee, and I will get all the information he wants, and more than he wants along that line.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: My hon. friend is surely not ashamed of his authority; he is surely not ashamed of the newspaper from which he is reading, if he is reading from a newspaper.

Mr. TURRIFF: Did I hear my hon. friend rightly?——

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I take it that my hon. friend is reading from some newspaper report of the meeting he speaks of. Surely he is not ashamed to give the name of the newspaper.

Mr. TURRIFF: I always like to satisfy a moderate man when I can, and I am going to satisfy my hon. friend right now by telling him that I am not reading from any newspaper.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. TURRIFF: I said a moment ago that the reason for the alliance between the Nationalists and the Government was that the Government were perfectly satisfied. I know that my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works, will in his heart agree with me because, as he says, he knows something about elections.

I suppose the Government felt that they were not able to carry the country on what I might call their domestic record—their record in connection with carrying on the affairs of Canada. You will remember that the present Prime Minister thought that the late Government were extremely extravagant, and promised all sorts of economies. I am not going into that question to-night, because I have taken up a lot of time already and that question can, and will come up for discussion later on. But, I may say, shortly, that the record of the Borden Government from September, 1911, to the present time has been a record of broken promises from first to last with one single exception. Of all planks in the platform issued by the leader of the Government prior to the election of 1911 there has only been one carried out. Therefore, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister and his friends know perfectly well that it would be ridiculous to appeal to the country on their record, or on the plea that they have carried out their promises. Have they done any better in carrying out the part which Canada has taken in the war? I heard my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Copp) speak about the two hundred lieutenant-colonels who were in England, who have been in England from the time that the first contingent went over, who are there yet drawing salaries and incurring expenses costing the country about $1,000,000 per annum, and the country is getting absolutely nothing for it. My hon. friend only dealt with the lieutenant-colonels. What about the majors? We have some of them back, I see.

Mr. BRADBURY: I would like to know where the hon. gentleman gets his information when he says that there are 200 lieutenant-colonels in England. That means two hundred battalions and 200,000 men. It is absolutely absurd.

Mr. TURRIFF: We have lieutenant-colonels who are not with battalions.

Mr. BRADBURY: That is rot.

Mr. TURRIFF: We have more lieutenant-colonels than battalions over there.

Mr. BRADBURY: No, you have not.

Mr. TURRIFF: Yes, we have; my hon. friend is not such a good military man that he knows everything. Very many battalions went over with lieutenant-colonels at their head and these lieutenant-colonels are still in England. The lieutenant-colonel who went over with the battalion is still in England and another lieutenant-colonel has been appointed to do the fighting.

Mr. BRADBURY: That is not right.

Mr. TURRIFF: To-day you have more lieutenant-colonels than battalions over there. But, what about the majors and captains? The Prime Minister said that there were 2,700 men alone in the Pay and Records Office besides the hundreds of clerks hired in England to do the work; these 2,700 majors, captains, lieutenants and a gang that are no good for war purposes are hanging on to the skirts of the Government, the idea being to spend the money of Canada, and it is not $1,000,000, as my hon. friend from Westmorland said, but many millions of dollars a year that are being absolutely squandered and wasted for that very purpose. In addition to that, my information is that there are 30,000 men, privates, corporals and ser-

9 p.m. geants, in Great Britain to-day who are unfit to be sent across the channel to the firing line. What does that mean? It means that these 30,000 men cost this country at least $30,000,000 by the time they were landed in Great Britain. It means that since they have been landed in Great Britain another $30,000,000 of Canadian money has been expended. What are they doing?—nothing at all. They cannot be sent to the front; they are too old, or too cripled, or too young; they are men who never ought to have been enlisted at all. I say, with all due respect to many excellent physicians and doctors throughout

Canada, that the manner of the examination of the soldiers in Canada has been nothing but a gigantic disgrace from beginning to end. Remember that these 30,000 men are altogether outside of the rejects of which we heard the other day—some 60,000—in Canada. When I speak of rejects I do not mean the men who came up to enlist and who were turned down upon the first medical examination, because I do not suppose those were counted, but the hundreds and thousands and tens of thousands of men who were able to go from one doctor to another until they got some doctor to pass them, who were drilled for from twelve to fifteen months, and who, upon getting their final examination by a good doctor, were rejected. When the Prime Minister says that he has sent from Canada 434,000 men, he is making an absolutely misleading statement, a statement that has mighty few grains of truth in it. In that number of 434,000 men, why should he include Italians? A lot of these Italians went over before Italy was in the war. Why should French reservists be included? Why should they be mentioned at all except to impress the public with the figures? Why should British reservists be counted as Canada's share? Taking the figures he gave, and deducting these classes, we have 390,000 men. Then there are 60,000 to come off that number for rejects, and 30,000 for the men who are in England to-day and who are useless in so far as going to the firing line is concerned. So that, instead of 390,000, we have very few over 300,000 effective men in the Canadian army to-day. How are we to make good the promise of the right hon. the Prime Minister—a promise that never should have been made at the time he made it, and which was made for political purposes and nothing else? It was made within a couple of weeks of the assembling of Parliament, and it was a statement that should have been first made from his seat in the House as Prime Minister. But he chose to make it to get a little bit of party capital out of it. He comes forward now and talks about 434,000 men as having gone from Canada when, all said and done, we have about 300,000 effective men. That is about the position of affairs. The right hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that under the circumstances he has not very much chance of being returned to power because of the way in which he has conducted Canada's share in this war.

There is another evidence of extravagance that I wish to speak about. I see a statement in the papers to which I desire to direct the attention of the House. I have never been able to find out the facts exactly and if I make the statement incorrectly I trust some hon. member of the Government who is posted on the subject will put me right. I see by the press that three new large munition shops are being erected, one near Toronto—I forget at the moment where the other two are. One of them is to cost $1,750,000, another, $2,000,000 and the third $2,250,000, the three shops together costing $6,000,000. It does not make very much difference whether those shops are being built by the Government or by the Imperial Munitions Board or by the contractors. From an article I saw in one of the Toronto newspapers, I would be inclined to think that those shops are being erected by the contractors; but if they are, it is obvious to every hon. member and to every person in Canada that if a contractor is going to build a shop costing $2,000,000 for the purpose of manufacturing munitions for the Canadian Government or for the British War Office, the cost of that shop will come out of the contract that the contractor receives, because he will receive such prices for the shells, fuses, and other war material that he manufactures as to enable him to build that shop and have a profit over and above.

What I charge against the Government is, that while they are permitting the construction of those three munitions shops at a cost of $6,000,000, which will eventually come out of the pockets of the people of Canada and of Great Britain, they have had standing absolutely idle since the war began railway workshops that are already equipped with all kinds of machinery for making munitions, with the exception possibly of lathes for making the shells and drills for boring them. I venture to say, however, that an expenditure of a quarter of a million dollars would equip them with all the machinery required, and yet this Government have absolutely refused to allow those shops to be used for munition purposes, and they have absolutely refused to use them themselves to make munitions at cost price for Canada, for the Empire, and for our Allies. Why? Simply because it would take away from their partisan friends the opportunity of fleecing Canada and fleecing Great Britain to the extent of millions and tens of millions and, I think, probably hundreds of millions of dollars. Why should this Government not have done what was done in Great Britain? How long did it take the British Government to realise what faced it? As I said

before six o'clock, the Prime Minister had promised to Great Britain all the resources of Canada in men and money to carry on this war, and yet here are shops controlled by the Minister of Railways and costing millions of dollars, that he could have used; that he promised Mr. Thomas when he was out here would be used for the manufacture of munitions, and yet that have not been used and the Government have absolutely refused to use them, simply because they do not want to make munitions at cost price for the Canadian and British soldiers. Although those shops are standing idle to-day, we are spending in one way or another $6,000,000 to erect three new shops. Those are the things that the Government will have to answer. My hon. friends opposite at present refuse to answer our arguments but the day is coming in the near future when they will not be able to sit tight in their seats and laugh, when they will have to come before the jury of the people and submit their records to them, and the people of Canada are at present in a frame of mind to pass judgment on the record of this Government in regard to its manner of conducting the war. It is no wonder that our friends opposite want an extension of the term of Parliament instead of an election; but they will be very apt to get an election that will give them a longer extension than they are asking for at present, an extension that will probably give them fifteen years in the cool shades of Opposition to repent of their sins, and their sins have been so many and so scarlet that I think fifteen years will be required for them to come to repentance, because they can repent of only so many at a time.

There is one question I want to ask, and as I suppose it can be answered only by the Minister of Finance and as he is not in his seat at the present time, I will ask the question, and possibly my hon. friend who is leading the House (Mr. Rogers) will ask the Minister of Finance to give a reply to it later on. You will remember, Sir, that either last session or the previous session, the Minister of Finance stated that Canada was paying for the upkeep of the Canadian army, both in Great Britain and at the front. It is generally stated that the war is costing Canada over a million dollars a day, but that is only for this end of it and does not take into account all the food, uniforms, boots, socks, shirts, all the wagons, horses, trucks, bicycles, shells, ammunition of all sorts and everything else that goes to make up the cost of the war. I do not know and I want to know what the war is really costing Canada daily; but, roughly speaking, half of the cost of the upkeep of the Canadian army to-day is being paid by Great Britain, to be repaid by us. My hon. friend, I think, stated the other day that we were financing this war ourselves, but we are financing only one end of it; Great Britain is financing the other end of the war, and the accounts will have to be adjusted at a later date. It is possible I may be wrong, but I think I would have heard something about the matter, if we had up to the present paid for all the uniforms, food, ammunition and guns supplied to the Canadian soldiers in France and Belgium, so that if we have not done so yet, instead of the war costing Canada over a million dollars a day, I am inclined to think that at the present moment it is costing us $2,500,000 a day. I may be wrong to the extent of half a million dollars.

Mr. ROGERS: A million and a half.

Mr. TURRIFF: We are spending over a million dollars a day in Canada.

Mr. HAZEN: Not in Canada.

Mr. TURRIFF: In England for what Canada is supplying to the soldiers in England? But when the soldiers go across the water, as I understand it, the British War Office supplies the food, the uniforms, everything that the soldiers in France and Flanders use. It may be that that only amounts to a million and a half a day. My hon. friend may be right. But that is what I want to know, and I would like to have the Finance Minister, if he has the facts, give us, a statement showing approximately, if he cannot show exactly, how much a day the war is costing us over and above what Canada is paying at the present time. I think it will be found to be a very large sum. The Minister of Militia (Mr. Kemp) is now in his place, and possibly he might be able to give that information approximately. I can quite easily understand that he has not the exact figures. But if he or the Minister of Finance will give us that information at a later day I for one would appreciate it very much.

I was surprised when the Prime Minister took the position he did concerning the extension of the life of Parliament. He spoke of the disadvantages of holding an election during the war. There would be disadvantages for the Government—I quite appreciate that. But what right has the Government to come forward with that plea now? War broke out on the 4th of August,

1914, and a special session was called to open on the 18th, which session lasted for five days. During that session my right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and every member on this side of the House joined in with the Government and voted all the money the Government asked in order to carry on the war. My right hon. leader had a number of engagements to hold meetings; he cancelled them all. It is true that no formal political truce was made, as the hon. Minister of Militia stated at a meeting in his constituency, but there was a tacit abandonment of partisan activity—on the part of the Liberals, at all events. However, during that time hon. gentlemen opposite were preparing and sending out the most atrocious partisan literature ever sent out under the stamp of a member. This was done at the very time when they were saying: We must all join together, we must put the whole force of the country behind the Government in carrying on properly our share in the war. The circulation of this literature by hundreds of thousands of copies went on during September, October and November, 1914. It is not often that my hon. friend who is leading the House (Mr. Rogers) slips a cog, but he did it on that occasion. This literature was supposed to be sent out privately; but the West was flooded with it—and it was dated. If anybody questions the time, I have the goods and can show them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: You call that "goods."

Mr. TURRIFF: It is goods of a kind, the goods the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rogers) uses to win elections. Hon. gentlemen opposite have, whenever it suited them to do so, claimed that there was a truce. But, if there was a truce, that is the way they kept it. I do not make this charge against all the members on the other side, because I know there are many men sitting before me who would not be guilty of such an action as that; but naturally they are all willing to take any advantage that may come to them from it.

One member of the Government, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), is travelling all over the world to secure trade for Canada; and he and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) and the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) are talking increased production. We are glad to see the Minister of Agriculture in his place, and hope that his health is fairly well recovered from the bad experience he went through at the burning of the Parliament Buildings last year. I would like to say to him, in the most friendly manner possible, that if he and his colleagues want to increase production and to secure more trade, it is not necessary for them to send the Minister of Trade and Commerce travelling all over creation. All that is necessary is to take off some of the trammels that now hinder trade. Let us in the West have the American market,—not that it will make much difference this year with wheat at $1.50 to $2 a bushel—let us have the right to sell our wheat where we please and get the best price for it. Take off the extra duties on everything the farmer uses. Put the farmer in a position to make the best of his land. Then there will be no need for the Minister of Agriculture to make appeals to the people for increased production; the increased production will come without any effort on his part. But under the system adopted by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) and the arbitrary action taken by his department, farmers have had to pay during the past year duties on agricultural implements amounting to from 48 per cent to 76 per cent, and that on goods on which the nominal rate of duty is 27½ per cent, with 7½ per cent extra, a total of 35 per cent. I say that through the arbitrary measures of the Minister of Customs and his Customs board, prices have been so changed, at the demand and instigation of the Canadian implement manufacturers, that the duty the farmer has to pay amounts to the figures I have given.

Mr. REID: That statement is both absurd and untrue.

Mr. TURRIFF: Did my hon. friend ever collect that duty and afterwards refund it?

Mr. REID: No, we have not. The rates of duty collected on agricultural implements are based on the prices at which the manufacturers invoice them to the people in the western provinces.

Mr. TURRIFF: In spite of what my hon. friend has said—and he has not made a straight answer—I say again that the importers of goods in the West have in many cases paid duty on a valuation which was 20, 25 or 30 per cent more than the price they paid for the goods. For instance, if a man imported a machine for which he paid $100, the Customs Board would say: the valuation for duty purposes of that machine upon its entry into Canada is $120

or $125. They use the dumping clause to do this.

Mr. REID: The members of the Board of Customs are the same gentlemen who have been the members of the board for the last twenty years.

Mr. TURRIFF: I know that.

Mr. REID: The large implement manufacturing companies in the United States have a regular price list upon which they sell in the United States, and on that price-list are based the values upon which customs duties are collected. There has been no change of policy on the part of the Customs Board since this Government came into power. The policy adopted is that which was in force during the 15 years that hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, when the hon. gentleman was sitting on the Government benches.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend says that the Customs Board has not been changed. That is true enough, but unfortunately for Canada the minister was changed. I say again, and the minister knows that I am stating the truth, when I say that the prices at which the goods are sold are in many cases not those of the price-list and that the minister has made importers pay duty on a valuation greater than the price paid for the goods imported. I stand by that statement, and I do not take it back in view of anything that has been said, because I know what I am talking about.

Mr. REID: You have been giving us no evidence but your word, and I do not think that is good so far as this case is concerned.

Mr. TURRIFF: Will my hon. friend give me a committee to prove it? He knows better than to give a committee; he knows that what I say can be proved, because I am stating an absolute fact that is known to many people. It is no secret. I have seen price lists from which deductions of 50, 20 and 10 per cent are made; you cannot go by price lists. As I said a moment ago, this has been done at the instigation of the big manufacturers in Canada. I say to the Minister of Agriculture: take these burdens off the farmers and you won't be able to keep the people away from the land. It will not be necessary to put advertisements in the papers calling on the farmers to increase their production, because no man knows better how to use the land than the man who is working it.

We have heard a good deal about these National Service cards. I would like some member of the Government to say what they are going to do when they get these cards all in. Suppose every man in Canada filled in and returned the National Service card, how much further ahead would you be? I will tell you how much further behind you are going to be. These National Service cards have already driven thousands of people out of Canada, and thousands more are going. I have heard it stated—and there is much to be said for it—that we are as well without the man who would leave Canada for fear he would be sent to the war. But many of these people who have left are not Canadian citizens as yet. They are people who have come into Canada, many of them into the West, and they are going over the border in hundreds and thousands. They say that they are going to visit their people at home and that they will be back. Yes, I believe they will be back, but not until after the war is over. The same applies to eastern Canada; they are going by thousands simply because of the fear that these National Service cards may lead to conscription. For myself I do not think so; I do not believe the Government has any intention of that. But what I say is that these cards are doing no possible good and any amount of harm.

We heard to-day before six o'clock that not later than the day before yesterday a member of this Government told the people in the county of Dorchester that if they feared conscription they could go across the line and there would be no danger. You cannot stop people from going across the line. The hon. Postmaster General, Mr. Blondin, telephoned the Minister of Public Works and asked him to deny that, but unfortunately for the Minister of Public Works, who has just made the denial—probably in good faith—Mr. Blondin had already sent a letter to the press in which he acknowledged both charges. Here is the letter, Mr. Speaker, on page 5 of to-day's Evening Journal.

Mr. MARCIL: Read it.

Mr. TURRIFF: It was read before, but I will read it; I am always willing to oblige. It is as follows:

SAYS LIBERALS HAVE DISTORTED HIS WORDS.

Hon. P. E. Blondin Says He Never Intended to Convey Meaning They Attach to His Speech.

By Canadian Press.

Montreal, Jan. 26. — Hon. P. E. Blondin,

through his lieutenant, Felix Durocher, has issued a reply to an affidavit, which purported to give a report of his remarks at Ste. Rose during a Dorchester county by-election speech on Wednesday night. The affidavit credited Mr. Blondin with contending that the Allison scandal was of no importance to Ste. Rose because it is English money that was stolen, while those who desired to escape conscription could do so by crossing the United States border. Mr. Blondin's explanation follows:

"The statements which have been sworn to by certain Liberals with regard to my utterances are a distortion of my words. I never by any means intended to convey the meaning which they have attached to my speech. Mr. Cannon had been stating in his speeches that the Conservative party had been grafting from the Canadian treasury in connection with munition contracts.

"In my speech at Ste. Rose I explained that it was not true that the Allison scandal had to do with Canadian money, pointing out that the money paid for the shells was the money of the British Government. I did not imply that Allison had done a worthy act, but simply corrected Mr. Cannon's mis-statement. In regard to the conscription matter I told the people of Ste. Rose that I did not believe conscription would be necessary because so many Canadians were eager to go and fight for the cause of liberty and humanity. I added that if any of them were afraid of conscription, if conscription should be passed and they did not want to go to the war, they had a remedy left. They could go across the United States line which is near Ste. Rose and escape military service."

Mr. Speaker, when you find a Minister of the Crown advising the people of Canada in Quebec to get across the line to escape conscription, do you wonder that recruiting is slow in Quebec?

Mr. WILCOX: Is that a signed letter?

Mr. TURRIFF: Do you imagine that recruiting would be good in Quebec in view of a statement of that kind by a Minister of the Crown, a Minister who has just been promoted? Why it is absurd to expect anything, and if it had not been that by mistake that letter got into print, my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works would have got away with his bluff.

Mr. ROGERS: No bluff.

Mr. TURRIFF: It was not a bluff on the part of my hon. friend, perhaps, but it was a bluff on the part of the Hon. P. E. Blondin, and my hon. friend, in his innocence, was carrying it out.

Mr. McKENZIE: Innocence, eh?

Mr. TURRIFF: We have the three Ministers in this bluff on the Canadian people; and it apparently worked, because while there is the letter on page 5 of the Evening Journal of to-night, it is in only a few of the papers. In all the balance of the issue of to-night's evening Journal, the home edition, these two columns, down about two-thirds of the way, are cut out. Somebody found out that there was a bad give-away in this letter, that there was an acknowledgement of both charges in the affidavit, and they got busy in the Journal office and cut out the whole two columns, in order to keep that particular letter out. But some papers of the issue had already been distributed and I hold one of them in my hand, with this article in it. So my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works, nearly got away with it, but he just slipped a cog for once—and I give my genial friend credit that he does not often slip a cog in that manner. It was not in his hands. If it had been in the master's hands the cogs would have clutched together all right, and it would have worked. But the tools that my hon. friend uses are not as good as he is himself. You cannot expect the ordinary mechanic to be as good as the master mechanic, and I take off my hat to the Minister of Public Works and express my sympathy for him that the cog slipped on this occasion. But do not wonder if in the future, so long as this gang are trying to get recruits in Quebec, they do not get very many.

Mr. WILCOX: Order.

Mr. TURRIFF: Why order? They are not a single individual, and what are they if they are not a gang—and the gang is not improved any by my hon. friend.

Mr. WILCOX: Compare favourably with yourself.

Mr. TURRIFF: Perhaps. My hon. friends are starting in now recruiting from the Civil Service, and I want to say just one word on that. If you are going to recruit from the Civil Service let it be genuine all through, let there be the same treatment to everybody. Why, in the House of Commons here, have we so many young able-bodied men, single men, between the ages of twenty and twenty-five? Why are those men hired by the House of Commons for the session when they ought to be at the front, fighting for their country? And they would be if they had the blood of men in them. But, if you are going to recruit from the Civil Service, let it be fair all round. I know the case of one Minister who has a man working for him who wanted to go, but the Minister says he cannot be spared. I understand that in the recruiting that is taking place now in the Civil Service, the chief clerk

in a department has the right to say what men can go and what men cannot. Is that fair? Does anyone mean to tell me that there is any man in the Civil Service, or any man in this Government, or in this House, who cannot be spared? I never knew a man yet so big that he could not be replaced. So, if the Government wants to get the Civil Service to recruit, they should make the recruiting fair and even all round, and not have one taken and the other left, because one has a little bit of influence.

I had intended to speak on the high cost of living and also of what is going to happen when the war is over and three hundred thousand soldiers and four hundred thousand munition workers are discharged. I was also going to speak of the Ross rifle, and I will say one word on that. Mr. Speaker, I have talked to men who have come back from the trenches, and those men have told me with tears in their eyes that on several occasions when they were in the trenches and the Germans made attacks on them, they were there in the trenches with the Ross rifles jammed, and they could not get a cartridge in or out and could not use the rifles, and the Germans came right up to the edge of the trench and shot them in the trenches with the useless guns in their hands—and them cursing because they could not retaliate and kill some of their enemies. The Government and my hon. friend the Solicitor General said that they were bound by the contract that was made by the Liberal Government, the contract that provided that no change could be made inside of a year. But Sir Charles Ross has said that he never insisted on that part of the contract, but was always ready to make any changes, and Ross has challenged my hon. friend to say what he means by this statement. My hon. friend has kept a judicious silence ever since.

Another returned soldier told me of one battle that he was in where his battalion made an advance and were able to dig shallow trenches about a foot deep, in which they were lying protected to a certain extent from the German bullets. After firing a few shots their rifles jammed, and they could not get the bolts to work. In their eagerness to do some execution against the enemy, they would rise up on one hand and their knees and take the other hand to get a crack at the bolt in order to force it back so as to be able to insert a cartridge, and as they would rise up six inches or a foot above the ground, they would fall over dead or wounded by the scores and by the hundred—and the fathers and mothers of this country have a right to know from this Government what they meant by continuing the use of that rifle for a year after they knew that it was no good for war purposes, a year after the commander at the front had to withdraw a division of Canadian soldiers because of the arm they carried, and knew that thousands of our men had discarded the Ross rifle and stood around the dressing stations to grab a Lee-Enfield rifle whenever one was dropped by a wounded British soldier. This Government is responsible. I do not hold them responsible at the first, but when they found out that the rifle would not work in war, I say this Government is absolutely and directly responsible for the death of hundreds and thousands of our Canadian boys who were killed because of the uselessness of the rifle that they had in their hands.

If they had had a good rifle they would have put the enemy out of business, and fewer of them would have been killed. At this hour of the night I have not time to take this matter up—I have spoken too long—but we intend to take it up and to hold the Government responsible. My hon. friend the Solicitor General has a good deal to do yet before he can make good his claim that the Government were bound by the contract made by their predecessors with the Ross Rifle Company. That contract was for a rifle agreed to by the Government, a rifle which could be changed at any time; and what is more, Sir Charles Ross himself pointed out the defects of the rifle a year before they stopped manufacturing. What are the Government doing now? They are buying thousands and tens of thousands, yes, hundreds of thousands of uniforms more then they need, but they have not ordered any more rifles. Why, I do not know, but they have not, and it is up to them to explain. I will not say anything further about the Ross rifle in the meantime.

I had intended to take up the question of nickel. My hon. friend the Solicitor General did some fancy skating around that matter last year, but it looks pretty poor stuff in view of the information that has come out during the past year. These are things that will have to be taken up. The men and women of Canada who have sent their sons to the front want to know, about how the Government have handled the nickel, the Ross rifle, and other things;

but they will keep until after the adjournment, until the Prime Minister comes back, and then we will take them up and discuss them with our friends opposite.

Mr. G. W. KYTE (Richmond): Moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of hon. Mr. Rogers the House adjourned at 9.50 p.m.

Monday, January 29, 1917.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the chair.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Copy of amendment to sub-section (d), section 104, of the Radiotelegraph Regulations.—Hon. Mr. Hazen.

Annual report of the Department of Customs for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1916.—Hon. Mr. Reid.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 13, to consolidate and amend the Railway Act.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: I should like to ask the Minister of Railways whether the Government have come to a decision concerning the announcement made by the First Minister the other day, that the consideration of this Bill might be taken up in Committee during recess?

Mr. COCHRANE: When the Prime Minister makes a statement, he means what he says.

Mr. MACLEAN: We did not get a statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not in order to go into a discussion on the first reading of a bill.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What did the Minister say?

Mr. ROGERS: You had better read Hansard.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

[Mr. Turriff.]

RECRUITING.

STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER.

On the Orders of the Day:

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, during my absence on Friday the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. J. G. Turriff) made a statement in the House with regard to myself to which my attention has been directed. I need not read all of his speech, but the statement to which I refer was in effect: that I did last spring intimate to the representatives of the Ontario Recruiting Committee that if I had my way there would be no more recruiting in Canada and that the attention of the Canadian people should be turned to the development of their industries. That statement is on its face so transparently absurd that I must apologize to the House for making allusion to it. However, my silence might be misunderstood, and therefore I desire to assure the House and the country that neither to the Ontario Recruiting Committee on the occasion mentioned, nor to any other organization or individual on any other occasion, did I ever convey any such intimation as that suggested, or anything that could be tortured into such an intimation. I regret that my hon. friend should have seen fit to make a statement which is entirely inconsistent with every act and word of mine from the commencement of the war up to the present time.

CONFISCATION OF COAL BY RAILWAYS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. McKENZIE: I wish to call the attention of the Prime Minister to a telegram which I have received, as follows:

Have sent Premier Borden to-day a telegram reading as follows: "The Dominion Atlantic Railway has confiscated coal consigned to the Nova Scotia Underwear Company, Limited, of Windsor, after arrival of coal at Windsor freight yard. The confiscation of Underwear Company coal is serious, as they have military contracts to perform and will be unable to do so if confiscation of any of their coal by railway is permitted. If you will kindly instruct Dominion Atlantic Railway that coal confiscated must be returned at once, and that coal for the Nova Scotia Underwear Company, Limited, must not be interfered with in future, we feel they will obey. While the Nova Scotia Underwear Company is willing to co-operate with the railway in every reasonable manner, it feels that interference with its coal supply is unwarranted by conditions obtaining in this vicinity, and such interfer-

ence is a matter of serious importance to them. Your kind offices in the premises will be appreciated.

This is a duplicate of a telegram which was sent to the Prime Minister. I sent notice to the Prime Minister that I would bring this matter up, and I trust that he will be able to give some satisfactory information on the subject.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The telegram to which my hon. friend refers was received by me, and I at once asked the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada for any information that they might have with respect to that or like matters. I have a memorandum from the Chairman of the Board, Sir Henry Drayton, which has just been handed to me. It is as follows:—

The practice of commandeering coal by railways is the occasion of great annoyance and frequently positive loss to consignees. It is a practice which is not covered by the Railway Act, one way or the other, nor authorized by any regulation of the Board. The practice is very similar to the practice of general average applicable at sea, and the taking of necessary cargoes, belonging, of course, to consignees, in case of emergency. It is justified by the railways in that it is better that some freight should move rather than that no freight should move at all.

Railway companies, of course, ought to lay in their own coal; they ought to have supplies; they ought to be able to carry on their business without commandeering coal; but, at the same time, it has to be recognized that the coal shortage is very acute, and that railways in some instances have been entirely unable to obtain supplies of coal which they in due season contracted for.

The Board has already had up the question of coal confiscation with the railways, and everything has been done to minimize it. The complaints on this score now are very much fewer than they were, and the situation is being got in hand.

The Board has not been advised of any confiscation of coal belonging to the Nova Scotia Underwear Company, but the matter will be immediately taken up.

My hon. friend will bear in mind that the telegram reached me only this morning, and that the Board of Railway Commissioners, to whom I referred it, have had only a few hours to consider the situation. The hon. gentleman will note the statement in the concluding paragraph of the memorandum, to the effect that the board will investigate the matter at once and give me further information. I am very much obliged to my hon. friend for giving me an intimation in advance that it was his purpose to ask a question in the House upon the subject.

WESTERN COAL MINING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. BUCHANAN: I ask the Government for a statement regarding the latest developments in connection with the coal strike in southern Alberta and eastern British Columbia. Is it their intention to carry out the policy outlined in an official statement of the Government, made on Monday, January 15, that if the increase fixed by Commissioner Harrison was not granted by the operators, the Government would take over and operate the mines at the expense of the operators?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Minister of Labour left last night for the West with a view to getting into direct personal touch with the parties and of doing what he can to bring to an end the unfortunate condition which is now prevailing in the West.

THE IRISH-CANADIAN RANGERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MACDONALD: Will the Minister of Militia make a statement to the House as to whether the rumour is correct that the Irish-Canadian Rangers of Montreal are to go to the front as a unit?

Mr. KEMP: I shall be very glad to make inquiries from the Overseas Minister of Militia; then I shall be able to give my hon. friend an answer.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. G. C. Wilson (Wentworth) for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Friday, January 26.

Mr. G. W. KYTE (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I know you will not deem me lacking in courtesy if I do not give expression to those sentiments of congratulation upon your accession to the Speakership that were so gracefully voiced by the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me in this debate. I desire to adopt them to the fullest extent as expressing my own feelings in respect to the action of the Government in your selection, as well as in respect to the honour which has been conferred upon the province of Nova Scotia through you as one of its representatives.

We are now in the seventh session of the twelfth parliament. Since the 21st of September last the Cabinet has been govern-

ing this country, not by virtue of the mandate of the people of this country, but by grace of the representatives of the people sitting in Parliament. It does seem to me that it would have been fitting for the Government in this debate to enter into some explanation of the manner in which it has carried out its trust, particularly since the 21st day of September last, when the period of the extension of the life of Parliament first began to run. Except for the intervention of the right hon. the Prime Minister in this debate, which according to parliamentary usage and custom he was bound to, we have had no statement or explanation from any member of the Government of the manner in which they have administered their responsibilities, not only since the extension began but before that time.

Before entering into the discussion of the more general questions that naturally arise in the course of this debate, I desire to refer to a matter having a more local interest in the province of Nova Scotia, and particularly in that part of the province from which I come. I refer to the recent appointment of senators for Nova Scotia. Nova Scotia, as you well know, is made up of two geographical units, Nova Scotia proper and the island of Cape Breton. At the time of Confederation it was agreed that Cape Breton should be accorded three senators in the distribution of senatorships at that time. Since then the number has increased to four, and on no occasion, except in recent years, has the number been less than three. The island of Cape Breton has made tremendous advances in industrial life during the last twenty years. It has now a population well on to one hundred and fifty thousand, or nearly one-third of the total population of the province. Its coal, steel and iron industries are well known throughout the Dominion of Canada, and it has on the whole as important and diversified interests as can be found anywhere in the Dominion of Canada. Some few weeks ago the Conservative party of the United counties of Cape Breton and Richmond passed a resolution referring to the appointment of senators, which I shall now read:

"In view of the fact that the resignation and death of the late Senator William Macdonald has left a senatorial vacancy in this Island; and, whereas Cape Breton Island has never had since Confederation less than three representatives in the Senate of Canada; and, whereas we are now represented by one senator only who lives a greater part of his time from the Island; and, whereas a persistent rumour declares that the Government's intention is to fill the late Senator William Macdonald's seat by a resident of the City of Halifax; and, whereas, Cape Breton with its record of almost unswerving loyalty to the Liberal Conservative party ought not to be penalized for any other county of the province and least of all in the interests of Halifax whose record, from a party viewpoint, is quite well known to the Premier and whose present senatorial representation is already amazingly beyond its deserts.

"Therefore resolved that the Liberal Conservative Association of South Cape Breton and Richmond earnestly request that the seat of the late Senator Macdonald be filled by a bona fide resident of Cape Breton and by a man whose whole interest will be more or less identified with the moral and material advancement of our Island."

The reply to that resolution was the appointment of the Hon. Senator Tanner from the town of Pictou and of the Hon. A. B. Crosby from the city of Halifax. Regarding the appointment of the former gentleman, I have not a word to say. He filled a considerable place in the public life of the province of Nova Scotia for the last twenty years. During that period he was the leader of His Majesty's loyal Opposition in the Legislature and he did all in his power and within his capacity to bring the Conservative party back into office in that province. As I said, he deserves well of the Conservative party, and I congratulate both the Government and Senator Tanner upon the appointment. I should have nothing to say in regard to the appointment of the other gentleman from Nova Scotia, were it not for the fact that party organs in the province of Nova Scotia claim that Senator Crosby was appointed to represent the island of Cape Breton in the Senate. The Halifax Herald says:

Mr. A. B. Crosby has the high honour of being called to the Senate to represent eastern Nova Scotia and Cape Breton.

Senator Crosby himself gave an interview in the Halifax Herald a few days after his appointment and said:

I will see more of Cape Breton in the future than in the recent past. It is my intention to spend much of my time in that part of the province, particularly in the summer season, and I look forward to this with unfeigned delight.

Let me repeat, it is a matter for justifiable pride to be appointed to the Senate of Canada, but what gives me added pleasure is that I will have the honour of representing Cape Breton in the upper chamber of Parliament.

This is an extraordinary declaration coming from a gentleman residing in the city of Halifax who has recently been called to the other Chamber of this Parliament. The gentleman I refer to was the colleague of the First Minister in the election of 1908, and he

was his colleague in 1911, in which election he suffered defeat. The time has now arrived when the Conservative party in the city of Halifax feel that they ought to be making some preparation for the next Dominion election; and inasmuch as Senator Crosby was very persistent in his claim to be the colleague of the Prime Minister in the next election, it was necessary that he be disposed of in some way in order that a stronger candidate might be selected. That is really, in my judgment, the reason for the appointment of Senator Crosby. I am sure it will afford great consolation to the people of the island of Cape Breton to know that in the future Senator Crosby will visit them occasionally to receive tributes of loyalty and fealty from his liege subjects. The Government of this country is absolutely haphazard and topsy turvy; its whole course appears to be subject to that peculiar dispensation of Providence that Charles Dickens said determined the distribution of clothing among the inmates of charitable institutions, by which all the tall boys got the short trousers and all the short boys got the long ones. Four senators represent and tread upon each other's heels in the city of Halifax, while Cape Breton, with its enormous and varied interests, that give life and vigour to the whole commercial fabric not only of Nova Scotia but of the Maritime Provinces, is doomed to absentee representation. Shades of Bourinot, Archibald, Macdonald, McKeen, Miller and Ross! Cape Breton that in days of yore, through her native sons, shed a lustre and radiance over the Senate Chamber, must hereafter be content to shine by the reflected glory of the junior senator for Halifax, while men prominent in its professional, business and public life are burned deeply with the brand of senatorial unfitness—in order that the Prime Minister may be rid of an unwelcome colleague.

The condition of affairs throughout the Dominion of Canada is not such as should bring very much congratulation to the Government at the present time. We have had some evidence in the speech of the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) as to the public sentiment that exists in the province of Ontario from which he comes. The whole burden of his speech was not congratulation for what the Government had done, but condemnation for what the Government had failed to do. The hon. member for South York has always been known to be a thick-and-thin and loyal supporter of the Conservative party. It is true that on occasions he has propounded doctrines that are not altogether acceptable to the majority of the party he supports, but, taken on the whole, his support of the party has been loyal and true. When such a prominent member of this House, such a prominent citizen of Canada as he is, makes the declarations he made a few days ago, there must be some reason for thinking that things are not well with the Government of this country or with the country itself. Other opinions in favour of a change in the form of Government in this country have been voiced by large representative bodies throughout the Dominion. We have had resolutions passed by city councils, trades and labour congresses, and other representative bodies calling upon this Government to give way to a more patriotic and more energetic Government, one capable of dealing with the great obligations that arise from day to day in respect to the war. The cry from Ontario apparently is for a national Government, whereas the cry from the other provinces is for a Liberal Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. KYTE: But there appears to be no cry for a continuation of the present Conservative Government.

The subject of the cost of living is one that affects the people of this country, perhaps, more than any other, except the great question of the war. During the last three or four years the burdens of the people of Canada have been increased to an enormous extent. There have been agitations in every part of the Dominion urging the Government to take steps to bring relief to the people in respect to the high cost of living. The Government, or a sub-committee of the Government, met some months ago and evolved an order in council which apparently they felt discharged their full duty and obligation to control the cost of living. That order in council was put forward as the acme of perfection and as a full discharge of the duty of the Government. I know that in the city of Sydney some attempt was made under that order in council to regulate the price of one of the important commodities of domestic consumption, but after examining the order in council, and after endeavouring to put it into effect, the whole proceeding came to an end because it was found that the order in council and the proceedings under it were absolutely unworkable. A large delegation

waited upon the sub-committee of the Government with respect to this matter some months ago, and my recollection is that the hon. Minister of Public Works, who was a member of that sub-committee, declared that the Government were not called upon to take any action inasmuch as no remedy had been suggested by the people of Canada. The hon. the Minister of Labour took the ground that, inasmuch as the cost of living was high and was increasing in other parts of the world, there was no particular reason why we in Canada should worry over the matter. In the Dominion of New Zealand the Government have taken stringent steps for the purpose of regulating the cost of living. By orders in council, by regulations, and in some cases by statute, they have actually fixed the prices of certain commodities of life which had been unduly increased to the consumers of that Dominion. They have dealt with the price of flour, of butter, of cheese, of milk, and of coal. They have prepared an elaborate system which renders it absolutely impossible for the dealers in those commodities to unduly enhance the prices of articles of domestic consumption. When the time comes to discuss the Budget, I hope to be in a position to place upon Hansard the regulations and orders in council by which the Government of New Zealand have dealt with these matters.

In England, steps have also been taken with the same view. One of the provisions adopted by the Government of England some months ago empowered the Board of Trade to requisition stocks of food on such terms as the Board of Trade may direct, the amount of compensation payable in default of an agreemeent as to price to be determined by a single arbitrator, who must take into consideration cost of production and a reasonable profit, but without necessarily considering the market price.

With regard to bread stuffs, the price of flour, being a commodity of universal consumption, more particularly fixes the standard of the cost of living. It is well known that when the price of flour goes up, the price of every other commodity increases in sympathy. Strong objection was taken to the action of the Government two years ago when they proposed to increase the revenues of this country to meet the war emergency by a general increase of the tariff. It was contended by hon. members on this side of the House that to make a flat increase of the tariff to the extent of seven and a half per cent would result in unduly enhancing the cost of living to a people already overburdened. I have before me a statement issued by the Ogilvie Milling Company previous to its last annual meeting. We know that whenever there is a complaint that the price of flour, or of other commodities of domestic consumption increases, the increase is attributed to war conditions. The universal answer and defence of those who increase prices is that it is entirely due to the war. I think that I will be able to show that the increased price of flour, which the consumers have to pay, is not due entirely to war conditions, but is due to the avarice and greed of the men who are engaged in the manufacture of that commodity, and who are making the war a pretext for increasing the price. The Ogilvie Milling Company, in the month of October last, issued the following statement:

> A bonus of 4 per cent. for the year ended August 31st last was declared by the directors of the Ogilvie Flour Mills Co., Limited, on its $2,500,000 common stock, at a meeting held here yesterday afternoon. The bonus will be paid on October 1st along with the regular quarterly dividend of 2 per cent., making a total distribution out of the year's profits of 12 per cent.
>
> The bonus declared yesterday is the first extra distribution to be made by the Ogilvie Company since the stock was listed on the Montreal Exchange in 1908, although bonus payments have been popular with other milling concerns when an exceptionally good run of business has been struck. When the stock was listed the common shares were returning 7 per cent.; the rate was advanced to 8 per cent. in 1910 and has been held steady at that level through good times and bad.
>
> A year ago, when exceptional profits from wheat brought the earnings up to the phenomenally high level of 95 per cent on the common, the directors held to their conservative course, and shareholders received the usual 8 per cent. and nothing more. Investment values added to by this conservation of resources have naturally been potent in increasing the earning power of the stock. The status of the company, with a large supply of liquid capital at its disposal, has changed from that of a borrower to a lender.
>
> At yesterday's meeting the directors took the view that the results of another year's business having been extremely satisfactory, there was no reason why an extra distribution of profits should be withheld any longer.

Here, Mr. Speaker, we have a statement by the company themselves that, whereas previous to the war all they earned was six per cent and seven per cent, and in one year eight per cent, owing to the exceptionally good prices they were able to get after the war they were not only in a position to declare a dividend of eight per cent but to give a bonus of four per cent in addition. How was it possible for the Ogilvie Milling

Company to get such exceptionally good prices during the war if it was not by unconscionably enhancing the price of their flour on the pretext that it was due to war conditions? I have seen the statement made that the actual earnings of the Ogilvie Milling Company were twenty-five per cent, that in addition to the twelve per cent which they paid to stockholders, they put to rest account, a sum equal to another thirteen per cent. If the flour placed upon the market by the Ogilvie Milling Company was the product of wheat purchased last year, when the farmers got an unusual price, and when wheat was selling upon the Grain Exchange at from $1.70 to $1.80, we could understand that it would be necessary to put up the price of flour in order that the Ogilvie Milling Company might give fair dividends to its stockholders. But, bear in mind that the flour, manufactured by the Ogilvie Milling Company and upon which they declared dividends and bonuses of twelve per cent during 1916, was flour manufactured from the wheat crop of 1915, for which the farmers did not receive more than 75 cents a bushel. Therefore, it is perfectly clear that the enormous price of flour in the markets of Canada during this past summer was not due to war conditions, but, as I said a moment ago, was due to the avarice of the soulless corporations that controlled that commodity and were free to take full advantage of the last dollar that they could extract from the people. Not only were they suffered to do so but they were assisted in their design to do so by the course of the Government in keeping up the duty on food products and increasing the duty notwithstanding that every consumer in Canada was in favour of keeping the duty where it was if not absolutely reducing it.

But, it may be said that the Ogilvie Milling Company has contributed a large amount of money to the treasury of Canada by reason of the war tax. I stated a moment ago that the bonuses and dividends paid to the shareholders of the company amounted to twelve per cent. The statement of the company which I have just read shows that the dividends were paid upon $2,500,000 of the common stock of the company. I do not know what the total capitalization of the Ogilvie Milling Company is, but, taking the item of common stock alone, I will be able to show you how much the Government got out of this war tax and how much the stockholders of the Ogilvie Milling Company were able to put into their pockets by reason of the enormous earnings which they enjoyed. Twelve per cent upon $2,500,000 of common stock would amount to $300,000. Seven per cent, the amount which this company was able to retain clear of any war tax, amounted to $175,000 and 25 per cent upon the balance of the profits, or upon $125,000, would amount to $31,500. So that out of the earnings of $300,000 of the Ogilvie Milling Company upon its common stock, the Government only secured $31,250 and the stockholders of the company put $268,550 in their pockets. If it is true that the earnings of the Ogilvie Milling Company amounted, as a matter of fact to 25 per cent instead of 12 per cent, then we have this condition of affairs: The profit of the company would then amount to $625,000 and the amount of the war tax upon that profit, over and above seven per cent, would be $145,000, which would go into the coffers of the Government. But the shareholders of the Ogilvie Milling Company would still be able to put $479,700 into their pockets.

It is said by the friends of the Government that they have done all that could reasonably be expected in the way of commandeering the wealth of this country in order to make sure that it shall bear its full proportion of the war expenditure. But, is it not idle for the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) to tell the people of the country that he is taking 25 per cent of the profits of the large corporations, over seven per cent, because, when we come to actually figure out what that means, as I have done with respect to the Ogilvie Milling Company, we see what a bagatelle it is that the Government receive out of this war tax compared with the enormous profits that these corporations are making out of the overburdened people of the Dominion. If our friends who are governing the country to-day are really anxious to bring this war to a termination—and I know they are—if they are determined to mobilize our men, industries and supplies, the one thing above all others which they must mobilize to a greater extent is the wealth of this country. If we are in the war to the same extent as Great Britain is in the war—and we are in the war to that extent—there is no reason why we should not follow the example set by Great Britain, France and the other allied countries, and take from these manufacturers who are making money out of the war, not only 25 per cent of all the profits they make beyond 7 per cent, but every dollar over and above a

reasonable compensation for the money which they have invested in their enterprise. I scarcely think that our friends on the Government benches realize that there is a class of people which is not doing its duty in regard to carrying on the war. Talk about sacrifice, talk about doing our bit in the war! Where is the sacrifice of the shareholder of the Ogilvie Milling Company, who pays 25 per cent to the Government over and above the 7 per cent profit upon his total investment? What is that sacrifice compared with the sacrifice of the farmer, fisherman, or miner, whose only son has, perhaps, enlisted, has gone to the front, has been wounded, or, perhaps, killed in defence of the liberty and freedom of the British Empire? What is the sacrifice involved in a paltry tax of 25 per cent upon this profit compared with the sacrifice of the widowed mother who has allowed her only son to give up his life in order that the Empire might be preserved? In every village, town, hamlet and city throughout Canada there are sacrifices going on among the humble and simple people, in the houses of the fishermen, the farmer, the miner and the artisan, that are far greater in proportion than any sacrifice that the wealthy have been called upon to make up to the present time.

This war has given rise to industries that have yielded enormous dividends to those who have engaged in them. The other day I saw where a company down in Montreal that has contracts for the manufacture of munitions had made profits amounting to over 300 per cent. That is not exceptional, but it is the case wherever munitions are manufactured. I think that under the circumstances, in order that the sacrifices that the people are making should be equalized, in order that the sacrifice of the wealthy manufacturer should approach in some reasonable degree to the sacrifice of the classes I have mentioned, the manufacturer of munitions, and the manufacturer of every other commodity, ought to be obliged to give not only 25 per cent over the 7 per cent allowed, but every dollar over and above a reasonable compensation for the money which he has invested.

It was a great disappointment to find that shortly after the appointment of Sir Thomas Tait as head of the National Service Commission this distinguished non-partisan felt obliged to resign, and we got back to where we were a year ago. Sir Thomas, in his letter of resignation as head of the National Service Commission, addressed to the Prime Minister on the 12th of October last, said:

> In view of what has occurred in the case of Mr. G. M. Murray, who had been offered by me and who had accepted the position of Secretary of National Service, and of that incident as indicative of what may be anticipated in connection with the future organization and work of National Service, I feel compelled after serious consideration to relinquish the position of Director-General of National Service, and I therefore do now resign from that position.

That was the result of the first real effort of the Government to conduct affairs pertaining to the war on non-partisan lines. What was behind the enforced resignation of Mr. G. M. Murray? Mr. Murray has been secretary of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association for many years. I do not know which particular political party he supported, if, indeed, he supported either party. We have been told time and time again that the Canadian Manufacturers' Association is a non-partisan organization, and I presume that is true. Therefore, I assume that if Mr. Murray was not a non-partisan, he was at all events not sufficient of a partisan to merit the rebuke he received at the hands of the Government upon his being suggested as secretary of the National Service Commission. It is true that Mr. Murray had something to do with certain correspondence that passed between the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and the Prime Minister in the fall of 1914, a few months after the war broke out, wherein protests were made by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association against the intervention of middlemen in the letting of contracts for war supplies. It was alleged in that correspondence that the interference of middlemen was resulting in increasing to a very large extent the prices of munitions and other war supplies to the War Office, in order to provide commissions for the middlemen; and the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, through Mr. Murray, protested that if this matter was not stopped the high prices in Canada would result in the British War Office withdrawing orders for war supplies in Canada and placing them elsewhere. But whatever the cause may have been, Mr. Murray was evidently not persona grata with the Government, and his appointment as Secretary of the National Service Commission was not confirmed. As a result, Sir Thomas Tait resigned, and the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett) was appointed in his stead.

I have in my mind another illustration of how the question of National Service has been taken out of politics, and for the condition which I shall describe I do not hold the two hon. gentlemen responsible in the slightest degree who went down to the city of Halifax to address a meeting there on the subject of National Service. The hon. member for Calgary, as chairman of the commission, and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) went down to the city of Halifax to address the citizens on the aims and purposes of the National Service Commission. It was announced in the Liberal newspapers of Halifax that in addition to these two gentlemen the Premier of Nova Scotia would also address the meeting. But, strange to say, in the announcement of the meeting that appeared in the columns of the Halifax Herald, there was no reference whatever to the fact that Premier Murray would speak. The only speakers mentioned were the hon. member for Calgary and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. If the National Service Commission does not intend to do business on such lines of narrow partisanship, I would suggest that the chairman of the commission, or some other functionary interested in its success, give instructions to the party press throughout Canada to give something like a fair deal to members of the Liberal party, who are as anxious for National Service as any hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House.

There is another matter in which the people of Canada have been very much concerned since the last sitting of Parliament, and that is the resignation of the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence. Very pointed references have been made to that correspondence since this debate opened, but up to the present we have had no explanation with regard to it either from the Prime Minister or from any other hon. gentlemen sitting on the Government benches. I am sometimes inclined to suspect that a discussion of the correspondence that passed between the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence and the Prime Minister is not what hon. gentlemen opposite are most anxious for. It appears to me that the ex-Minister of Militia has hon. gentlemen opposite scared into a blue funk, so that they dare not venture into a controversy which would bring to the discussion to-morrow afternoon some observations from the ex-Minister of Militia that perhaps they would prefer him not to make. The charges and allegations made by the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence stand uncontradicted at the present time. The ex-Minister of Militia placed the Prime Minister in a position where his words were challenged and his motives in certain respects questioned. Allegations of a serious character were made against the colleagues of the Prime Minister, and I do think this debate ought not to close until we have an explanation from some member of the Government or from gentlemen supporting the Government, as to whether the allegations made by the ex-Minister of Militia are true or not.

We have also had a report from Dr. Bruce, who was appointed to inquire into conditions prevailing with respect to the medical service in England. A summary of Dr. Bruce's report contains twenty-three charges, which reflect very seriously upon the conduct of the Medical Staff in respect to the way in which they have treated our soldiers. The answer to the Bruce report was made a few days ago by an hon. gentleman for the Government, and that answer was that another commission had been appointed, at the head of which was Dr. Baptie, and had completely disproved the charges that were made by Dr. Bruce. It so happens that the report of the Baptie Commission was published a few days ago, and those who are familiar with the particulars of Dr. Baptie's report will not be surprised to learn that of the twenty-three charges made by Dr. Bruce, eighteen are confirmed by the Baptie Commission. I will read the summary of the report of the Baptie Commission. It gives the twenty-three charges made by Dr. Bruce, with its own comments on each charge.

1. Soldiers arriving in England medically unfit. Criticism largely justified.

2 and 3. Segregation of Canadian wounded and centralization of Canadian hospitals. Board admits this to be a fair question for argument, but thinks Dr. Bruce's suggestions impracticable and inadvisable.

4. Unnecessary detention in hospitals, Board professes to disagree with Dr. Bruce, but admits the justice of much of his criticism.

5. V. A. D.'s inefficient, Board thinks criticism unjustified and regrettable.

6. Shorncliffe V. A. D. hospitals. Board admits justice of some of the criticism.

7. Relations with Red Cross. Board admits justice of some of the criticism. "Glaring departures from service methods passed unnoticed."

8. Detailing of C. A. M. C. personnel for Imperial service. Board's opinion disagrees with that of Col. Bruce.

9. Colonel Rennie in dual role at Shorncliffe. Board thinks it's all right.

10. Surgical operations not tending to increase military efficiency, Criticism partially concurred in.

11 and 12. Special hospitals Ramsgate and Buxton. Col. Bruce's criticisms partially concurred in.

13. Venereal situation. Criticism partially concurred in.

14. Infectious diseases. Board thinks present arrangements all right.

15. Medical Board situation. Board thinks Dr. Bruce's words too strong, but "reformation" (a significant word) is essential.

16. Records. Criticisms generally concurred in.

17. Pensions. Criticisms too strong.

18. Co-ordination. Criticisms partially concurred in.

19. C.A.M.C. personnel not used to advantage. Board disagrees.

20. Consulting specialists. Criticisms partially concurred in.

21. Discontent as to promotions. Board thinks this is not abnormal, but a change is recommended.

22. C.A.M.C. Training School. Board agrees this has not been properly organized.

23. Economy in management. Board thinks there has been economy.

This summarizes the findings of the Baptie Commission which, as I said, concurred in eighteen out of the twenty-three charges contained in Col. Bruce's report.

As there seems to be a question whether the findings of the Baptie Commission or the statements of Col. Bruce are correct, it does appear that further inquiry ought to be made in order that the people of Canada may be able to reach a proper conclusion. Col. Bruce, a gentleman eminent in the medical profession—so eminent that he has since been appointed by the British Government as surgeon in charge of two hospitals in France—made charges and allegations of a serious character as regards the management of hospitals under the Medical Staff in England. A commission—hand-picked, it is said, by the Overseas Minister of Militia in London—has made a report which, we were told, completely refutes the allegations of Col. Bruce. But, from the summary I have read, it will be seen that the commission has not disagreed in any essential particular with the report of Col. Bruce. That leaves the people of Canada in a haze, to some extent, as to these allegations. I do think the Minister of Militia ought to have this matter put in such a position that some intelligent judgment can be arrived at as to whether these allegations are well founded or not.

It is alleged that recruiting at the present time is not carried on as briskly as it might be, or as briskly as the necessity of the time calls for. As to the province of Nova Scotia, I know that while the citizens of that province have done well, perhaps have done very much better than other portions of Canada,—and I do not say that for the purpose of casting reflections on any other parts of the Dominion—yet a good deal more could be done in that province if there were a better system of recruiting. I am not speaking in a critical spirit, nor with any desire to make political capital out of conditions that have arisen; but I do think that if we are not doing more in the matter of recruiting in Nova Scotia it is largely due to the fact that no regular system of recruiting, apart from the system of political patronage, is relied upon to get recruits.

In the matter of the separation allowance and Patriotic funds, I am sorry to say that in certain parts of Nova Scotia these two funds have been annexed as part of the political patronage system. In some cases members of the Patriotic Fund committees who are not in sympathy with the present Government find that their colleagues who are in sympathy with the Government undertake to dispose of these funds without reference to them. I cannot conceive of any reason that would suggest the dividing of the membership of a Patriotic Fund committee on party lines unless the object be to enable the Conservative members of the committee to control the funds as part of the political patronage. As to the separation allowances, I regret to say that some criticism can be made. Members of Patriotic Fund committees throughout Nova Scotia are frequently consulted by the officers of the Department of Militia and Defence who have to deal with separation allowances, and their recommendations are not in any case submitted to the Liberal members of the committee. A year ago I received a copy of the regulations under which separation allowances are paid. They provided that no person should enjoy separation allowance except the wife of a soldier who has enlisted, the mother of a soldier who is a widow, or the minor children of a soldier who is a widower. It may surprise you, Mr. Speaker, as it will surprise other hon. members of the House, to know that, notwithstanding the regulations, there are women drawing separation allowances although their husbands are living and are contributing to the support of the family as before the son enlisted. A few weeks ago I applied to the Department of Militia and Defence for information as to whether any change had recently been made in the regulations that would permit the fathers of soldiers to participate in the benefits of

4 p.m.

the fund, and was told that no such change had been made. But if the separation allowance is to be paid in such cases as those I have indicated it should be under a change of the regulations made after full consideration and for good reasons. I am only calling the attention of the minister to the matter in order that it may be taken up, and that, if abuses are found in the payment of these allowances, these abuses may be corrected at the earliest possible moment.

There is evidence that partisanship has continued to permeate military affairs in this country, in a statement that appeared in the Toronto Globe of a few days ago, as follows:—

> Is it necessary for a returned soldier in Toronto to join a Conservative ward association before he has any chance of securing a government position? Is the spoils system still in operation? Can no Liberal who has fought for his country hope to serve it in time of peace without renouncing his political creed? These questions are forced to the front by the uncontradicted statement that Sergeant Soloman, a returned soldier wounded in France, was told by Sergeant-Major Creighton at the city hall, when he applied for a position, to "go and join the Second Ward Conservative Association and get in line for a government job." The sergeant-major says he told the returned soldier to see the Conservative Patronage Committee, not to join the association, but that is a very lame excuse.

I submit that the explanation of the Sergeant-Major does not inspire us with very much hope that the allegation is not perfectly correct. Why should a returned soldier be asked to go to a Conservative patronage committee in order to get that relief and assistance to which every man is entitled who has taken his place in the ranks?

Mr. BURNHAM: What authentication has the hon. member (Mr. Kyte) for this newspaper statement? Let him establish the facts, and then he can make a charge, instead of asking the attention of the House to what may be a mere supposition.

Mr. KYTE: I am making the allegation; it is up to Sergeant-Major Creighton to say whether or not the allegation is true. He says that he did not tell the returned soldier to join the Conservative association; he told him to see the Conservative patronage committee. What I desire to impress upon the House is that according to Sergeant-Major Creighton's own statement the matter of the employment of returned soldiers in the city of Toronto is in the hands of the Conservative patronage committee. I do not see why a man who goes to the front, is wounded in battle and returns, should be sent to any patronage committee to get that which every person in Canada knows he is entitled to. Every incentive to patriotic action on the part of at least one-half of our population is blasted and withered by this accursed blight of political patronage. If a recruiting meeting is held in Nova Scotia, the recruiting officer is a Conservative who has been recommended by the Conservative patronage committee. If he addresses a meeting every man upon the platform is a Conservative. If a young Liberal comes forward to enlist he is sent for examination to a Conservative medical officer; and the more offensive a man is in politics the more likely he is to get an appointment of that kind. Why should there be any restriction in this respect upon the young men who enlist? It would be only fair if this Government should take steps completely to remove that part of the Militia Department out of politics. If the young man passes the medical examination and goes into training, he finds that everything he is supplied with and every service that is rendered to him is done by virtue of the system of party patronage. If he goes across to the other side in company with one of his young Conservative friends, he finds that his Conservative friend is very soon promoted and transferred to officers' quarters, while he is left to do battle in the trenches. If he goes to the front, he knows that his mother is not likely to get her allowances out of the Patriotic Fund unless she is able to enlist the sympathy and support of Conservatives who handle that fund. He knows also that she will not get the separation allowance unless she is strong enough with the Conservative members of the Patriotic Fund Committee to get them to recommend her for a separation allowance. The mother of the young Liberal recruit will have grave difficulty in getting her separation allowance, whereas the mother of the young Conservative recruit, notwithstanding the fact that her husband is living and is supporting her, will get a separation allowance without any difficulty. If the young Liberal recruit is wounded and comes back from the front, the chances are he will be told, as Private Solomon was told, that he cannot get employment unless he is recommended by the Conservative patronage committee. If he comes back incapacitated, I believe that under present conditions he will get a pension, because the Pensions Board is administered absolutely apart from political patronage. But if our Conservative friends do not make the Pen-

sions Board a part of their patronage system, it is evidence that they are losing their instinct for getting everything they can out of this war.

The people of Canada are seriously concerned in this war. Many of them are anxious to do more than they have done if they way were only made clear to them. The National Service Commission, notwithstanding the resignation of Sir Thomas Tait and the substitution of the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett) is, I believe, designed to do well. There are people and interests in Canada who are anxious to co-operate to a greater extent than before in the winning of this war, and the only thing that is holding them back is political patronage. Whatever excuse there may be for hon. gentlemen opposite for keeping their hands on political patronage in respect to other departments of government, there is certainly no excuse whatever for their administering the Department of Militia and Defence along those lines, particularly since September 21, 1916, when the mandate of this Government expired, and when they were continued in office only by the vote of both political parties in this House.

I am very glad to see that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) has returned from his travels and is once more amongst us as an ornament to the House and a great figure in debate. We all remember the magnificent speech which was delivered by the hon. minister in this House a year ago on the subject of political patronage, during the course of which he said:

> On the contrary it almost always causes dry rot and disintegration that break up Government after Government and party after party; and I wish now in the white heat and light of the great contest and struggle and the self-sacrifice that we are called upon to make that we might speak from the heart and make an agreement in this country between both parties that hereafter patronage shall not be applied by political parties in the administration of our public services. . . . If there is any canker of public corruption in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred you can trace it to the baleful effect of political party patronage.

Political patronage generally called forth this vigorous condemnation from the Hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce; what shall we say of the political patronage which is being employed in respect of services rendered and money voted for the purposes of the war? Every assertion made by the Minister in that speech applies five hundred-fold more strongly to the question that is now under discussion. But what evidence have we that these pious exhortations of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce received even a respectful hearing from his colleagues? I regret to say that up to the present time there is no evidence of their eliminating party patronage in connection either with the other departments of government or with the money which is voted for the purpose of carrying on the war. Now that we have the Minister of Trade and Commerce back with us again, I do hope that before this debate closes he will refer once more to the text upon which he preached so admirably a year ago and make one more effort to convert his recalcitrant colleagues to the truth and virtue of the observations that he made respecting political patronage.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I desire, to express my concurrence in the regret so eloquently voiced by the two leaders in this House at the departure from Canada of Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Connaught and the Princess Patricia. I also desire, in the name of Frontenac, my constituency, to bid a cordial welcome to Their Excellencies the Duke and Duchess of Devonshire and to express the hope that their stay in Canada will be as pleasant for them as I am sure it will be profitable to us.

There is one very important point upon which we are all agreed in regard to this war, and that is the justice and righteousness of our cause. There is no stain upon Britain or upon any of her Allies in regard to causing the terrible conflict which is raging. Russia stands clear in that regard, and history will so write it. Russia, with her vast territory of eight millions square miles, possesses perhaps the most inadequate and poorly-equipped railway system of all the countries of Europe. Her fleet is small and scarcely sufficient, with the assistance of land fortifications, to protect her capital. Her army, large in numbers, as the war has demonstrated was very poorly equipped when the war started, and that fact alone seems to me to show that Russia had no intention of aggression. But Russia went into this war, not because she wished to do so, but because to remain out of it would have forced her forever after to hide her head in shame and dishonour. France stands acquitted of any desire for war. With an army very much smaller in numbers and lower inefficiency of general equipment than that of Germany, with a fleet much inferior to the battle fleet of Germany, no person who gives the subject

a moment's consideration could think that France had any thought of aggression. History will clear the name of France in that regard, as the world will ring for generations and ages with the valour of her sons and the splendid courage of her women and children. England, as we know, from the very outset had done all that a nation could possibly do to prevent this struggle. She pleaded and begged for peace and pleaded and begged in vain. On one arm of the service England could rely; she possessed the most powerful and best equipped navy in the world. But she had practically no army, so far as numbers are concerned; simply a force of about one hundred and fifty thousand British regulars.

The one country above all others on the continent of Europe that was absolutely safe from invasion, was absolutely safe from the danger of war being waged on her soil by any other country, was Germany. She had a population of nearly seventy millions. She had a railway system under Government control and built for strategical as well as commercial purposes. She had the best organized, the most thoroughly equipped and best trained army in the world, and she had a navy second only to the navy of Great Britain. But the time had come, in Germany's estimation, to attempt world conquest, and she therefore declared war; and as we all know, in the month of August, 1914, this terrible conflict started. Not one of us in this House would have believed that any country calling itself civilized would have perpetrated the crimes, the atrocities, which Germany has committed since the beginning of this war. Not one of us would have thought possible, two and a half years ago, the wanton destruction of Louvain with its priceless treasures of art, the bombardment of Rheims cathedral, the sinking of the Lusitania, the murdering and butchering of women and children, or the driving into slavery of the remnants of the crushed and broken Belgian people. So far as our side of this struggle is concerned, such was and is impossible. We may be thankful that the teachings of centuries have become so imbedded in the hearts and minds of the people of England and France that since the outbreak of this struggle there has been not one single act of barbarism to mar the glory of their achievements or to stain the pages of their future history.

But we may ask: how is it that we find on the continent of Europe at this time two such different ideals? Cromwell purged England, and the French Revolution purged France of the false ideals which Germany has systematically encouraged for generations. We, in the British Empire, we, throughout the Anglo-Saxon world, have passed through centuries of cruelty and oppression to the final triumph of democracy. Throughout the Anglo-Saxon world, yes, and also in France, the individual has been encouraged to develop his individuality; he has been made to feel, no matter whether he is rich or poor, that he possesses within himself a value and a status in the national life which the nation regards as worth while. Democratic principles have been given expression to in such measures as Magna Charta, the Habeas Corpus Act, the Bill of Rights. But what are the conditions in Germany? In Germany for generations they have taken an opposite course. There the individual has been taught that he must blot himself out as an individual, that he must become or should become a mere military number, and that he has no right to be anything else; that he must become and should become a mere cog in the national machine. The gospel of hate has been preached in that country, in their schools, in their colleges and in their universities, yes—and from their pulpits; and men throughout the German Empire have been taught to regard the war teachings of Bernhardi and the writings and theories of Treitschke as something more worthy of their admiration and adoration than the gospel of Christ. These are the two different ideals which we have in Europe, and which are largely responsible for the outbreak of this conflict. The world is too small for these two ideals to exist side by side; one or other must triumph; either democracy as represented by Great Britain and France and Russia will triumph or militarism will triumph. I repeat the world is too small for both of these two ideals to exist any longer in it, and the time has come when the Allies must not only crush and defeat Germany's army but crush for all time Germany's ideals.

Mr. Speaker, reference has been made by different hon. gentlemen who have spoken in this debate to matters of patronage in connection with Canada's participation in this war. The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), when speaking a few days ago, said there were very few places where supplies for the troops were provided by anybody but followers of the Government. The hon. gentleman who has

just taken his seat (Mr. Kyte) has spoken along somewhat the same lines, only, as one would naturally expect, in somewhat more extravagant language. Allow me to call your attention to the statements made by the hon. member for North Oxford and to make one or two comments on them. If I have any fault to find with the Government it is that they have been rather too generous in the matter of distributing their patronage along certain lines.

Allow me to be explicit. I for one do not endorse the action of the Government, for instance, in giving advertisements to any newspaper which will print the most scurrilous and scandalous articles, which can only have the effect of retarding recruiting. I do not endorse the action of the Government in giving patronage to papers of that kind. There is one man who has a seat in the press gallery of this House—and I am glad to say there is only one—who has been capitalizing his scurrility and selling his lies at so much a word throughout this country. The lines of Byron apply very well to that gentleman and to men of his class:

> A would be satirist, a hired buffoon,
> A monthly scribbler of some low lampoon,
> Condemned to drudge the meanest of the mean
> And furbish falsehoods for a magazine,
> Devotes to scandal his congenial mind
> Himself a living libel on mankind.

Mr. Speaker, I say that any newspaper which in this time of stress of war, when every effort is being put forth to get recruits, and when the Government should receive every possible encouragement along that line, a newspaper which will print on one page of its issue the most scandalous and shameful lies in regard to the action and conduct of the Government, and will accept an advertisement from that Government and insert it on another page of its issue, is playing the part of a hypocrite.

In regard to the question of patronage, the War Purchasing Commission was appointed on, I think, the 8th of May, 1915. This commission has had supervision of the purchases of supplies for the Canadian Expeditionary Forces, the Naval Service, the Military Internment Camps, and so on. It receives its authority for making expenditures from the Privy Council, and before seeking authority to make purchases or to authorize contracts, it prepares a report for the Prime Minister based upon the requisition of the department concerned. It seems to me on the face of it that that is fair and reasonable. Purchases by this commission are made on tender, on the competitive basis, and upon the files of the commission, and in the departments are to be found the documents relating to each transaction. Tenders are opened in the presence of a member of the commission and a representative of the department concerned. These tenders are called for by poster advertisements and by tender forms mailed to known dealers and to those who ask for tender forms. Surely that is fair, as fair as it possibly could be.

I have spent some little time in getting figures from the report of the commission which was brought down just a few days ago. Let us see how the system works out at the various camps. Tender forms for provisions and supplies to Barriefield Camp were sent out to 116 firms; for Borden Camp, to 172 firms; for Camp Hughes, to 100 firms; for Niagara Camp, to 186 firms, for Pettawawa Camp, to 96 firms; for the Sarcee Camp, Calgary, to 142 firms; for Valcartier Camp, to 196 firms; for Vernon Camp, to 148 firms. Will any person say that these various firms or individuals were all Conservatives? Tender forms were sent out not only to known dealers, but to any person who requested a form to be sent to him. In the matter of teas and coffees, some ninety-eight different firms tendered, or had tender forms sent to them, and for the supply of fish for overseas, 130 firms. I am not going to mention all the different articles, but let us take general supplies. For ambulance stretchers, 44 firms tendered or were asked to tender; for hospital clothing, 78; for boots and shoes, 130; for bedding and blankets, 138; for housewives, 60; for boxes, chests, and cases, 223; for canvas goods, such as bags, haversacks, tents, kit bags, 156; clothing for uniforms as jackets, trousers, etc., 226, and for white and grey flannel khaki, 31, harness and leather goods, 108; knitted goods, socks, sweaters, etc., 130; medical supplies, 242; service and flannel shirts, 92; wagons, carts and carriages, 88.

One could go through the whole list and show similar results. As I have stated, I spent some time in satisfying myself that, so far as the purchase of supplies by the Government for overseas is concerned, there has been nothing of a partisan nature about it. The door was thrown wide open, and every person in the business has been given an opportunity to put in his bid for the supplies that were wanted. In the constituency of my hon. friend (Mr. Nesbitt), some 81 firms were afforded an opportunity to submit

tenders, and in looking over the list I find that only eight of them happened to be outside of the city of Woodstock. I submit that these facts and figures demonstrate clearly that the statement made by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) was not a correct statement, and was not any more accurate than the statement which has been made by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte).

The hon. member who has just taken his seat referred to the distribution of the Patriotic Fund separation allowance, and that sort of thing, in the province of Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman went so far as to say that if a boy from that province went overseas to the trenches he must realize that his mother could not get her share of the Patriotic Fund allowance without going to some Tory official and asking for it. He made other statements along that line, but what are the facts? Who is the secretary of the Patriotic Fund in the province of Nova Scotia? The secretary, I am informed, is A. S. Barnstead, who is also secretary for immigration in that province, a strong Liberal, who was appointed to his present position by Premier Murray of Nova Scotia. In regard to the distribution of the Patriotic Fund, Liberals and Conservatives alike must go to that gentleman, who is not a Conservative, but a Liberal of the Liberals. I am also informed that his actions have shown him to be fair to every person regardless of the party to which he or she belongs. That is only as it should be.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kyte), referring to the question of military appointments, stated that if two boys left Nova Scotia, one a Conservative and the other a Liberal, the Conservative would get a commission, while the Liberal would have to fight in the trenches. That statement is not in accordance with the facts, and the hon. gentleman knew perfectly well that it was not. Why do I say that? Allow me to refer to the fact that Mr. W. F. Carroll, a Liberal member of this House who went overseas, holds the rank of lieutenant. I might also call attention to the fact that the son of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) is a lieutenant, and I do not think that any person will charge the hon. member for Pictou with being a Tory, whatever else they may think of him. Mr. Ralston, a Liberal member of the Provincial Legislature, holds the rank of captain, and so we might go on and name dozens and dozens of such. As far as I have been able to see, speaking for my own locality, I have never observed any distinction whatever made in regard to politics in so far as military positions are concerned. I speak honestly and sincerely in making that statement. I have not seen the slightest indication of any favouritism along that line. I do not think that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kyte) will make very much out of talk of that kind. The boys who enlisted from Nova Scotia and from every part of Canada, enlisted to serve their country, and I think the boys who have enlisted have a higher sense of their duty to their country than has the hon. member for Richmond. If they can best serve their country by fighting in the trenches, I give them credit for being willing to do so, and the fact that they have enlisted proves that they are willing.

The hon. gentleman blames the Government very strongly for the war tax on excess profits over seven per cent, and he says that it is a great burden to the people. My recollection is that that measure went through the House unanimously, that there was no division upon it, and that being so, the hon. gentleman is as much responsible as any person else for the seven per cent additional war tax. However that may be, whether the Government are or are not, taking as much from the manufacturers and others as they should, the truth of the statement cannot be denied that this is the first Government that ever did impose a special tax of that kind upon the manufacturers of the country.

The hon. gentleman from Richmond bewailed the fact that there was no representative from Cape Breton in the Senate. He said that Cape Breton was very unfortunate in that regard. I may say that there are a great many of us on this side of the House who think that Cape Breton is also very unfortunate with regard to its representation in this House, and especially so with regard to that portion of it which includes the county of Richmond. Last year there was a provincial election in Nova Scotia. That election resulted in the return of the Liberal Government by a very largely increased majority. But there was a very significant occurrence in connection with that election. The county of Richmond, which is represented in this House by my hon. friend, was for years and years represented in the local legislature by two Liberals. When the election came on the hon. member for Richmond appealed to the people there to return his two friends, the Liberal candidates, but, although the tide was running very strongly in favour of the Liberals in

Nova Scotia, the people of Richmond county would have nothing to do with the two Liberal candidates who were backed by the hon. member for Richmond. That, I say, is a significant fact. The two Conservative candidates were elected in that county and it is currently reported that the reason they were elected was that the hon. member for Richmond had opposed their cause. They had been reading the papers and they remembered something of the spectacle which the hon. member for Richmond had made of himself in Ottawa last session, and they showed their disapproval by casting their votes for the gentlemen who were opposed to the candidates endorsed by the hon. member for Richmond.

There was also a by-election last year in the county of Carleton, New Brunswick. The hon. gentleman who represents Carleton in this House (Mr. Carvell) declared to the press that he made this fight his own, and he went out and worked assiduously and energetically for the Liberal candidate, with the result that the Conservative candidate was elected by a very large majority. Why was this? What is the significance of it? The significance of it is that the people in Carleton had become aware of the manner in which the hon. member for Carleton had forced them to take only $8 a ton for their hay in times past; they had also heard of his doings in this House last session, and they would have nothing to do with a man who was backed by the hon. member. As the election in Carleton progressed the hon. member for that constituency in this House sent an S.O.S. call out to the prairie, which was responded to by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). I am told that the hon. member for Assiniboia never had been in that part of the country before, and he has not been there since. I do not know whether that is correct or not but he responded to the call and immediately he landed in the county he went to see the hon. member for Carleton. He did not stay very long. In two or three hours he was on his way back to the West, but it is said that he left the house of the hon. member for Carleton with his satchel somewhat lighter and his conscience somewhat heavier. Be that as it may, the people of Carleton showed that they were not for sale in that election, they repudiated the candidate who was endorsed by the hon. member for Carleton, and in repudiating that gentleman they repudiated the hon. member for Carleton himself. So that we have in these two facts in regard to the hon. member for Richmond and the hon. member for Carleton, an explanation of the somewhat changed demeanour which has been shown by these two hon. gentlemen since this session opened. Every person must have noticed the sad and gloomy appearance which these gentlemen have had since the opening of this session. The hon. member for Richmond's sadness and sorrows are not caused so much by the absence of any representation of Cape Breton in the Senate as by his dread of what is to come, and will come, as far as he is concerned when the next general election takes place. I fancy the gloomy countenance of the hon. member for Carleton is due to somewhat similar reasons. Last session two new political Zeppelins ventured forth emitting thunderous sounds and poisonous gases. These two Zeppelins came down to earth with a crash and all that was left of them was a mass of twisted and distorted political wires and a bad odour. The electors of Carleton and Richmond, when the next election comes round, will clear away the wreckage and disperse the bad odour which has been caused by these hon. gentlemen.

But now we have another election, one of a more recent date, one which took place in the county of Dorchester in the province of Quebec. On January 18 of this year, the following letter was sent to Mr. Lucien Cannon, the Liberal candidate in Dorchester:

> My dear Lucien:—You have done a good act in renouncing your provincial mandate to revindicate and affirm in Dorchester the rights of outraged conscience. I trust the electors will respond to your noble appeal. I wish you all success.
>
> Your devoted friend,
>
> WILFRID LAURIER.

There seemed to be some little doubt in Dorchester whether Mr. Cannon was really endorsed by the right hon. gentleman who leads the Liberal party in this House and country, and the matter came up at a meeting at Ste. Rose on January 21, when Mr. Lucien Cannon, the Liberal candidate, emphasized even more clearly than before that he was a candidate because of the approbation of the Leader of the Liberal party, and of his supporters in the county. He said at that meeting:

> When Mr. Sévigny was made minister of the Borden Cabinet I asked my friends to meet at Ste. Henedine in convention, not, as Mr. Sévigny says, on my own initiative, but at the demand and following the desire of the venerable head of the Liberal party, hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. It was after he asked me to have the electors

of my county meet that I sent notices of a convention in the county.

This convention was, I believe, presided over by Mr. Lapointe, the hon. member for Kamouraska in this House. The Liberal organizer for the province of Quebec also took a very active part in the election. I do not think there is any doubt in any person's mind at the present time that Mr. Cannon was a candidate in Dorchester with the endorsation and approval of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition. At St. Prosper on January 18, the same day that the letter of Sir Wilfrid Laurier was sent to Mr. Cannon, the Liberal candidate in Dorchester used this language at one of his meetings:

> National Service is preliminary to conscription, and with the chief of my party, I am against conscription. Do not forget one thing. There are men in the Borden cabinet who want to cut the head off the French-Canadian race. Are we to ruin our country from the point of view of men and wealth and everything else for England? I say no, without hesitation. If you elect Sévigny, there will be no limits to the sacrifices Canada will have to make.

I would ask the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition whether he endorses those sentiments expressed by Mr. Cannon in Dorchester county?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I might answer my hon. friend that Mr. Cannon has repudiated that language.

Mr. EDWARDS: My right hon. friend will realize that he has not answered my question. I asked whether he endorsed the sentiments alleged to have been expressed by Mr. Cannon in Dorchester. His statement that Mr. Cannon has repudiated those sentiments is not telling this House whether the right hon. gentleman endorses those sentiments or not.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friends knows my sentiments. I have expressed them in this House, not once, but hundreds of times.

Mr. EDWARDS: I should indeed be happy if I knew the sentiments of the right hon. gentleman, but the difficulty I have in knowing what his sentiments are is that they differ so widely on different occasions. At times we find him making most eloquent statements in regard to recruiting and Canada's participation in this war, and at other times in his career the right hon. gentleman has used different language, which I am sorry to say he has never seen fit to retract, and he used such language, not as an irresponsible youth, but as leader of a great party in this House and country. These are the things which leave me in doubt as to what the real sentiments of the right hon. gentlemen are.

Mr. Cannon in his remarks at meetings in Quebec also referred to the Hon. Dr. Sproule, a former Speaker of this House, as the master of Orange lodges and the bitter enemy of the French-Canadian race. I want to say that a statement of that kind is unworthy of Mr. Cannon, and I say that any person who knows the Hon. Dr. Sproule would not believe for one moment a statement of that kind against him. This precious Liberal candidate in Dorchester appealed to the people of his constituency to condemn his opponent, Mr. Sevigny, and he included in that condemnation Mr. Rainville, also a member of this House. And why? Because they had stood up in this House and sang "Rule Britannia." Mr. Cannon also appealed to his constituents to condemn this Government and defeat Mr. Sevigny, because the Government made them put an extra stamp on their letters and pay a war tax on a bottle of medicine. Notwithstanding the repudiation by Mr. Cannon of the statements he is reported to have made, one has only to follow the reports of the different meetings he held throughout the riding to be convinced of his attitude, and his attitude was not that which should be expected of a man seeking a seat in this House. It was not one person alone who reported Mr. Cannon to have made the statement about, "Are we to ruin ourselves for England?" There were several reporters there, and his words were carefully taken down, and reported from one end of the country to the other.

One thing however does stand out and it is this: I think in a time of war like this, when such statements were alleged to have been made by a Liberal candidate in the field, with the endorsation of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, and when those statements were reported in the papers from one end of the country to the other, it would have been in the best interests of Canada and the cause we have at heart, if the right hon. gentleman had taken the trouble to stand up in this House the moment those sentiments were reported, and say that those sentiments were not his sentiments. What a pitiable, contemptible position Mr. Cannon, the Liberal candidate in Dorchester with the endorsation of the right hon. gentleman, places himself in when at a time like this he appeals to the people to condemn the Government, be-

cause, forsooth, the people have to put an extra stamp on a letter or pay an extra cent as war tax on a bottle of medicine. The pitiable thing is that this gentleman, well educated as he is, and of a very good family, having every advantage, and possessing, one would naturally suppose, more than ordinary ability—the pitiable part of it is that in seeking a seat in this House he apparently lost sight of the big things and descended to the small and petty. He asks, "Are we to ruin Canada for the sake of England?" "No," he says, "I have no hesitation in saying no to that." Ruin Canada for the sake of England! For England! England, which at the outbreak of war sent across the Channel every man she had—a little army of 150,000 British regulars, every man of them a hero. That little army stopped the German hordes, blocking the way to Calais at a point almost within sight of England. And Calais is in France. That little army, nearly every man of whom lies buried in France, should not have been supported by Canadian arms, according to Mr. Cannon, when he was making his racial appeal in the county of Dorchester. Ruin ourselves for England? England has poured out her money to all the countries engaged on our side in this war to the point almost of bankruptcy, and has thrown into the struggle every available man for the defence of France. Ruin ourselves for England? No, says Mr. Cannon, no.

There is only one kind of bankruptcy or ruin that we have to fear in Canada, and it is not represented by dollars, but it is represented by discredit and dishonour. We need not be afraid of spending money, of spending the extra cent on a letter or on a bottle of medicine, though these taxes were represented as burdens by Mr. Cannon whose candidature was endorsed by the leader of the Opposition. The bankruptcy we have to fear in this country is the bankruptcy of high ideals—ideals which do not seem to be possessed by the Liberal candidate in the county of Dorchester.

An hon. MEMBER: But they are possessed by the people.

Mr. EDWARDS: As my hon. friend has said, they are possessed by the people. I offer my congratulations to the newly-elected Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sévigny), because he is a member of this House sitting on this side, and because he is a member of the Government. But I offer my congratulations more to the people of the county of Dorchester than to Mr. Sévigny. They are to be congratulated because of the stand they have taken. It is a good omen; I take it to mean that the day of the political demagogue in the province of Quebec has passed. Not only the county of Dorchester, but the province of Quebec is to be congratulated because of this victory; as is also the Dominion of Canada and the British Empire. This election was wider, far wider, in its scope and influence than the county of Dorchester, or the province of Quebec, or even the Dominion of Canada.

Allow me to refer to some of the statements made in this connection by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil). I desire to test some of the logic of that hon. member. Speaking here a few days ago he said:—

> Sir Wilfrid Laurier had to go and plead with the Liberals of the city and county of Quebec to allow the late Postmaster General to be elected by acclamation. The present Postmaster General (Mr. Blondin) passed through the same door that was opened for the late Mr. Casgrain. When the ex-Secretary of State, Mr. Coderre, was elected as the successor of the late Mr. Monk, Sir Wilfrid Laurier again appealed to his people to elect him by acclamation.

And he asks:

> What was the reason for all this?

And this is the answer he gives to his own question:

> The reason was that Sir Wilfrid Laurier wanted Canada to be united, that we might take our full part in the great war that is now in progress.

Will the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) give his endorsation to that question and that answer? Is it true that the right hon. gentleman allowed these members to be elected by acclamation because he wanted Canada to be united while this war was on? If so, is it not as important that Canada should be united now as that Canada should have been united when these members were elected? It seems to me even more important that Canada should be united now. Then, what other inference can we draw from the statements of the hon. member for Bonaventure except this—either that the right hon. leader of the Opposition does not want the country to be united now on account of the war, or else that his influence is not as great now as it was when these other gentlemen were candidates. The hon. member for Bonaventure also says:

> I think this House will not be much surprised should Mr. Sevigny be defeated, and if he is defeated it will be in vindication of a great principle, a principle which should be

respected, not only in Canada but everywhere. That principle is that public men must be true to their declarations.

When I read that, I really was surprised to find that a gentleman on the other side could make use of such words. Follow this statement to its logical conclusion, and there are not half a dozen members on that side of the House who would have seats here. Public men true to their declarations! Has the leader of the Liberal party in this House been true to his declarations? What about the declaration he made that he was going to cut off the head of protection and trample on its body? What about his declaration in favour of the reform of the Senate? What about a hundred and one other declarations that he made from one end of the country to the other, and not one of which he ever fulfilled? The hon. member for Bonaventure went further and quoted for us the Nationalist doctrine, and I am going to place it on Hansard again:

(a) No participation by Canada in Imperial wars outside her territory.

(b) To spurn any attempt at recruiting for British troops.

(c) To oppose the establishment in Canada of a naval school with the help and for the benefit of Imperial authority.

(d) Control over our militia and military colleges in time of war as in time of peace and for the defence of our territory exclusively. Refusal to grant leave of absence to any militia officer in order that he may take part in any Imperial war.

The hon. member for Bonaventure says that that was the Nationalist doctrine and the doctrine to which Mr. Sévigny subscribed in 1911.

Mr. MARCIL: In order that there may be no misunderstanding, I may say that I quoted in full the resolution adopted at St. Eustache. I suppose the hon. member is giving a summary of the resolution.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am giving what was given in this House—

Mr. MARCIL: Not by me, I read the resolution itself.

Mr. EDWARDS: Then it was quoted either by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) or the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), if I recollect correctly. The hon. member (Mr. Marcil) will not say that these were not the principles declared—

Mr. MARCIL: I suppose that that is a summary of the resolution, but I should think it would be more satisfactory to the House if the hon. gentleman will refer to the resolution in full. He will find it in Hansard.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am giving here what was given on the floor of this House by the hon. member for Rouville as the Nationalist doctrine, and the hon. member for Bonaventure, and the hon. member for Rouville condemned the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sévigny) because, as it is said, he subscribed to that doctrine in 1911. I would like to ask the hon. member for Bonaventure this question— does he think a man is doing right or is doing wrong in subscribing to that doctrine which I have just read.

Mr. MARCIL: That is not the question.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is the very question. And I will put it again to the hon. member,—does he think that a man is doing right or is doing wrong, who subscribes to the doctrine of no participation by Canada in Imperial wars outside of Canada's own territory?

Mr. MARCIL: I think that under present circumstances he is doing wrong, because the whole of Canada wants to participate in this war. The whole Liberal party has declared that over and over again.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. gentleman says that he thinks he is doing wrong now. Does the hon. gentleman think that he was doing wrong in 1911 in subscribing to that doctrine?

Mr. MARCIL: I opposed that policy; we all fought against it in Quebec.

Mr. EDWARDS: You think he was doing wrong?

Mr. MARCIL: Certainly.

Mr. EDWARDS: Let us see where that lands the hon. member for Bonaventure. Speaking the other day in this House, my hon. friend, after paying a glowing tribute to Mr. Lamarche because he had stood true to Nationalist principles, went on to say— he will find it in Hansard:

If the present Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sévigny) had preached this week and last week the same gospel to the electorate of Dorchester that he preached in 1911 he would have been elected by acclamation as was the late Postmaster-General.

The hon. member says to-day that the doctrine of "no participation by Canada in the wars of the Empire" is wrong. He says, therefore, that Mr. Sévigny must have been wrong in 1911; if he was wrong in 1911 he is right now in repudiating that doctrine. But the hon. member for Bona-

venture, and the hon. member for Rouville and the right hon. leader of the Liberal party in this House condemned Mr. Sévigny because he dared to repudiate the Nationalist doctrine which they say he espoused in 1911.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I never repudiated Mr. Sévigny for taking the attitude which he did take in this House. I blame him and his party for proclaiming in the province of Quebec that under no circumstances should Canada ever take part in the wars of Great Britain. He obtained his mandate in the 1911 election by appealing to the vilest passions of the human heart.

Mr. MARCIL: I have a correction to make, if the hon. member will permit me. If he will look at the revised Hansard he will see the correction that I have made. It would have been nonsense for me to say what appears in unrevised Hansard; the reporter misunderstood me. What I did say was that if Mr. Sévigny had proclaimed in 1911 the policy that he was now proclaiming, he would have been elected by acclamation. My statement was reversed in the unrevised Hansard.

Mr. EDWARDS: Unfortunately for my hon. friend we have Hansard reporters in this House. I am taking his own words from Hansard and there they are. It is all right for my hon. friend to twist and turn now so that he may change this in some way to suit his purpose.

Mr. MARCIL: The hon. gentleman is bound, under the rules of the House, to accept my statement.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am bound under the rules of the House to accept the hon. gentleman's statement. I will accept it, as I have to, under the rules; but I will do so with a mental reservation.

Mr. MARCIL: Reporters are liable to make mistakes as well as anybody.

Mr. SPEAKER: The rule is clear that the statement of an hon. member as to his words must be accepted unqualifiedly, which I hope the hon. member for Frontenac will do.

Mr. EDWARDS: The spoken word, Mr. Speaker, or the written, printed or reported word? I am accepting the statement made by the hon. gentleman as recorded on the pages of Hansard. If Hansard made a mistake in the report of the hon. gentleman's speech, the hon. gentleman should have made the necessary correction.

Mr. MARCIL: The moment the unrevised Hansard report came before me I made the correction, as the hon. gentleman will find in the revised Hansard. What I said was that if Mr. Sevigny had preached in 1911 what he was preaching now, he would have gone in by acclamation. How could a Liberal have opposed him now if the policy we are supporting in this House had been supported by him.

Mr. EDWARDS: Do not ask me to explain why a Liberal should do this or that; ask me something easy. I ask my hon. friend to explain how it was that the Liberal party supported a man of Mr. Cannon's calibre—a man who would make use of the expressions that he has used, according to reports in the press?

Mr. MARCIL: Mr. Cannon has made a correction; perhaps my hon. friend does not wish to accept it.

Mr. EDWARDS: Of course he did, just as my hon. friend made a sort of correction.

Mr. MARCIL: I have been 16 years in this House, and my statement has never yet been challenged.

Mr. EDWARDS: If my hon. friend will sit down for the time being, I have something else that I wish to refer to.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope that the hon. member for Frontenac does not mean that he does not accept the statement of the hon. member for Bonaventure.

Mr. EDWARDS: No, Mr. Speaker; I accept the statement of the hon. member for Bonaventure as it is on Hansard, and if the hon. member says that the report in Hansard is not correct, I will accept his statement as he gives it now.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that that is what the hon. member for Bonaventure does say. He says that he has corrected the report accordingly.

Mr. EDWARDS: Let us now come back to the subject. The hon. member for Bonaventure at least says that a man who accepts the doctrine of no participation by Canada in Imperial wars outside her territory is doing wrong. It is alleged by the member for Rouville that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue did subscribe to that doctrine in 1911 and that he was opposed for that reason. In other words, if he had remained true to that doctrine he would

have been elected by acclamation; because he did not remain true to that doctrine he was to be punished. The member for Bonaventure and the member for Rouville placed the Minister of Inland Revenue, the present Postmaster-General, and the Hon. Mr. Coderre all in the same box with regard to their Nationalist proclivities in 1911. The member for Bonaventure states also that his leader allowed certain of those members who had professed Nationalist principles to be elected by acclamation, but would not allow this particular gentleman, who had professed that doctrine but had since repudiated it, to be elected by acclamation. What explanation is there other than that they sought to punish him because he had fallen away from that nefarious doctrine of 1911? The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue said the other day:

I placed the question of the war before my electors and told them that it was their duty to make all sacrifices to assure victory.

We on this side of the House can all subscribe to that doctrine, but hon. gentlemen on the other side cannot. They endorse Mr. Lamarche for sticking to his Nationalist principles, but they have no mercy or consideration for a man who came to the conclusion that the principles that he had espoused in 1911 were wrong. If ever there was a time when a minister of the Crown deserved to be elected by acclamation, this was the time, even from the standpoint of hon. gentlemen opposite, because he had repudiated the doctrines which they said they were opposed to. Another reason why they should have offered him no opposition is that given by the member for Bonaventure as to why these other gentlemen were not opposed: because Canada should be united while this war is in progress.

The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) referred quite extensively to the matter of recruiting in the province of Quebec, and I desire to place upon Hansard some views upon that matter. Allow me to quote from a paper called l'Autorité, of the issue of September 5, 1914. That French-Canadian paper makes this statement:—

Of the thirty thousand troops at Valcartier, how many are French-Canadians? We cannot answer this question with any degree of certainty, but from the best information at hand we are led to believe that there are scarcely four hundred.

I also wish to quote from l'Evenement of date June 4, 1916, which says:—

We must perforce submit to evidence. The recruiting campaign in the province of Quebec is almost a complete fiasco. . . After twenty-two months of war it would be stupid to try and justify this extraordinary fact by local considerations. It is better to admit this truth publicly—The large majority of French Canadians is hostile to the idea of all participation in the war. Why? First by lack of military vocation; second by antipathy to the cause of Great Britain.

We add immediately that, from our point of view, this antipathy for the British cause is a misfortune. . . The respect of civil authority represented by the King does not exist any longer in this province. . . Most certainly, the Catholic Episcopate reacts against this pernicious tendency, and the elite of the laity cordially seconds its wishes. But the lower clergy, the politicians in favour, and the French Canadian middle class are indifferent or hostile to the Mother Country and to our compatriots of English origin. Is it not time to loudly and frankly express this sad truth?

I have quoted from two French-Canadian papers. I wish now to quote some expressions given utterance to by the hon. member for Bonaventure in regard to this matter of recruiting.

Mr. MARCIL: What is that paper l'Evenement of Quebec, and who is the editor of it?

Mr. EDWARDS: Very frankly I answer: I do not know, and I do not care.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the hon. gentleman allow me to tell him?

Mr. EDWARDS: If it will satisfy my hon. friend.

Mr. MARCIL: It is the chief Conservative organ in the city of Quebec, and the editor is Mr. Bernard, who was Mr. Sévigny's candidate in the county of Dorchester in the provincial election and was defeated by Mr. Cannon.

Mr. EDWARDS: And the other?

Mr. MARCIL: The other is published in Montreal, by a man who is not in politics. It is a Sunday paper and it hits at both political parties.

Mr. EDWARDS: The whole thing is then that one paper has the misfortune to be published by a Conservative and the other by a man who is not in politics. If my hon. friend gets any comfort from that he is entitled to that comfort.

Let me refer to other statements and see if my hon. friend will get as much comfort out of them. The hon. gentleman, speaking in this House the other day, said:

All Canadians, regardless of their origin, regardless of the province in which they reside, are one in wishing that the Allies will soon win a great victory, the victory of civilization and of humanity.

That is a very nice expression. We will see if it is borne out by the facts. The hon. gentleman also says:

If there is anybody in this country who has reason to be loyal to the British flag it is the French-Canadian. I want you and the members of this House to put this down deep in your hearts, that the last gun to be fired here in defence of the Union Jack will be fired by a French-Canadian, because for us the British flag means all that we have.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is very nice language and I think I have heard something like that several times before. Allow me to call my hon. friend's attention to this fact, that nearly always when they are speaking in those terms, they refer to the last gun being fired for the defence of the flag and say it will be fired by a French-Canadian. Now, we are not so much concerned about the last gun, we would like some one to go over and fire the first gun and the middle gun; to take a crack at it along that line. Allow me to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Marcil) and the member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) and some other gentlemen who have got off that last gun business in this House, to, for Heaven's sake the next time they are bringing that up as an evidence of the loyalty and devotion of French-Canadians of the province of Quebec, change that word 'last" to "first." Let us have a change in that way.

My hon. friend from Bonaventure said in the course of his remarks the other day that certain of the people of his province took a limited view of their duties as British subjects. These are his words, they are not mine. I cannot be blamed for repeating them. He also said:

We are with the Allies, and there is not a man, woman or child in the province of Quebec who is not in some way or other helping the cause of the Allies.

In what way does he think a certain man by the name of Bourassa is helping the cause of the Allies, or is he to be left out of Quebec? There is another gentleman down there by the name of Lavergne. Does my hon. friend include him in the list of every man, woman and child, or does he place him out of the category of men?

Mr. MARCIL: I will make an exception of those two.

Mr. GAUTHIER: The exception proves the rule.

Mr. EDWARDS: If my hon. friend will except many others, we may let the matter pass. Now, about this remark of my hon. friend from Bonaventure, I hope I am quoting him correctly—again I am quoting from Hansard, although he may have had this corrected. I shall give him an opportunity to say:

All that could possibly be done in Quebec has been done to give the ranks of the Allies a fair representation of the people of the province of Quebec.

All that could be done has been done? So he alleges.

If the Government would send a circular throughout my constituency saying: We need 500 shantymen at $40 a month for a period of six months, they would get them in a week. If they would send another circular saying: We need so many deep sea fishermen and we are going to pay them so much a day and employ them for so long, they would have an immediate response.

Oh, indeed? So in the county of Bonaventure, according to my hon. friend's statement, if the Government wants somebody to cut wood or to fish, the county of Bonaventure can provide them and provide them speedily and quickly provided they pay so much a day or a month and agree to employ them for a certain specified time.

Mr. MARCIL: If my hon. friend will allow me to explain—

Mr. EDWARDS: I am sorry if I am getting on my hon. friend's nerves.

Mr. MARCIL: I made those remarks in connection with the National Service, which I understood had no miltary intent whatever.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MARCIL: Is that the intention of the Government or not? The Government have declared that the cards were sent out for economic reasons and not for military purposes.

Mr. EDWARDS: Allow me to point out that there is a bigger National Service than that represented by the National Service cards. I wonder does my hon. friend realize that. But at the same time since, he challenges me in regard to those words of his not of mine. The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) asked:

If the Government sent out a request for 200 volunteers, would they get them in your constituency?

What was the answer of my hon. friend (Mr. Marcil) to that? He said:

If my hon. friend from North Grey will come down to the county of Bonaventure to spend his vacation two thousand Scotch Presbyterians will give him his answer.

Mr. MARCIL: Is that not fair?

Mr. EDWARDS: Was it from the Scotch Presbyterians that my hon. friend's constituency sent the one per cent of its population, as he alleged to the war? The only man he mentioned as having gone from his county was a man who bore the name of Maguire. That sounds somewhat Irish to me. But there it is on Hansard, and it is unfortunate that my hon. friend should express himself in such a way that he has to correct himself and make explanations later on.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the hon. gentleman allow me to explain now? In answering my hon. friend from North Grey, I did not want to impose upon him the obligation of coming to my constituency and addressing the French people there. What I intended to say was that I would get together two thousand English-speaking citizens of Bonaventure county at New Richmond, in the centre of the county, and give him the opportunity of making the appeal he was then making. That is what I meant.

Mr. EDWARDS: Very good. I notice that my hon. friend did not answer the question of the hon. member for North Grey as to whether Bonaventure would give him two hundred recruits.

Mr. MARCIL: Will my hon. friend allow me to make another explanation; it will be the last one.

Mr. EDWARDS: My hon. friend is rather infringing the rule. I understood that an hon. member could speak only once in the debate on the Address.

Mr. MARCIL: It is merely an explanation.

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not wish to prevent my hon. friend from making his explanations. However, I will not dwell too long on one point, because there are one or two others.

Mr. MARCIL: I will tell my hon. friend exactly how things are. We are all interested in recruiting at the present time. The Rev. Father Freve, who is, I understand, in the employ of the Militia Department, has been going through the whole county of Bonaventure, accompanied by two officers. They have practically made a house to house visit, and I am told that the reports are very satisfactory. My hon. friend can obtain the exact figures from the Militia Department at any time.

Mr. EDWARDS: The reverend gentleman deserves the highest commendation for his patriotic action and service. The hon. member for Bonaventure made a reference to a regiment which was raised in the province of Quebec and the colonel of which was named Asselin, who, I believe, was at one time in his career a Nationalist. Referring to the fact that this regiment had been sent to Bermuda, my hon. friend, according to Hansard, made use of these words:—

> There a mistake was made. This gallant band of French Canadians who were anxious to go to the front were sent to Bermuda to do the work of the coloured men in that place.

What was my hon. friend's purpose in making a statement of that kind? Was he desirous of helping recruiting, or was he desirous of stirring up a little bit the people of his province in regard to this particular regiment? Was he desirous of conveying the idea that, because Colonel Asselin was at the head of a French-Canadian battalion, that battalion was being imposed upon by being sent to Bermuda to do the work of the negro? What was the explanation of that statement? I have indicated how it appeared to me, and I cannot draw any other inference from it. Otherwise, why was it made?

The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), copying the President of the United States, who plagiarized the statement of some Emperor down in Brazil some sixty years ago, spoke a day or two after the hon. member (Mr. Marcil), and made use of practically the same words. The hon. gentleman said:

> I was also elected chairman of the Civilian Committee that helped to raise the Asselin Battalion, and in less than three months we had raised that battalion, which I regret to say, instead of being sent to the front was sent to Bermuda to do the work of the negroes there.

What was the object of the hon. member for Rouville in making a statement of that kind if it was not to jar the minds of the people in the province of Quebec? But this same hon. gentleman, who represents Rouville in this House, is on record in Hansard of 1916, page 4152, as having used these words:

> Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, I received a telegram from Mr. Asselin saying how proud he was to inform me that he had been ordered to go to Bermuda. I suppose it is for training purposes, as other battalions have been sent to Bermuda, and that ultimately it will go to France. It is very anxious to go to the front.

What do you think, Mr. Speaker, what can any person think of an hon. member who was a member of the Liberal Government getting up in this House and making the statement that the Asselin regiment was sent to Bermuda to do the work of negroes

when that same gentleman had stated last session that he had received a telegram from Colonel Asselin to the effect that he was proud to have been sent to Bermuda? What could have been his object? Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about the failure in getting recruits. I will tell them why we are not getting recruits in the province of Quebec as we should get them, and as we would get them if the people of that province were allowed to follow their own consciences in the matter. It is because hon. gentlemen like the member for Bonaventure, (Mr. Marcil) and the member for Rouville, (Mr. Lemieux) are poisoning the minds of the people of Quebec, and have been doing so for the last two or three years. That is the reason why the province of Quebec is not recruiting as it should in this war.

The French Canadian Battalion referred to was not the only battalion sent to Bermuda. A battalion from the city of Ottawa was sent there, but no reference was made to that fact by the hon. gentleman. Why was the Asselin Battalion sent to Bermuda? As the hon. member for Rouville says it was raised in three months, which shows what men can do when they go to work earnestly and sincerely. What was the best course to follow if they wanted to get that regiment to the front? Was it not to send it to Bermuda where they could train during the winter to better advantage than they could here? That is the reason why these battalions went there. The Asselin regiment was sent to the front and like every other battalion containing French-Canadians, it has done splendid service. No better men have been placed in the field by any country on God's earth or have done better work—that is the admission of officers—than the French-Canadian soldiers who have gone overseas. I pay them that tribute, and I pay it gladly. The only thing is, we want more of them, and I repeat that we would have more of them but for such poisonous stuff as has been circulated in the province of Quebec by hon. gentlemen who occupy seats in this House.

What are the figures in regard to recruiting in this country? Allow me to place upon Hansard the figures by provinces. These figures show the enlistments up to December 31, 1916:

Ontario..	157,908
Quebec..	41,729
Maritime provinces	34,802
Manitoba and Saskatchewan.	77,254
Alberta..	34,517
British Columbia	37,575

[Mr. Edwards.]

Mr. OLIVER: May I ask the hon. gentleman where he gets these figures?

Mr. EDWARDS: I would not be certain, but I think these figures were given the other day by the Prime Minister himself. They do not include reservists or any one of that kind. I am not perhaps prepared to give the answer to my hon. friend that he would naturally expect, but I will state that the figures I am now giving are up to the end of December, and they are from the Militia Department.

Mr. OLIVER: May I give the reason why I asked the question? I wish to say, on behalf of the province of Alberta, that the figures are absolutely incorrect in that they do not give that province credit for all the men who have been recruited.

Mr. EDWARDS: Well, the statement is up to December 31, 1916. My hon. friend may have other information. These figures total 383,967, and the return which I have here shows a total to January 17 of 387,409. What is your district, please?

Mr. OLIVER: Alberta.

Mr. EDWARDS: Is it No. 10?

Mr. OLIVER: Military district No. 13.

Mr. EDWARDS: The return for No. 13, is 34,659 to the middle of January, which differs little from the figure I have given —34,517 to December 31, 1916.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to reflect upon the hon. gentleman's figures, but I do not want the statement to be made, apparently, officially and to go, apparently, uncontradicted. Alberta is credited only with the number of men in the battalions that have been enlisted there, but there have been at least 10,000 men recruited in Alberta for units whose headquarters were outside of the province and these men are credited to those other provinces and units.

Mr. EDWARDS: That, of course, is true of every province. I could name dozens of men from my own county who, in the last four, or five, or ten years, have left my county and gone to some part of the prairie west to settle. Of course, I do not feel that I have a right in these figures to include them amongst the recruits from the province of Ontario. At all events, I have no desire in the world to minimise what Alberta has done. My hon. friend will I know give me credit for that?

Mr. OLIVER: Quite so; I do not throw any aspersions at all upon the hon. gentleman.

Mr. EDWARDS: When we take into consideration the population of each of these various districts or divisions, as represented by the last census, that of 1911, we find that the enlistments per thousand of population are as follows:

Ontario	63
Quebec	20
Maritime provinces	38
Manitoba and Saskatchewan	81
Alberta	92
British Columbia	104

Let me put that in another way. The Prime Minister asked for half a million men. What would be the allotment, or fair share, of that half million men to be put down to each of the provinces? The following table will show the allotment of each of the provinces and the percentage of the allotment which has been enlisted:

Province	Allotment.	Percentage Enlisted.
Ontario	170,213	93
Quebec	138,298	30
Maritime provinces	65,957	53
Manitoba and Saskatchewan (including a portion of Northwestern Ontario	70,213	110
Alberta	34,517	135
British Columbia	29,787	126

Now, commenting upon this statement, might I here remind the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) that he made a little mistake the other day, not intentionally, of course, if Hansard has correctly reported him, in saying that the population of Ontario was one million greater than the population of Quebec. I do not know where he gets those figures. The population of Ontario is 2,500,000, according to the last Dominion census, and the population of Quebec is a little over 2,000,000. He was just wrong by about half a million. It will be seen that Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia have enlisted more than their allotment. I may say, also, that these figures are based upon the census of 1911, and it is only fair to state that the population of the western provinces probably has increased more rapidly than has the population of the eastern provinces since that time. But the showing of the western provinces is magnificent; we are all proud of the showing they have made and the members from the west have every reason for pride in what the divisions represented by them have done.

Let me point out to the House, Mr. Speaker, that if the province of Quebec had done as well as the Maritime Provinces, that is to say, if Quebec had recruited 53 per cent of its allotment, instead of 30 per cent, it would mean 31,568 more men in uniform to-day, and it would bring the total up to 415,535. If Quebec had recruited, as well as the province of Ontario, 93 per cent of its allotment, it would mean 86,888 more men, and bring the total up to 470,855. The provinces of the west have done better than Ontario even, but if Quebec had done as well as Ontario—and there is no reason why Quebec should not do as well as Ontario—then, counting in the reservists and so on, we would have to-day more than the half million men that were promised by the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden.

Let me still further call your attention to this fact, that Manitoba and Saskatchewan have contributed 7,041 over their allotment in the half million, British Columbia, 7,970 over its allotment, and Alberta, 8,985. Altogether the western provinces have contributed 23,996 more men than their allotment or fair share of the half million promised by the Prime Minister.

Is there anything fair about that? Do you wonder that in certain parts of the country there are people who say that we should have compulsory service? Do you wonder that there are in several parts of Canada people who see the unfairness of this, who recognize that one of the greatest provinces of this Dominion has been rather behind in the matter of recruiting while the other provinces are making up the numbers required of them? More than that I want to say this: Our boys at the front feel this and feel it keenly. They are obliged to stay in the trenches for months and months at a time instead of getting that relief which they are entitled to. On the enlistment—30,000 or 40,000 more French-Canadians, or recruits from the province of Quebec, would give them more opportunities to go back and rest and more chance of coming out of the war.

These are things of a practical character, and I bring them to the attention of the House because I think the House should be seized of the facts. I think the time has arrived in the Dominion of Canada when it behooves every hon. gentleman opposite from the province of Quebec to go down to that province and place the facts fairly before the people. Tell them that it is not only the men of France who are laying down their lives in this war, but the women of France, and, I may add, the children as well. Tell them that England is doing her part, that to-day there are millions of British soldiers in France gradually

crowding the German foe back off French soil. Tell them that the very best blood of England is being sacrificed in defence of liberty and justice. Point out to them what German success in ths war would mean to the province of Quebec as well as to the rest of Canada. Place men of the Bourasa and Lavergne type, who have been preaching treason for years, where they belong. I believe the people of the province of Quebec would respond to such an appeal if hon. gentlemen opposite did not at the same time breathe in their ears excuses for not recruiting, as they have done from time to time, and as was done just recently by the right hon. gentleman who leads the Liberal party in this country. Speaking in Montreal, on the 4th or 5th of June, at a meeting in aid of the 178th Battalion, the right hon. leader of the Opposition referred to a recitation which had just been given on the suppression of the French language in Alsace, and said:

> There was something very apropos in the choice of this recitation, because the French language is menaced in other countries besides Alsace. . . So long as there are French mothers in Canada the French language will not die.

That remark was naturally received with vociferous applause. A few days later another man from Quebec, speaking at Hull, said:

> Do not deceive yourselves. The Prussianism in Alsace-Lorraine is not so oppressive as the Prussianism of Ontario and Manitoba.

That man was Bourassa. You will note, Mr. Speaker, the same ring in both these quotations. The language used by Mr. Bourassa is almost word for word the same as that used by the right hon. leader of the Opposition in Montreal. And what was the purpose of using such language at a recruiting meeting in the city of Montreal? Was the right hon. gentleman more concerned in getting political recruits than recruits for the army? What other interpretation can you place on his language? What earthly reason was there for making use of language of that kind at a meeting the object of which was to induce men to come forward and enlist? Were statements of that kind calculated to make men come forward and enlist? Were they not rather calculated to make men who wanted an excuse quote his very words as the reason why they should not enlist? That is the sort of thing I condemn, and I am not the man to stand up and condemn men like the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) and the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), and let pass what I think should be condemned in a man very much higher than either of them can ever hope to be.

That is not the only expression that has been made use of by the right hon. gentleman in times past to which I wish to refer. At that same meeting in Montreal he said that the thought that had been with him in all his long political career was "to perfect the harmony and bring together the two elements composing our nation." It seems to me, Sir, that the right hon. gentleman was very unfortunate in the means which he adopted to bring about harmony. He was unfortunate last session in forcing this House to pass upon the bilingual question. Why could he not have waited until the Privy Council had given its decision? Why? Because it would not have had the same political effect. Because it was necessary to make an appeal to the people of the province of Quebec, and that was as good a thing as he could possibly get to appeal to them on. His concern was to consolidate, if it was possible, the province of Quebec for political purposes, not to consolidate it in the interests of this war or in the interests of the Empire. The right hon. gentleman from time to time has made use of expressions which have led astray the people of his province, and many other people in this country. What was his object years ago when speaking in Boston he said:

> It is a mistake, a fatal mistake, to make allegiance, British allegiance the basis of trade.

It seems to me that language of that kind used by the right hon. gentleman in a foreign country has a bad ring to it. Referring to British displomacy in 1892, he said:—

> British diplomacy in so far as Canada is concerned has been a record of failure, of surrender and sacrifice.

In using that language, was it the right hon. gentleman's idea to bring together the two peoples and win the respect of the people of Canada for British institutions, or was his object to come nearer to the day when he would reach the goal of his aspirations, which he has repeatedly stated to be the independence of Canada? The right hon. gentleman also used the following language in this House in 1892 (Hansard, p. 1145):—

> The hon. gentleman stated also that at Boston I had said that the conduct of Great Britain and of Canada during the American Civil war had been unworthy of British civili-

zation. Sir, I would not have been guilty of making that statement in a foreign country if I had not made it again and again in my native land, and even on the floor of this House. In the year 1889, I stated in the presence of the Government what I stated in Boston, that in my estimation the conduct of Great Britain and the conduct of Canada had been unworthy of the civilization both of Great Britain and of Canada. I stated the same thing at Boston.

What was his object in making use of statements of that kind? Those statements are not in accordance with the facts. The right hon. gentleman should know that the Archives of Canada contain the published thanks of the Government of the United States of that day to the Government of Canada and the Canadian people for the wise, prudent, neutral and conservative course which they took during that Civil War. Yet the right hon. gentleman goes to Boston, in a foreign country, and declares that Canada and Great Britain should be ashamed of their conduct during the American Civil War. I could cite many similar utterances of the hon. gentleman. Speaking of British diplomacy, he said:—

Is there a Canadian anywhere who would not hail with joy the day when we would be deprived of the services of British diplomacy?

At another time he said that if he had been on the banks of the Saskatchewan when the Northwest half-breed rebellion broke out he would have taken up arms against the Government. I understand that the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) fought to suppress that rebellion. Just fancy what a calamity it would have been to this country if the right hon. gentleman had gone out there and shouldered a musket and his aim had been true, and he had deprived this country of the present Minister of Justice, or, horror of horrors, if he had deprived it of the services of the ex-Minister of Militia. The only hope these hon. gentlemen would have had would be that the right hon. gentleman was as inaccurate in his marksmanship with the rifle as in his marksmanship throughout his political life.

I wish to call attention to another statement of the right hon. gentleman. Speaking in this House the other day, he said:—

After the passing of a year I think I can repeat that the only complete victory which is being won in this war is the victory which is being achieved by the British Navy.

With those sentiments I heartily agree. This is not the first time the British navy has stood as the bulwark of the liberties of mankind. Ever since the days of Elizabeth the British navy has been the strongest guarantee the world has had of the security of its liberties.

The British navy has kept fourteen million square miles of British territory, during the continuance of this war, so that not a single hostile German has placed his dirty foot upon one inch of it. It has adequately protected in their homes four hundred and fifty millions of this earth's people who live on British soil. It has protected our commerce, and not ours alone but that of France, that of Russia, that of our Allies, and it has driven the commerce of Germany from the seas, and has forced her cruisers and battleships to hide behind land fortifications. We are not the only people who may be thankful that there is a British navy. Over there in the United States are a hundred millions who, if they ever lift their eyes from their money-bags long enough to offer a prayer to Heaven, are thanking God every day they live that there is a British navy. And well they may, because it stands as their security as well as ours.

I wish to call the attention of the House to one fact in this connection. After that memorable battle which Sir David Beatty fought, the Secretary of State for the Colonies sent to the Governor of New Zealand, and also to the Governor of the Malayan States cablegrams of thanks and congratulation. These cablegrams were identical except in the name of the ship referred to; in one case the Malaya and in the other the New Zealand. The cable to the Malayan States was as follows:

The battleship Malaya was in the thick of the naval fight on May 31, and the Admiralty desire once more to place on record the debt of the Mother Country to the Federated Malay States for the generosity which has enabled the navy to place so valuable a unit in the fighting line.

Every man of us, I care not whether he sits on this side of the House or on the other, would be glad to-day if we could read a telegram from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, saying that the battleship Canada, or more than one of our battleships, had been in that fight as were the battleships from New Zealand and Malaya. The premier oversea dominion of this Empire, the brightest jewel in the British Crown as we proudly call it, could not supply a battleship for that fighting line, but the Malayan States and every other oversea dominion took part in strengthening that navy which means the very existence of this country, our national

independence, and the liberties we prize. Let me add one word. I quote now from the naval expert of the London Chronicle, a newspaper regarded as the mouthpiece of the British Liberals and one of the strongest supporters of the Government of that time, the Asquith Government, in a discussion of the naval battle to which I have referred.

> Sir David Beatty could have overwhelmed the enemy if Britain could have given him three or four more battle cruisers than were assigned to his command.

Had Sir David Beatty had three or four more battleships, he could have smashed and obliterated the German fleet. And whose fault is it that he did not have these battleships? The blame is not to be laid at the door of hon. gentlemen on this side. We voted the money; we were willing to spend $35,000,000 in supplying three battle cruisers to strengthen the navy. But opposition came from the leader of the other side of the House, and the Bill was defeated by his partisan Senate at his command. The responsibility lies at his door. It was the party of hon. gentlemen opposite who refused to allow us to strengthen that navy which they, as well as we on this side, recognize as the greatest guarantee of our liberty and our greatest security from danger.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. EDWARDS (continuing): I wish to place upon Hansard one or two more extracts from the remarks of probably one of the greatest authors that this country has ever produced. I refer to the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition. One of the gems in the political literature of the right hon. gentleman is the following statement:

> I am ready any day, whether I am charged with annexation or not, to take a Yankee dollar in preference to an English shilling.

Whatever the faults of the right hon. gentleman may be, no one can truthfully say that he is mercenary. He is not a man who is after the dollars for himself, and never has been; therefore when he made use of this expression he was not laying particular emphasis upon the value of a shilling or of a dollar—he was rather using the words in another sense. Such expressions are unfortunate, especially when they come from a man who has occupied the position which the right hon. gentleman has occupied.

At the time of the South African war he said:

> There is no menace to Canada, and although we may be willing to contribute troops, I do not see how we can do so.

But when an agitation arose from one end of this country to the other in favour of taking action, troops were sent from Canada. If we except those sent by Lord Strathcona, about 2,500 men were sent to play their part in that war—and they were sent on the c.o.d. principle.

At the Imperial Conference in 1907 Dr. Smart, Premier of Cape Colony, brought forward this resolution:

> That this Conference, recognizing the vast importance of the services rendered by the navy to the defence of the Empire and the protection of its trade, and the paramount importance of continuing to maintain the navy in the highest possible state of efficiency, considers it to be the duty of the Dominions beyond the seas to make such contribution towards the upkeep of the navy, as may be determined by their local legislatures, the contribution to take the form of a grant of money, the establishment of local naval defence, or such other services, in such manner as may be decided upon after consultation with the Admiralty and as would best accord with their varying circumstances.

Speaking to that resolution, the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier said:

> I am sorry to say so far as Canada is concerned that we cannot agree to the resolution. For my part, if the motion were pressed to a conclusion, I should have to vote against it.

I do not think that on that occasion the right hon. gentleman truly represented the sentiments and feeling of the people of Canada. These expressions of the right hon. gentleman have had a great deal to do with the framing of opinion in Canada, especially in his native province, where he is held in high and, one would almost say, venerable esteem by the great mass of the people as one of their compatriots.

The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) in the course of his remarks the other day made a vigourous attempt to connect the Prime Minister with the Nationalist party. He referred to the by election in Drummond and Arthabaska, in which Mr. Gilbert was elected. He said that Mr. Gilbert had run as a Nationalist and had been introduced in the House by the present Prime Minister; the hon. gentleman's idea being to link up the Prime Minister with the Nationalists. If my hon. friend will

turn to Hansard of November 28, 1910, he will find that Mr. Gilbert was introduced not by the present Prime Minister but by the Hon. Mr. Monk and Dr. Paquet, the member for L'Islet. I merely refer to that to set the matter right in the minds of the people. We have ample evidence that there is not now and never has been anything in common between the Nationalists or the principles for which they stand and the right hon. Prime Minister. They are as far apart as the poles. Not an expression which has been uttered by the leader of the Nationalist party or any member of it can find its counterpart in any utterances by the Prime Minister. On the contrary, expressions used by Henri Bourassa and other leading Nationalists in the province of Quebec do find their counterparts in language repeated again and again for years back by the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition.

I wish again to refer for a moment to the matter of recruiting. The member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) said on January 18, 1916, page 54 of Hansard for that year:

> In six months, the turn of the tide having taken place, the public of the province of Quebec will have been educated—yes, educated as regards this war, because the population being largely rural, and having enjoyed peace for a hundred years, is not, as many would think, so much affected by events in Europe as other sections of Canada, because it is Canadian born, seven, eight, nine, ten generations back. I say that the public, having been made acquainted with the facts concerning the war, thanks to the eloquence of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, thanks to the campaign of my hon. friend the Postmaster General, thanks to the articles published by the Quebec press—

He does not mention what part of the Quebec press; I suppose he does not refer to Le Devoir.

> within six months we shall have nearer 20,000 than 15,000 new recruits in the province of Quebec.

After two years of the bloodiest conflict that the world has ever seen; after two years of fighting that had been drawing to the limit upon the resources of the Empire in men and money, the hon. gentleman looked forward to what would be done at the end of another six months. Well, the six months have passed, Something must have been wrong in the methods of the educational processs which, as the hon. gentleman suggests, was being vigorously carried out by his right hon. leader. Some little word must have been thrown in which weakened the influence of even his most eloquent appeal for recruits.

In speaking of enlistment this afternoon I was not quite fair to the province of Ontario. The figures relating to certain portions of Ontario, embracing the large towns of Port Arthur, Fort Williaim, Rat Portage, and Rainy River, were included in those relating to Saskatchewan and Manitoba. It is estimated that some 6,000 men have enlisted from this district, the northwestern part of Ontario. I do not know whether or not that is strictly correct; at any rate a number of enlistments included in the figures for Saskatchewan and Manitoba should very properly have been included in those relating to Ontario. This would bring the Ontario figures up to 96 per cent of the total allotment of the 500,000 instead of 93 per cent, still showing an excess on the part of Saskatchewan and Manitoba over their allotment.

Mr. DEVLIN: The same applies to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec: in Military District No. 3, the Kingston district, for instance.

Mr. EDWARDS: I did not understand that district No. 3 included any portion of the province of Quebec.

Mr. DEVLIN: I understand that it includes Pontiac, Wright, Labelle and Argenteuil.

Mr. EDWARDS: I was not aware of that; I am very glad to accept the correction. I am credibly informed, however, that the total number of French-Canadian enlistments in Canada since the war began is 17,400, of whom 14,200 have gone overseas.

Mr. MARCIL: Are these figures official?

Mr. EDWARDS: I have these figures on the very best authority.

Mr. MARCIL: Are they official?

Mr. EDWARDS: Yes, I think they are.

Mr. MARCIL: The Premier refused to give an answer to a question of that kind last session. I read to him figures prepared by Senator Mason in the other House, and the Premier said that there were no official figures.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am well aware of that. I myself asked for information along these lines and failed to get it, but I understand that the figures have since been compiled.

Mr. MARCIL: Are they officially compiled?

Mr. EDWARDS: Officially compiled by officers of the Militia Department. Nobody else could compile them.

Mr. MARCIL: They have never been brought down in the House.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is true. Neither have the figures that the hon. gentleman gave the other day been brought down except by himself. I am giving these figures on what I believe to be good authority, and the hon. gentleman has the same opportunity that I have of confirming them by asking for a return in the regular way.

Be that as it may, whether it is 17,000 or 20,000 or 25,000, the fact is that the province of Quebec has not recruited in the same proportion as other parts of the Dominion. There is no question of that, nor do I think that any person will attempt to question that statement for a moment. I repeat what I said this afternoon, that in my judgment the fault for that does not rest with the mass of the people of the province of Quebec. No person can make me believe that the mass of the people of the province of Quebec are less courageous than the mass of the people of any other province in Canada. As a matter of fact, those who have gone to the front from Quebec have proved themselves just as good stuff as any men from any country in the world, and I would not be acting fairly if I did not pay them that tribute and pay it gladly; it is their due. The fault lies, I am afraid, in the fact that a certain set of politicians, political leaders down in the province of Quebec, have made their chief stock in trade in political elections anti-British talk. In election after election in that province, in order to get votes they have depended upon playing on the passions of the people, appealing to them on racial grounds. That is what I wish to condemn and to condemn as strongly as I can.

Some hon. gentlemen speaking in this House—the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) and some others—say that the reason we did not get recruits is that the wrong class of men were sent down there, that it is no use sending these Cabinet ministers from Quebec there, that they are not the right class of men. Then why under Heaven did they not go themselves? There is nothing to stop the hon. member for Rouville, the hon. member for Bonaventure, or any of the rest of them from going on the stump in Quebec, as practically every man from Ontario has done throughout his constituency. There is nothing to prevent them going on the stump and attending recruiting meetings.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the hon. gentleman—

Mr. EDWARDS: Will my hon. friend keep quiet? They cannot lay the blame entirely—

Mr. MARCIL: Will the hon. gentleman deny that I went on the stump to advocate recruiting?

Mr. EDWARDS: I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. PARDEE: Yes, you did.

Mr. EDWARDS: I did not make use of any expression that could be construed into that language at all. I did not say anything of the kind. I said there was nothing to prevent the hon. gentlemen from going on the stump recruiting. It is up to the hon. gentleman. He knows to what extent he availed himself of the privilege of appealing to the electors of the province of Quebec; and I want to tell my hon. friend from Bonaventure that, if in speaking at recruiting meetings in the province of Quebec he adopted the same line of argument and the same line of talk that he adopted in his address in this House the other day, he could not expect to have much result. That is the point I wish to bring home to the hon. gentleman. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) said the other day:

> I want to say this, that at this present time and under these conditions, when the future of the world depends upon the success of the allied armies, inefficiency is treason—

Mr. OLIVER: Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS: (reading)

> —and the talk that leads to inefficiency is treason.

Mr. OLIVER: Hear, hear.

Mr. EDWARDS: To part of that I am prepared to subscribe. The hon. gentleman says inefficiency is treason. I am not prepared to subscribe to that literally; it depends on whether that inefficiency—governmental inefficiency I presume is meant—is wilful or not. There was a certain amount of inefficiency, nobody can deny it, in the Government of Great Britain. Inefficiency was found in every department, in every arena of the war; that is, a certain amount of inefficiency, and as it was found it was corrected as fast as possible. But will the hon. member say that because it was found advisable to replace Premier Asquith, of England, by a man whom I presume they considered would be more efficient, Mr. David Lloyd George, therefore any in-

efficiency that there was while Premier Asquith was First Minister is to be characterized as treason? I say no; I will not subscribe to that literally, but I will subscribe to the latter part of the hon. member's sentence and say that the talk that leads to inefficiency is treason. I will subscribe to that, and I will refer my hon. friend to a good deal of the talk which has emanated from hon. gentlemen on his own side of the House, talk which was not calculated to advance recruiting or to make our efforts more efficient, talk such as that which fell from the lips of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) the other day, the wild talk of that man—was that the kind of talk which was likely to lead to efficiency or inefficiency? Was that the kind of talk which would produce recruits in this country, or which would encourage men in this country in recruiting? Was the talk of the hon. member for Assiniboia not calculated to provide any man who wanted an excuse for not enlisting with a reason why he should not give his services in this war? I agree with the hon. member for Edmonton and I refer his words to the hon. member for Assiniboia and to the hon. member for Rouville and other gentlemen who have spoken on the other side of the House, and who have spoke in regard to this matter not only here, but throughout the country. I also refer the words of the hon. member for Edmonton to certain of the newspapers throughout Canada which have used their columns for party political purposes, regardless of the effect this would have upon recruiting in this country. Their first aim, their chief object—and they have demonstrated it up to the hilt from one end of Canada to the other—has been to try and bring this Government into disgrace, and effect a change of government in this country. They have been more concerned about the welfare of their own political party than about the conduct of this war and its successful termination. That is what I state here to-night, and I state it with a full knowledge of exactly what my words mean.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) the other day, referring to the war and its possible termination, said:—

> On the contrary, it seems to me that there are circumstances which may lead us confidently to expect that at the end of this year, 1917, we shall see the beginning of the great victory for which we have been fighting during the last thirty months.

I sincerely hope, as every man in this country hopes, that the right hon. gentleman's prediction will prove true. I am going to assume that in making that statement the right hon. gentleman said what he believed to be true. Of course, no person can tell when the war will terminate, but in the opinion of the right hon. gentleman the beginning of victory will be seen at the end of 1917. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we are to take that as a correct prophecy, it means that if the beginning of victory is to take place at the end of 1917, it will be well into 1918 before victory will be finally achieved, and our men at the front in a position to come home. I have referred to this matter for this reason: in the Speech from the Throne reference is made to a further extension of the life of this Parliament. I say that it would be one of the greatest disgraces in the history of the Dominion of Canada if we deliberately do that which will disfranchise those soldiers who are at the front risking their lives for Canada.

Some hon. gentleman opposite referred to the Act enabling soldiers to vote and said, if I mistake not, that they thought at the time the Bill was introduced that it was insufficient, and so on, and wondered why it was introduced at all. Surely we will all agree that if an election must come, provision should be made to give those men a chance, even if it be a poor chance, to poll their votes. Since the attempt of the province of British Columbia to poll the vote of soldiers at the front, we have all become aware, I think, of the difficulties attending such an attempt. In that case, if I am correctly informed, they were only capable of polling about one quarter of the votes. My point is that, if the right hon. gentleman is correct in his prophecy that the war will not end until 1918, I suppose the right hon. gentleman, if he is to be logical, will say when this Bill for extension comes up; because I believe that it will be impossible to poll the vote of the soldiers at the front, because I believe that those men, more perhaps than any other men of our country, are entitled to poll their votes, I will grant an extension of Parliament for that reason, if for no other. I submit, Sir, that this is a sufficient reason for granting an extension of the term of this Parliament, in order that we may give the men who have gone over there to risk their lives an opportunity to poll their votes in the next general election. If hon. gentlemen opposite are sincere in stating that they believe that that vote will be overwhelm-

ingly cast in their favour, and in condemnation of this Government, then all the more reason why hon. gentlemen opposite, being human, as all of them are, should accede to the proposition of extending the life of Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, I referred very briefly this afternoon to what was done by that first band of 150,000 British regulars who went over to France at the beginning of the war and blocked the road to Calais. Since I spoke this afternoon I have come across a statement which I desire to place upon Hansard. It is from a leading French newspaper, and refers to what that band of soldiers did. It reads as follows:

> It was their difficult mission to bar the road to the new German invasion between Ypres and La Bassée. To accomplish it they had to hold the trenches for several weeks, in face of an enemy which was not only superior in number but which also attacked with the resolution of despair. In many places at the beginning of this new battle the British lines were so thin that without the display of a stubbornness worthy of Waterloo they were in danger, if not of being broken, at least of being driven back in perilous conditions. None the less they held on.

Sir, I want to place that on Hansard as a tribute to that first army which Britain sent over to France, and I desire to say—and I say it with the full consciousness of all the glorious deeds that have been performed by other armies on our side since the war began,—that I do not believe there was at that time on the face of this earth another 150,000 men that could have done what those 150,000 British regulars did. That is the tribute I desire to pay to those men. In that connection, before I sit down, allow me to read a sentence uttered by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) the other day. In referring to the magnificent stand made by the French troops at Verdun, my hon. friend used words which appealed to me because of the poetry in them. This is what he said:

> Only once or twice in history has the world witnessed such a spectacle of greatness at tension. Everything spiritual in a nation touched with genius has been mobilized.

That was his tribute to the French soldiers who held out against overwhelming odds for so long at Verdun, and it is none too great a tribute to pay to those men. We will all agree, I am sure, in that. But there was another time in history when men did as much. To that time I referred just a few moments ago. Later on, I think there was another achievement which came very close indeed to those two exhibitions of valour, the one referred to at Verdun, and the other by the first army from Britain. That was the achievement by our own Canadian troops against overwhelming odds when they held the salient at Ypres. These are deeds to which we as Canadians may refer with justifiable pride. I wish we could apply the words of the hon. member for Rouville to every part of this country. I wish that were possible.

Mr. Speaker, I said this afternoon that Germany had committed crimes and atrocities that none of us two and a half years ago would have thought it possible that any civilized nation would commit. I tried to point out that the reason why the German people had got into that condition of mind was that for thirty or forty years they had been assiduously and persistently trained along wrong lines, that false ideals had been brought before them, and that they had been taught certain doctrines in their schools and colleges and universities and from their pulpits until their minds were utterly perverted and they became capable of committing acts which no other nation on earth, at least on the Allies' side, could possibly have committed. The point I wish to make is this—and again I desire to refer back to the question of recruiting. It is unfortunate that during his long political career the right hon. gentleman has from time to time thought it advisable to give expression to opinions which, if they had any tendency at all were bound to have a tendency of weakening the regard which the people of Canada would have for Britain and British institutions. I have placed some of these phrases on Hansard and I say that just as the appeal to false ideals brought the German people to the state in which they were, and they are, just so must the many unfortunate remarks which have been made by the right hon. gentleman from time to time against British diplomacy, in favour of annexation and so on, have a tendency to weaken the regard of the people of his native province, who hold him in very high esteem, for British institutions, and in my humble judgment we are now reaping in the lack of recruiting in that province, the fruits of his teaching during the last thirty or forty years. It is unfortunate that it is the case.

A new Canadian nation, a new Canada, has been born on the battlefields of Flanders and baptized by the blood of our own Canadian heroes and it is up to us as Canadian citizens to be worthy of the sacrifice which has been made on far away battlefields in different parts of the world.

The greatest permanent good which we can get out of this war will be in higher ideals, in a nobler character on the part of our people, in a nobler and better conception of our duty as individuals and citizens of a greater Canada and of a greater Empire. I hope, Sir, that one of the results of this terrible struggle which is now going on will be that a greater Canada will grow out of this war and that the Canadians who have taken their place with the best troops of France and Britain and proved their worth upon the battlefield, as well as those of us who have been left behind in safety, will play our part in making this Canada what it is intended to be—one of the greatest countries the world has ever seen.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): Mr. Speaker, I was at a loss to understand many of the statements of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Edwards) until I heard him towards the close of his address remark that he was somewhat of a poet. It is well known that poets enjoy a license not accorded to other people. Those of us on this side of the House who are endeavouring in this debate to confine ourselves to facts relating to this war and the conduct of the war must be excused if we refrain from following the flights of this poetic gentleman and any of his friends on that side of the House who may also court the muse.

Mr. Speaker, the political history of the county which you have the honour to represent in this House contains a notable record of public achievement on the part of its representatives both in the Legislature and in Parliament, a record of which your native province is justly proud. In your person, Mr. Speaker, that record has been enhanced by your elevation to the position of first commoner of the Dominion. The congratulations that you have received from your fellow members, and to which I now desire to add my own, are not only an earnest of the belief held by both sides of the House that you will worthily maintain the traditions of the high office to which you have been called, but they are also an assurance that you can count upon your fellow members at all times, and under all circumstances, to assist you in upholding those traditions.

Let me associate myself with those gentlemen on both sides of the House who have extended their felicitations to the mover and the seconder of the address for the way in which they discharged the duties assigned to them at the opening of this session.

This debate has now been in progress for a week. It has been confined chiefly, and properly, to the discussion of the Government's conduct of Canada's part in this war. Incidental to that discussion there has been some analysis of the correspondence exchanged between the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes). Mention has also been made of the Bruce report upon hospital conditions overseas and of the failure of the Ross rifle under active service conditions. Dealing only with these three heads of criticism, I desire, Sir, before going into details, to point out that if what the ex-Minister of Militia says in his correspondence be true, if what Dr. Bruce says in his hospital report be true, and if what General Haig says in his report on the Ross rifle be true, then it is clear that unnumbered Canadian lives have been needlessly sacrificed, and that the responsibility rests upon the Government and upon the Government alone. If the Government seeks to escape this responsibility, then I submit that a searching inquiry in each case is necessary, and that these inquiries should be commenced before the House rises for the proposed adjournment. The Prime Minister has already suggested that the approaching recess might be utilized by a committee to revise the Consolidated Railway Act. Important as that work is, it is vastly inferior to the duty cast upon us, as the representatives of the Canadan people, to fix the responsibility for the needless loss of Canadian lives, and for that reason, Sir, I urge, from my place on the floor of this House, that three committees be appointed to investigate the Hughes charges, the Bruce charges and the failure of the Ross rifle, and that these committees conduct their inquiries during the approaching parliamentary recess and have their reports ready when Parliament reassembles after the Prime Minister's return from the Imperial Conference. If this is not done the conclusion will be irresistible that no matter what the Government, or its apologists, may say, its failure to order these inquiries will be due to the fact that it dare not run the risk of the exposures that these inquiries would bring to light. From that position there is no escape for the Government.

In connection with the correspondence between the ex-Minister of Militia and the Prime Minister, let me draw the attention of the House to what happened on Monday last, the 22nd instant, when this subject was first mentioned in Parliament by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Speaking in reply, the Prime Minister not only did not give the House the explanations required by constitutional practice as to the Cabinet change necessitated by the resignation of the ex-Minister of Militia, but he flouted constitutional practice and stepped down to a place never before occupied by any Prime Minister of this country, when he put forward as an answer to the criticism of my right hon. leader a saying attributed to the late Hon. Mr. Tarte; that the members of the Liberal Cabinet of his day "fought like blazes'. A statesmanlike utterance to those Government supporters, who laughed at it, but one which, as a Canadian, I heard fall from the lips of the Prime Minister with great regret. Mr. Speaker, grave matters of public concern are not to be dismissed or brushed aside with smoking-room flippancy. In these days of trial and grief the Canadian people are not concerned about what may or may not have been said or done by Cabinet ministers who are dead and gone. What they are concerned about is whether the charges made by the ex-Minister of Militia against the Prime Minister and his colleagues with reference to their conduct in regard to this war are or are not true. That is the arraignment the Prime Minister has to face, and the people of this Dominion want to know what is his defense to the charges made by his late colleague, the ex-Minister of Militia.

For the purpose of brevity, let me summarize the charges as they are contained in this correspondence. I will take them as they occur in the letters in the order of date, and I pass over purely personal matters, such as the conversations with Kitchener and others, and matters in regard to which the ex-Minister of Militia has not pledged his personal knowledge. Here are the charges made by the ex-Minister of Militia as I have summarized them:

1. That from the outset the management of our forces, supplies, equipment, transport, etc., were taken completely out of our hands and controlled by the British authorities.

2. That for the first ten months of the war our equipment, stores, supplies, armament, everything provided by us was set aside.

3. That the ex-Minister of Militia spoke to the Prime Minister about the rejection of all our stores and supplies of every description and submitted to him a written memorandum proving the utter falsity of the reasons given by the British officers for their rejection of everything that came from Canada, but that nothing was done.

4. That the Pay Department was found to be absolutely chaotic, and that the Medical Service lacked system, efficiency, and comprehensiveness.

5. That a force was raised and managed in spite of all sorts of intrigue.

6. That appointments in the force were based on two avenues of supply, of which one was British officers connected with society people, and the other Canadian Permanent Corps officers, with their usual pull.

7. That few, if any commissions, are of any practical value, and that everybody connected with the Hospitals Commission, the Pensions Board, and the National Service Commission knows of the absurdities they contain.

8. That had the forces been conducted on the basis of formal orders in council the First Division would not have left Valcartier yet.

9. That the Second Division was held in Canada for four months by the Cabinet's petty haggling over the question of paying commissions to agents on the sale of motor trucks, instead of purchasing at the lowest wholesale prices.

10. That no one knew better than the Prime Minister that the statements made by him in his letter of October 31, 1916, regarding the control of the forces during the first year in Great Britain, were not correct.

11. That the Prime Minister's reason for appointing an Overseas Minister of Militia was not, as alleged by him, due to the failure of the ex-Minister of Militia to secure authority by orders in council for his acts, but was the result of several months planing between Sir George Perley and the Prime Minister.

12. That for a long time there were petty intrigues going on in the Cabinet to which the ex-Minister of Militia had shut his eyes as he wanted to win the war.

13. That the Prime Minister had not supported the ex-Minister of Militia in the administration of his department.

14. That from the opening of Valcartier Camp the Prime Minister had agreed that matters of urgency need not be brought before the Privy Council, and that ratifying

orders in counil could be passed after action had been taken.

15. That the Minister of Finance never brought before Council any proposed loan for the Dominion of Canada, or any single important act concerning the administration of his department.

16. That the same observation applies to the Minister of Trade and Commerce

17. That two members of the Cabinet were usually antagonistic to anything proposed by the ex-Minister of Militia, and when they opposed him the Prime Minister did not support him.

18. That the Prime Minister asked the ex-Minister of Militia to submit orders in council before incurring large expenditures, so as to set an example and assist the Prime Minister to control the Post Office Department, Railway Department and Public Works Department, where projects had been undertaken without the authority of orders in council.

19. That the Prime Minister also stated that some boats had been purchased and other large expenditures incurred without his knowledge and without orders in council.

20. That for more than a year the ex-Minister of Militia had known of the meddling and intriguing that had been going on to place Sir George Perley in control in England, and that the position taken by the Prime Minister in the correspondence in regard to the matter was untenable.

21. That the Prime Minister was actuated by favouritism rather than by the best interests of the force.

22. That the Prime Minister misrepresented the attitude of the ex-Minister of Militia with regard to the sub-Militia Council.

23. That except when in trouble himself the Prime Minister had never been frank or loyal to the ex-Minister of Militia, and that he rewarded loyalty by preferring those who had been untrue to him.

Mr. Speaker, I have said elsewhere, and I repeat here, that this indictment of the Prime Minister and his colleagues by a member of his own Cabinet is absolutely without parallel in any country enjoying responsible government, and that to find anything approaching it we must go back in English history to the impeachment of Warren Hastings. But there are two features in regard to which the charges of the ex-Minister of Militia are absolutely unique. In the first place, the right hon. the Prime Minister, although he replied to the several letters containing the charges, did not deny the charges, nor in fact did he deny them in his speech in this House last week. In the second place, the Prime Minister dismissed his colleague, not for making the charges, not for incapacity or mismanagement in office, but merely for accusing the Prime Minister of not telling the truth.

Now, Sir, what do these charges reveal? They reveal at the outset divided authority and no attempt made by the Government to end the resulting evils and conflict. They reveal continued indecision, delay, and incapacity, when decision and prompt action were of vital importance. They reveal quarrels and intrigues and treachery within the Cabinet at the most critical periods of the war. They reveal Cabinet contempt for constitutional precedent and practice. They reveal patronage rampant, and the waste of millions of dollars. They reveal from first to last a criminal neglect to which must be attributed the loss of Canadian lives. Therefore, I repeat that if the Government disavows or seeks to escape responsibility a parliamentary inquiry at the earliest possible moment is absolutely necessary.

To the ex-Minister of Militia has been ascribed the reputation of being a fighting man. He is announced to speak in this House to-morrow. To-day's papers tell of strenuous efforts having been made to induce him to spare the Government in his speech. He can do that only at the expense of his own reputation, for these charges are his, and the people of Canada expect a fighting man to stand by his deliberately-written statements. More than that, the people of Canada expect the ex-Minister of Militia to explain why recruiting fell off when his recruting methods were changed about the time he left Canada for England last summer.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and other honourable gentlemen have referred in general terms to the Bruce Report on Canadian military hospitals. If that report is in the hands of the Government it has not yet been laid on the table of the House and it is therefore impossible to discuss it with first-hand knowledge. But its findings were given wide publicity in the press, and they were of such a startling character as to produce a feeling of general alarm throughout the country. That feeling was not allayed by the second or Baptie Report, which, as the right hon. leader of the Opposition said, praised what

the Bruce Report blamed, and blamed what the Bruce report praised. The matter cannot be left in this shape, and nothing short of a thorough inquiry will satisfy public opinion. I need only make one citation from each report to prove the necessity for such an inquiry. In the course of his findings Colonel Bruce made the following explicit statement:

> It has been found on investigation that many of the officers who have been given commissions have been failures as medical men at home, or are over age, or are drug fiends, or addicted to alcoholism, and these officers are not only of little or no use as C. A. M. C. officers, but their presence on an overseas unit is a detriment to the efficiency of that corps.

And dealing with this particular finding, the Baptie report says:

> As to allegations of unfitness among officers selected for commissions in the Canadian Medicals, through being over age or addicted to alcohol and other drugs, etc., this is not borne out by facts. Had Col. Bruce added what must have been within his knowledge, that the proportion of undesirables in the corps is at least as low as in any other branch of the service, there would have been no objection to his criticism.

Commenting on these two findings, the Toronto Globe, in its editorial of January 5, 1917, had this to say:

> To ask the people of Canada to set aside Col Bruce's specific charges respecting the drug and alcoholic habits of some of the Canadian medicals on the ground that "the proportion of undesirables in the corps is at least as low as in any other branch of the service," is an insult to the intelligence of Ministers at Ottawa, and to the common sense of the relatives of the men who have gone overseas to fight. The Canadian people will insist that there must be no proportion of undesirables among the medical men entrusted with the grave issues of life and death in the military hospitals. No drug fiends or alcoholic victims should be allowed to remain for a single day in the Canadian Army Medical Service. The thing is intolerable. The Government must act, and act at once.
>
> The Baptie report is not the last word in this controversy. The etiquette of the medical profession is not worth the life of a single Canadian soldier. When Parliament meets the facts must be dragged to the light of day. There is no room in the Canadian Medical Service for a single drug fiend or drunkard. The life of the soldier who is serving his country in the trenches is too sacred to be gambled away in the operating theatre or sick ward by medical men whose efficiency the Baptie report refuses to guarantee.

In the absence of the details of these two reports, there I will leave the matter for the present.

Last week the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) laid on the table of the House correspondence relating to the Ross rifle. A glance through the file shows that the correspondence is not complete, but there is enough of it to prove that our soldiers were not equipped with the proper weapon to defend themselves against the attacks of the enemy. By way of preface to the correspondence, it is, in my judgment, advisable to place before the House a few important facts that will help to a better understaanding of the general situation regarding the Ross rifle and its manufacture in Canada.

The Breech mechanism of the Ross rifle was the invention of Sir Charles Ross. The bolt had a straight pull, or single motion, as compared with the half turn and pull, or double motion, of every other military rifle. This was supposed to be an advantage in quick firing.

The Liberal Government of Canada, the late Sir Frederick Borden being then Minister of Militia, entered upon the manufacture of military rifles for the Canadian militia under contract with Sir Charles Ross, and adopted the Ross patent as the Canadian model. The Ross Company manufactured sporting as well as military rifles, and from time to time developed their rifle for sporting and target purposes, with the result that, at the outbreak of the war, the latest make of Ross rifle was recognized as equal to the best target rifle in the world. It was therefore not unreasonable to believe that the Canadian troops were going overseas armed with the best weapon available. This was the belief of the Canadian people, and they rested confident in that belief.

The Canadian First Division went into the trenches in January, 1915. It was very soon found that the conditions that made the Ross a good sporting or target rifle did not fit it for service at the front.

The battle of St. Julien, in April, 1915, was the first real test to which the Ross rifle was submitted. It is now a matter of common knowledge that the Ross rifle failed under that test. How many of the Canadian casualties were due to the failure of the Ross rifle can never be known, but without doubt they were numerous and terrible. Not only were the losses great, but the danger of actual defeat was even more terrible. Not to flinch at the surprise of the German gas was heroism, but it was even greater heroism for our men not to flinch at the still more unnerving surprise of the failure of the weapon placed in their hands upon whose efficiency their lives and the holding of their positions depended.

The occurrences at St. Julien must have come to the knowledge of this Government

within twenty-four hours after that battle. There is no evidence of this fact in the correspondence brought down and still less evidence of any action having been taken on the initiative of the Government to remedy matters.

The earliest mention of the Ross rifle in the correspondence is in a report of Sir John French to the British War Office, dated June 19, 1915, in which he states that, having looked carefully into the merits of the Ross rifle he had found that the Canadian infantry had so lost confidence in it that he had re-armed the First Canadian Division, then under his command, with Lee-Enfields before the battle of June 15, and that even before that date three thousand men of the division had armed themselves with Lee-Enfields without authority.

In other words, 3,000 Canadians had been so convinced of the inefficiency of the Ross rifle that they had thrown away their Ross rifles whenever they could pick up a Lee-Enfield. The obvious inference is that the only reason all the Canadians had not armed themselves with Lee-Enfields was because they could not get them without authority. General French gave as the reason for his rejection of the Ross that it could not be relied upon to work efficently under rapid fire with British ammunition, and that Canadian ammunition was not available.

There is nothing on the file to show that any correspondence took place between June 19, 1915, the date of General French's report to the War Office, and March 30, 1916. That there should have been no such correspondence is unthinkable. The Canadian Government knew that the First Division had been re-armed as a result of the experience at the battle of St. Julien and subsequent engagements. They were arming and placing in the field two new divisions. Either they corresponded with General French on the subject of the Ross rifle, or they did not. If they did, the correspondence has been suppressed in the file brought down—an absolutely damning action—or they ignored the fact that the Ross rifle had been discarded by General French for stated and definite cause—a still more damning action.

On March 30, 1916, nine months after General French had discarded the Ross rifle, these rifles were still being delivered and accepted by the Canadian Government. On that date the Prime Minister cabled Sir George Perley that the Government was seriously considering letting a further contract for 100,000 Ross rifles, delivery to begin in April, 1917, two years after the disastrous failure of the rifle at St. Julien.

On May 12, 1916, almost a full year after the Ross had been discarded by General French and the First Division re-armed with Lee-Enfields, Sir Max Aitken cabled Sir Sam Hughes:—

> Serious situation has arisen regarding Ross rifle. I request that you will show this telegram to the Prime Minister.

There is nothing further in the correspondence to show directly what the situation was or how serious it was, but a passage in a report of Sir Douglas Haig to the War Office, dated May 28, 1916, may be regarded as throwing some light on it. General Haig reports that as a service rifle the Ross is less trustworthy than the Lee-Enfield and that it has not the confidence of the Canadian troops. He therefore recommends that the Second and Third Divisions be armed with Lee-Enfields, and he continues:

> The inquiry on which these conclusions are based was the outcome of an urgent application from a battalion of the Third Canadian Division for re-armament with the short Lee-Enfield rifle, in consequence of a high percentage of jams experienced with these Ross rifles during a hostile attack on May 1, 1916.

Mr. Speaker, there is terrible significance in General Haig's guarded language. What a high percentage of rifle jams during a hostile attack meant in Canadian casualties we have no means of calculating, but the casualties must have been appalling when they impelled an urgent application from Canadian troops for re-armament with the Lee-Enfield rifle.

It will be observed, Sir, that the hostile attack mentioned by General Haig took place on May 1, 1916. Obviously it was to the failure of the Ross rifle in that engagement that Sir Max Aitken referred in his cable to Sir Sam Hughes on May 12, 1916, when he said:

> Serious situation has arisen regarding Ross rifle. I request that you will show this telegram to the Prime Minister.

And yet, with the information conveyed by this cablegram and with all the other information that they had in their possession, the right hon. Prime Minister and his Minister of Public Works stood in their places in this House on May 17, 1916, and specifically denied knowledge of the failures of the Ross rifle. The Minister of Public Works even suggested the imprisonment of those who would criticise it. The Prime Minister said:

I desire to say in the first place, that even if the Ross rifle were the best rifle in the world, it would be possible to destroy its usefulness by making and circulating public statements about it, and it is far from patriotic service to discredit the only rifle we are capable of producing in Canada at present. No one is more convinced of the absolute necessity that our men fighting in the trenches shall be served with an efficient and effective weapon than the members of the Government in common with all good citizens.

On the same occasion his trusted colleague the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) said:—

The conditions complained of at that time have all been remedied. The chamber of the Ross rifle has been enlarged.

I may interject here that when the story of the enlarging of the chamber of that rifle comes out there will be something more to be said in this House regarding the matter.

The chamber of the Ross rifle has been enlarged in such a manner that the difficulties that were met with a year or more ago have been corrected. So far as I know, with any information it has been possible for me to obtain, there has been no difficulty and no jamming of the Ross rifle for many months past.

Now, Sir, one would think that after receiving Sir Max Aitkens' cablegram of May 12; after the discussion in this House on May 17, and after receiving the report of General Haig of May 28, the Prime Minister would no longer desire to keep an inefficient weapon in the hands of the Canadian troops. But, Sir, incredible as it may seem, such was his desire. It will be recalled that the battle of Zillebeke lasted from June 2 to June 12. On June 7, 1916, while the battle of Zillebeke, where the Canadian losses were even greater than at St. Julien, was still raging, the Prime Minister dispatched a lengthy argument about the Ross rifle to the War Office, in which this statement occurs:—

The Ross rifle is the only one we are at present equipped to make in Canada and we believe it to be efficient if properly handled.

To this General Haig promptly replied in a report to the British War Office, dated June 21, 1916, in which he confirmed his previous report as to re-arming with the Lee-Enfield after consultation with the Officer in command during recent heavy fighting near Ypres, "The experience of the commanding officer in this fighting was that the Canadians of the 3rd division, at least, had 'lost confidence in their rifles'".

The hideous significance of these words can be read in the casualty lists and in the fact that in the attack of June 2 the Germans captured 700 yards of Canadian trenches, which were retaken later by the first Canadian division, which was armed with the Lee-Enfield rifle. General Haig's report of June 21 concludes:—

I must therefore adhere to my recommendation that the 2nd and 3rd Canadian divisions should be re-armed shortly with the short Lee-Enfield rifle, and I would urge that the necessary steps to give effect thereto be taken without delay.

Notwithstanding General Haig's statement of the urgency of the case and its approval by the Army Council, which offered to supply Lee-Enfields, and which requested that no more Ross rifles be brought to England, it was not until August 30, 1916, more than thirteen months after General French's report and sixteen months after the failure of the rifle had been demonstrated at the battle of St. Julien, that the Government of Canada finally gave its consent to the British War Office supplying Lee-Enfields to the second and third Canadian divisions, but expressed the hope that no re-arming had been done without their knowledge.

The correspondence closes with a reply from Bonar Law to Sir Robert Borden, stating that the fourth division sent to France with the Ross rifles had already been re-armed with Lee-Enfields; that is, they had been re-armed without the knowledge or consent of this Canadian Government.

As to the assertion by the Prime Minister on June 7, 1916, that "the Ross rifle is the only one we are equipped to make in Canada," the obvious answer is given by the Army Council in their memorandum of July 11, 1916, that the Government of Canada alter the equipment to make Lee-Enfields, Mark III, with improvements. The contractor, Sir Charles Ross, has publicly and repeatedly stated that he is and has always been ready to adjust his equipment to any requirements of the Governement, regardless of his contract.

That brings me to a brief consideration of the part recently played by the Solicitor General in connection with the public discussion of the Ross rifle. Speaking at Montreal in December last, the Solicitor General sought to absolve the Government of its guilty conduct by saying:—

As soon as the report that the rifle was defective reached the Government, what could the Government do? We were bound by the contract made by the late Administration.

The speech in which this statement was made led to a newspaper controversy, in the course of which Sir Charles Ross wrote to the Ottawa Citizen and stated his position under the contract to be as follows:

Since the outbreak of the war, I have endeavoured to assist the Government to turn out a rifle satisfactory in every respect, not standing upon the letter of the contract but acting upon the spirit of it.

The Citizen then asked Sir Charles Ross if he had made his position clear to the Government, and he replied by repeating the sentence I have just quoted. In response to a further question as to whether the Solicitor General was right in affirming at Montreal that the Government was bound by the contract made by the former Administration, Sir Charles Ross wrote:

I am quite willing to reply to your question, but to enable me to select the most appropriate extracts from official documents to back up my statement, I should like to know authoritatively first just what Mr. Meighen means by the word "bound".

Now, Sir, up to the present time the Solicitor General has not replied to Sir Charles Ross's challenge, and if he does not do so the public will conclude that once more he has been found out in the game of political sophistry, and this time in a matter affecting the lives of thousands of Canadian soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude as I began. If what the ex-Minister of Militia says in his correspondence be true, if what Dr. Bruce says in his hospital report be true, and if what General Haig says in his reports on the Ross rifle be true, then it is clear that unnumbered Canadian lives have been needlessly sacrificed, and that the responsibility rests upon the Government and upon the Government alone. If the Government disavows or seeks to escape this responsibility, then I submit that a searching inquiry in each case is necessary, and that these inquiries should be commenced before this House rises for the proposed adjournment.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings P. E. I.): Mr. Speaker, in the speech from the Throne which we are now considering, there is a paragraph which states that the Government intends to introduce legislation to further extend the life of the present Parliament. It therefore becomes the duty of the members, in my judgment, to consider whether, in the interests of Canada, in the interests of the Empire, and in the interests of the world, such legislation should be passed. In considering this question, we have to examine the record of the Government since it obtained power, but principally since this terrible war burst upon the world and threatened to overwhelm and destroy all the progress that the world had made from the dawn of civilization to the present time. From the time the Government took office until the time when the extended term expires they will have been in power for six years. Three of these years were years of peace, and three of them have been years of war. Looking at the whole record, with the greatest goodwill that I can command, I am forced to the conclusion that from the moment they came into existence, until the present time, this Government have never realized their duties or responsibilities, have never appreciated that they are the servants of the people and trustees for the people, but that, on the contrary, they seemed to think that the accident of power gave them the right to consolidate and aggrandize themselves and enrich their personal and political friends. Mr. Speaker, perhaps you may think that these statements are pretty strong, but I will submit the proofs of them, and then I will ask you to tell me what you think of them. I will be able to submit to you but a very small part of the Government's record, because it was with the greatest difficulty, and in face of the most strenuous opposition, that members on this side of the House were able to unearth even a portion of it. The time at my disposal will not permit me to submit more than a part of what we know, but it is a well known principle in every day affairs that from a part we can fairly judge the whole, and judge it with a fair degree of accuracy.

I desire to address myself for a few moments to the civil administration of this Government, and then say a few words about their administration since war was declared. When the members who now constitute the Government were in opposition, they stated time and again that the expenditure of some $80,000,000 on the Consolidated Account was proof positive of extravagance and incapacity; and the Prime Minister himself repeatedly declared that if he obtained power he would reduce the expenditure of this country by at least $10,000,000, without impairing the public service. Shortly before the last election the present Prime Minister visited Prince Edward Island, accompanied by the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), and addressed a meeting in the town of Souris, my home town. In the presence of a large number of people, he pledged himself, if returned to power at the approaching election, to reduce the expenditure of the country by at least $10,000,000 every year without injuring the public service. That pledge, as those hon. gentlemen know and as the people of Canada know, has never been implemented.

Turn to the Public Accounts and you will find during the first year that instead of reducing the expenditure by $10,000,000 this Government increased it, on the same account, by $11,000,000. In the following year, during which they were entirely responsible for the expenditures, instead of reducing the expenditure by $10,000,000, they increased it by $25,000,000. During the third year of their term of office, instead of reducing the expenditure by $10,000,000, they increased it by $40,000,000; and in the fourth year, the last year for which the Public Accounts have been made up, notwithstanding that that was the first full year of the war, when we were called upon to make economies in every direction and to face the dreadful issues that were at stake, instead of reducing the expenditure by $10,000,000, as promised, they increased it by $48,000,000, and remember this was all civil expenditure and had nothing to do with the war. This is a record of which some explanation should be given. If time permitted, I could go into the different departments and point out where those enormous increases in expenditure took place. The Civil Service was loaded up with new men. While 11,000 civil servants had been dismissed, 25,000 were appointed, and the salaries alone showed an increase of $14,000,000. Commissions of all kinds were appointed. I believe that in the Post Office Department alone 87 commissions were appointed to enquire into certain matters and to advise the Postmaster-General how to conduct his department. There was extravagance on every hand; indeed, the commissions were so plentiful that the present Minister of Trade and Commerce said they were as thick as huckleberries in Kalamazoo. This would have been bad enough in ordinary circumstances, but when the war broke out and we were called upon to face new issues, one would have thought that some kind of economy would be practised.

I remember that during the August session held after the outbreak of war, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and the Minister of Finance urged the people of Canada to brace themselves for the unknown issues that were before them, and advised economy. But it was then that the floodgates were opened. If ministers had made mistakes, a good deal would be forgiven, because they were called upon to face new and heavy responsibilities; but the things which I intend to point out were not mistakes, and could not be mistakes. Men who had dealings with the Government came before the Public Accounts Committee and made statements, all of which I cannot relate to you to-night. Large orders for all kinds of equipment were, of course, necessary. A man named Shaver, the Canadian agent of Bauer & Black, the largest drug manufacturers in the world, knew that the Department of Militia and Defence would be giving orders for drug supplies. He represented manufacturers who made a specialty of field army dressings, and supplied drugs for the United States army. He came before the Public Accounts Committee, and on his oath testified that he had come to Ottawa to look for an order for his goods, that he had called upon the superintendent of the Militia Department who instructed him to interview the head of the medical staff, Colonel Jones. Colonel Jones told him that he could do no business with the department until he got an agent in Ottawa, and suggested that he interview the late member for Carleton county. Mr. Garland, the late member for Carleton county, suggested that a clerk in his own store become the agent for Bauer and Black; and Mr. Powell, a lad of about fourteen or fifteen years of age, became the agent for these drug supplies, and sold $40,000 worth of drugs to the Militia Department out of which he made $9,000 profit. He never saw the goods, for they went straight from the Railway Department to the Department of Militia and Defence. There was no mistake there. That was a premeditated arrangement whereby friends of the Government would get a rake-off; and that is only a sample of what went on. The money obtained by Powell was returned to the Government after an exposure had been made by the members of the Opposition, and Mr. Garland was read out of the House and out of the party.

The Department of Militia and Defence required a large number of horses, and some $70,000 of departmental money was placed at the disposal of the member for Kings County, Nova Scotia. When this matter was brought before the Public Accounts Committee, and an effort made to get at the facts, officials of that department stated that the vouchers and books relating to that transaction were not in the department, and that they had been removed by some officials who were familiar with the transaction, and taken out of the country. That was a serious state of affairs. It showed that an effort was being made

to conceal transactions which would not bear investigation. The only thing left to the members of the Opposition in the Public Accounts Committee was to subpoena the men who had sold the horses, bring them to Ottawa, put them on their oath, and get from them the facts, as far as possible. That was done, and a serious state of affairs was revealed. These men came to Ottawa, and on their oath stated that they had sold horses that were lame, blind, spavined and ring-boned, and had all the disorders which horses could have There were horses that had been old at the time of the South African war, and yet they were sold to the Government for military purposes. One man swore that he brought a fairly good horse to the place where the horses were being bought and sold, and that seeing the quality of the horses that were being bought for the army he put his good horse in the barn and telephoned to his son to bring up the old mare. The old mare was brought up, and went with the rest. He stated that he had intended to shoot her that fall. These things are almost incredible.

Another man swore that he sold to the Government for military purposes a horse which he had traded for two ducks and a drake, and as I stated, even horses that had been too old at the time of the South African war were passed and sold to the army. Some of them died before they left Nova Scotia; others died on the way to Valcartier, and a good many died when they reached there. The exposure was so serious that the member representing Kings County, Nova Scotia, had to leave Parliament on account of it. That arrangement was not a mistake; dealings of that nature were not mistakes. So it was with almost everything which the Government purchased for the army; it was made manifest that the money of the people was being deliberately squandered. Binoculars were bought for the army costing $9, $15, $18, and $20, but when they reached the department they cost $58. Bauche-Lomb, manufacturers of binoculars in the state of New York, sold binoculars to a man named Harris. Harris sold them to Bilsky, a jeweller in Ottawa. Bilsky sold them to Birkett, Birkett sold them to Ellis & Company, Toronto, and Ellis & Company turned them over to the Government at a profit to them of ten per cent. The middlemen received their profits and the binoculars cost the Government $58 apiece. Everything else was in proportion.

That was in the early stages of the war but as the war progressed the appetites of the grafters increased, and we all remember that last session the leader of the Opposition moved a resolution asking that an investigation be held into the transactions that had taken place under the Shell Committee. It was known that enormous sums of money had been taken out of the pockets of the British taxpayers, and the charge was made by members of the Opposition that unreasonable prices were being paid, that the British taxpayer was being mulcted in millions and tens of millions of dollars, and that if an investigation were granted these charges would be established beyond a shadow of a doubt. But an investigation was refused until that memorable evening when the member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) made charges of such a character that even members on the Government side led, I believe, by the hon. member for Dundas county (Mr. Broder) told the Government plainly that if they refused an investigation into those dreadful transactions they could no longer give the Government their support. It will be remembered that upon that occasion the Minister of Finance stood up in his place and refused an investigation. Shortly after the hon. member for Richmond had resumed his seat, the Conservative members who insisted upon an investigation met in Room 16, and, it is alleged, sent for the Prime Minister and told him that they would no longer support his Government if the investigation was refused.

The minister sent a note to the Finance Minister asking him to adjourn the debate, which he did. A few days later the Prime Minister came down to Parliament and agreed to allow a partial investigation into certain transactions that had taken place in the United States but not into transactions that had taken place in Canada. Nearly all the members supporting the Government were satisfied with that but two or three of them were not—the hon. member for Dundas county (Mr. Broder), the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) and one or two others. However, that passed and that was the origin of the Meredith-Duff Commission. It was established before the Meredith-Duff Commission by the testimony of the chairman of the Shell Committee, General Bertram himself, that $42,000,000 of excess profits had been made by the Shell Committe on the orders they had received from Great Britain over and above the profits that the subcontractors had re-

ceived, the subcontractors being largely themselves. It was known that they had made inordinate profits. That amount was reduced afterwards upon further investigation to $31,000,000. The statement of General Bertram under oath was that, on the first order for 200,000 shells that they had obtained from the War Office in the autumn of 1914, they had made an excess profit of $52,000. They intended to give that money to the Patriotic Fund, but they consulted General Hughes and he advised them to return it to the War Office and this they proposed to do. But this strange feature of the case came up that notwithstanding the fact that they had made $52,000 of excess profits on the first order, they wanted to increase the price on subsequent orders so that, I suppose, they would have more money to return.

But the British War Office cabled that they could not pay a higher price and would not place any more orders in Canada if they were not taken at the original price. They were taken at the original price and in the spring of 1915 the surplus profits had amounted to $14,800,000. They were going on mounting up and the prospective profits were $31,000,000. Now, there is a strange circumstance in connection with this. General Bertram on his oath said that in the fall of 1914 that they had consulted the Minister of Militia and Defence as to what they would do with the money, and he advised them to return it to the War Office. The Minister of Militia and Defence knew, accaccording to this testimony, what was to be done with the surplus profits. I think it is the constitutional principle that what one member of the Government knows all know. The Opposition, during the greater part of the session, was accusing the Shell Committee of having charged the War Office and the British Government an enormous price for shells. A complete answer would have been that all the excess profits should be returned to the British Government. Yet the Minister of Militia and Defence spoke three or four times on the ubject, the Prime Minister twice, the Solicitor General twice, and the Minister of Finance at least once, and not one of these hon. gentlemen ever intimated that a dollar of this money was to be returned. This restitution, if I may call it that, in the opinion of nearly every man you meet on the street and who is familiar with the circumstances, was the result of the investigation made by Carvell and Kyte and pressed by members of the Opposition on the Government. That is what brought about the Meredith-Duff Commission of inquiry and apparently what brought about the return to the British Government of these enormous sums of money. Yet, the newspapers in Canada—for instance, a newspaper in my own province, the Charlottetown Guardian—have not a word to say in favour of the movers of this motion, but they call them carrion birds, who were wasting the time of Parliament in having this investigation held. This is the record of the Government in regard to this matter.

When we come to this year and read the correspondence that has taken place between the ex-Minister of Militia and the Prime Minister, we find that every assertion made by the Opposition against the Government is supported by the statement of the ex-Minister of Militia and that many others of a more serious and damaging character are made. The statement of that hon. gentleman reveals a condition of affairs that few men in this country thought was possible. The statements of the ex-Minister of Militia are made by a man who knows what he is talking about and he states that the second division had to be held up four months at Valcartier while the grafters were quarrelling amongst themselves as to the division of the spoils and that the Prime Minister of Canada was looking on hopelessly and could not do anything. He states that the Prime Minister and other members of the Government were intriguing against himself and that intrigues were going on all the time. He stated that some of the order in council, and actions of the Prime Minister, could have had only three motives and that not one of these motives was in the interest of the men, or officers, of the army or in the interest of the successful prosecution of the war. Could a more damaging statement of the case be made? The matter is so serious that an investigation should surely proceed. My hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Murphy) has asked for an investigation and he proposes that it shall proceed during the adjournment. I repeat that before this correspondence was made public I do not believe there were ten men in Canada who thought that the conditions were so serious as they have been shown to be or that anything like what we now know was going on.

The Prime Minister admits in his speech some of the statements made by the ex-Minister of Militia are correct. Up to this time neither the Prime Minister nor any other minister has denied any of the statements and I say as a member of this

House that if the Prime Minister fully appreciated his responsibilities to the country he would either deny and disprove these statements of the ex-Minister of Militia or he would resign his position. I have stated that the Prime Minister in his speech on the Address a few days ago actually admitted the correctness of some of the statements made by the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence. He stated that an order in council was passed taking from the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence much of the authority that he possessed over the troops in Great Britain and France, that this order in council was passed during the minister's absence and that he was not notified of it. That was a serious matter indeed. Here was an order in council passed in the absence of the very man who should know more about military affairs than any other member of the Council, a man who was considered by the Prime Minister and other members of the Government to be exceptionally capable, and well qualified for the position he held. Without his knowledge this order in council was passed, taking from him the power he had previously exercised over the troops in Great Britain. What was the result? As soon as the ex-Minister of Militia heard of this he came back, and the Government, apparently fearing his wrath, cowering before his anger, actually rescinded the order in council, and gave him back the power he had previously possessed. The Prime Minister says the order in council was amended: the ex-Minister of Militia in the correspondence says that it was rescinded. That, I suppose, is a sample of the Prime Minister's firmness and decision. The Prime Minister said the other day in reply to the leader of the Opposition that he was quite willing to compare his firmness and decision with that of any other man in Canada, and particularly with that of the leader of the Opposition. The incident to which I have referred does not appear to me to reveal very great firmness or strength of character.

But the most serious matter of all arises in regard to the rifle with which the Canadian troops were armed. It is now known from the report of General French that he had to withdraw the first line of Canadian infantry from the trenches because of the ineffective weapon with which they were armed. He had to withdraw them, I suppose, in order to save their lives, to prevent them from being slaughtered, from being murdered. But notwithstanding that this fact was known to the Canadian Government, the Second and Third Divisions were armed with the same weapon, and as has been pointed out here tonight, notwithstanding all the information the Government had in regard to this matter, last session, when this question was before the House, The Prime Minister and the Minister of Public Works stood in their places and said they had no knowledge of the fact that the Ross rifle was inefficient and there were defects in the British rifle, they said. This is the most serious thing that has ever transpired in the Dominion, and nothing has done so much to injure recruiting in this country, or is injuring it so much at the present time as the correspondence which took place between the ex-Minister of Militia and the Prime Minister, and the charges that are therein made and have not been denied. How could it be expected that there would be effective recruiting under such circumstances?

The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) said this afternoon that the falling off in recruiting was due to the speeches made by members from the province of Quebec. No member from the province of Quebec ever could do so much damage to the Government as the letters written by the ex-Minister of Militia. But the defence of the Ross rifle made by the Solicitor-General, Mr. Meighen, is worse than all, with its cold-blooded, heartless, calculating cynicism, when he said that the Government of Canada was bound by a contract to arm the troops with a rifle that was not good; bound by a contract to send out troops to be slaughtered in the trenches without one chance in ten of defending themselves. If ten thousand contracts existed, it would not justify the Government in an action of that kind. The worst that could happen to the Government, if they were bound by a contract, would be a suit for damages brought by Sir Charles Ross, the manufacturer of the rifle. But would any man in his senses bring an action against the Government under such circumstances? Sir Charles Ross says that the Solicitor General had no foundation for the statement he made, and that he had never tried to force an ineffective weapon on the Government of Canada. Supposing an action had been brought against the Government, Parliament would most certainly indemnify the Government for any damages incurred. An ex-

cuse of that king may be satisfactory to a few strong Tory newspapers, such as the Toronto News and the Charlottetown Guardian, but it will not bring consolation to the mothers in Canada, to the Rachaels that are weeping for their children and will not be comforted because they are not. It is possible that many of the casualties among our troops were due to the fact that they had no chance of defending themselves. This is a matter that will have to be investigated, and that will have to be investigated before an extension is given, and a matter that should be investigated before the Government even ask for an extension.

I did not intend to say anything with regard to naval matters, but I shall say a word as the subject has been referred to this afternoon by the hon. member from Fontenac. If there is one thing the present Government and the Conservative party should be ashamed of it is their action in regard to naval affairs in this country. It is well known that when the subject was introduced into the House by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce in 1909, the resolution then proposed was accepted by the Government of the day, and after one or two verbal amendments had been made at the request of the present Prime Minister, then the hon. member for Halifax (Sir Robert Borden), the resolution passed unanimously, every member voting for it except the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, the late Mr. Monk. The Government took immediate action, and the very next session brought in and placed upon the statute book the Naval Service Act. Acting on the advice of the British Admiralty, Canada entered into an arrangement with Australia and New Zealand, whereby this country would do its duty in naval matters, thereby carrying out the mandate of Parliament as unanimously expressed a year or two before. All reasonable speed was made. Tenders were called for and examined; the Admiralty was consulted, and arrangements were made with Australia and New Zealand. We were all to act in concert. The Nationalist party of Quebec—this is an old story, but is worth repeating—Monk, Pelletier and all the rest of them, and the present members who sit on the Government benches from that province, opposed the arrangement and denounced both parties for it. An election was held in Drummond and Arthabaska. The Nationalists put up a candidate, and so did the Liberals. The Conservatives had no candidate, and a newspaper in Montreal wired the present Minister of Trade and Commerce asking which candidate Conservatives should vote for, as they had no candidate of their own, and the reply of the man who brought in that resolution in 1909 (Sir George Foster) was, "Defeat Laurier by any means, fair or foul. Let the navy go."

Yes let the navy go—let the Empire take care of itself—let Great Britain take care of herself—but defeat Laurier, let the consequences be what they may. This was the Nationalist campaign in Drummond and Arthabaska, and from that day to this the alliance between the Nationalist party and the Conservative party has been cemented.

When this Government came into power they found two training ships in commission, one at Halifax and one at Esquimalt, they found a Naval College established, they found a large number of men enlisted for the navy. They dismantled the ships and discharged the crews. They did everything they could do to discredit the enterprise. They had promised the people of Quebec that they would repeal the Naval Service Act. In the very first session after they came into power the member for Yamaska (Mr. Mondou) asked if they intended to implement their promise, and the present Minister of the Naval Service (Mr. Hazen) said they did. But they did not repeal the Naval Service Act, and it is under that Act that we have done whatever we have done in the way of assisting the Mother Country on the sea. Not only did they discharge the crews and dismantle the ships when they came into power, but they filled the boilers and tubes of the Niobe at Halifax with a composition, and when war was declared it took over a month to dig out that composition and to get the vessel ready for sea. Had she been ready to go to sea on the declaration of war, she could have captured enough German merchantmen before they could get to safety to pay for the whole Canadian navy.

In the session of 1912-13 this Government brought in what is known as the Naval Aid Bill, appropriating $35,000,000 to build three ships to be presented to the British Admiralty. The Prime Minister in introducing that Bill said that if it did not pass, or if there were any strenuous opposition to it, he would dissolve Parliament and consult the people. He failed to carry out that promise. It has been stated here today, and has been stated over and over again by the party press in the country, that the Senate killed that Bill. The Senate did nothing of the kind, Sir George

Ross, who was leading the Senate when the Bill went before that body, said that, inasmuch as this was a departure from the principle laid down by both parties and unanimously adopted in the House of Commons, the Senate would withold its consent until the people of Canada would be consulted. It would not have taken more than two or three months at most to consult the people. Then, had the Conservatives been returned to power, they could have gone on with the Naval Aid Bill, and if the Liberals had been carried into power again they would have proceeded with their scheme. But, rather than endanger their political necks, the Conservative party withdrew the Bill. But, more than that, Sir George Ross pointed out to the Government that there was no need for that Bill in order to carry out what the Government said they wished to carry out, but that everything they proposed could be done under the Naval Service Act; under that Act the Government could build three ships of war, or any other number they wished, build them in England or anywhere else they chose, and, after they were built, might do with them whatever they liked, and neither the Senate nor anybody else would prevent them. Then, why did they not proceed under the Naval Service Act? Because had they proceeded under that Act they would have acknowledged the principle that Canada ought to provide men as well as ships and that was a principle the Nationalists of Quebec would not allow the Government to accept. No other reason than this can be given for their course, unless we are to assume that the Government was entirely insincere and was merely looking for an excuse to drop the whole affair. There was no reason why Canada should not have been in as good a position as Australia if the legislation placed upon the statute books by the Liberal Government under Sir Wilfrid Laurier, with the consent and advice of the Admiralty and by arrangement with Australia, had been proceeded with. We should have had ships on the ocean when this war broke out, as well as Australia, and probably the Canadian ships would have taken as glorious a part in this struggle as did the Sydney when she captured the German raider.

It was stated by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) this afternoon that if Admiral Beatty had had three more dreadnoughts in the Jutland battle he would probably have won a greater victory, and that if Canada had done her duty in 1913 these three ships would have been available to the British Admiralty. The very day before Parliament prorogued in the session of 1913 the Prime Minister stated that, because Canada had declined to build these ships the British Admiralty was proceeding with three additional ships, and would have them ready for sea as quickly as they could be finished. There was, therefore, no diminution in the number of ships at the command of the British Admiralty, when the war broke out, in consequence of Canada's action. The Prime Minister further stated on that occasion that, if the Government remained in power, as he believed it would, before its term expired he would bring down legislation to purchase three ships, or to pay for the three additional ships the Admiralty was building —another pledge the Prime Minister forgot to implement.

In short, there is no other thing the party in power has done since coming into office that is so discreditable as their action in this matter. I have already spoken of their dismantling the ships and discharging their crews. It is only this year that we have taken up the naval service again. To-day, under the Naval Service Act placed upon the statute-book by the Liberal Administration under Sir Wilfrid Laurier, we are recruiting all over Canada men for the navy. But four or five years of valuable time have been lost. We were told that Canadians would not enter either the Imperial or the Canadian navy. Time and again, when the matter was under discussion in the session of 1913, we were solemnly told that Canadians had no desire to enter the navy and that you could not get Canadian ships manned. But we find that, even after 400,000 men or thereabouts have been taken from Canada for the army, there is a considerable number of Canadians left who wish to join the navy, men for whom the seafaring life has attractions. Had it not been for the action of the Conservative party in this matter, Canada would have been in as proud a position as Australia.

These are some of the reasons why I think any man of the party of hon. gentlemen opposite is ill-advised who raises this question at all. I can see nothing to justify this Government's asking for an extension of the term of Parliament. Moreover, I see many reasons why the members of Parliament should refuse to grant an extension, particularly if full investigation is not made into the question of the Ross rifle and into other matters, including the very serious charges made by the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence against the Prime Minister

and his former colleagues in the Government.

Mr. DONALD NICHOLSON (Queens, P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, I wish before this debate is closed to say a few words. Not being accustomed to public speaking I shall have to draw very largely from notes that I have made, and I hope that the House will bear with me in the few observations that I desire to make. Coming, as I do, from the smallest province of this broad Dominion, but representing the chief county of that province, I feel that I should place my views before the House, and I shall do so as briefly as possible.

I feel that the part that Canada has taken in the most momentous events of history, the war, is a matter of the heartiest congratulations not only to this country, but to the Empire at large. Three years will have elapsed next August since the beginning of the war, and I need not say that the situation to-day from the Allies' standpoint is infinitely more favourable for a victorious ending of the war than it was when Parliament last assembled. Throughout Canada there is no dislocation of business; prosperity abounds from the Atlantic to the Pacific, in spite of the great conflict. In my own province, in which I am particularly interested, prosperity has prevailed and increased under Conservative rule. In proof of this, Sir, I should like to submit the following facts.

The value of field products for the year amounted to nearly $13,000,000. To this may be added the yield of the fisheries, which was $1,000,000, making $14,000,000 worth of products of land and sea which were shared amongst scarcely 100,000 people.

Important enterprises in Prince Edward Island which have been originated and carried out by the Conservative Government go to make for greater prosperity and continued development of our resources. In brief, I might refer to the completion of the car ferry terminals at Carleton Head, giving the Island complete connection with the mainland and the Intercolonial railway and carrying out in their entirety the terms upon which the province entered Confederation.

And who, Sir, have the people of Prince Edward Island to thank for this great boon? When the Prime Minister visited, in his political campaign, the province of Prince Edward Island during elections of 1911, he gave a pledge to the people that if the Conservative Government were returned to power, a car ferry would be constructed and the broken link between the Island and the mainland would be united. How nobly and generously the right hon. leader of the Government has fulfilled that pledge, let the magnificent terminals at Capes Traverse and Tormentine and the splendid car ferry steamer now operating between the Island and the mainland tell. Besides, through freight rates now exist between the Island and the mainland, thus eliminating the long grievance of the three short hauls, and proving a lasting benefit to our trade. These matters, which speak louder than any words of mine, show that when a prime minister of the Conservative party undertakes to carry out a great enterprise for the benefit of a province or of the Dominion, he crystallizes his words into action.

The passage of progressive and beneficial legislation has marked the administration of this Government. It has from the first day it assumed office particularly looked after the interests of the farming community. The expenditures on agriculture have almost doubled since Hon. Martin Burrell became minister, while the Aid to Agriculture Bill, appropriating ten million dollars for co-operation with the provinces in the development of the agricultural industry, is the greatest advance ever made by a Canadian Government.

Among other important measures may be mentioned the Bill to regulate cold storage warehouses and the legislation to regulate the sale and manufacture of dairy products. The latter measure is designed not only to protect both producer and consumer and to prevent the adulteration of butter, but also to guard against imposition upon the farmer by buyers. All this particularly benefits the agricultural province of Prince Edward Island.

It would take me a long time, Mr. Speaker, and it would weary the House, if I attempted to enumerate the many Bills of great importance and vast benefit to Canada that have been passed since this Government came into office. In the Departments of Justice, Trade and Commerce and Post Office—in all departments beneficial measures have been applied. Hon. L. P. Pelletier, the late Postmaster-General, was responsible for two Bills providing for increased pay to the underpaid letter-carriers, mail clerks and other employees of the department in the outside service.

Then, Sir, in addition to all these, the Tariff Bill must not be forgotten. The Tariff Bill has placed the steel industry on a sound basis without injuring the con-

sumer in Canada, while there was a substantial cut in the tariff on agricultural implements. The whole design of the Tariff Bill was to encourage the home market, looking also to the protection of all classes, particularly the farming community.

Two important and progressive Bills which could not be passed during the last session because of lack of time were the Bill to Consolidate the Railway Act and the Co-operative Credit Bill. These are two of the most advanced pieces of legislation ever introduced into Parliament. They will, no doubt, be dealt with this session. Then there was the Canadian Northern Bill, which settles the Liberal Government's legacy, provides for the completion of the Transcontinental Railway, and gives the Government outright $40,000,000 worth of stock.

It was with great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I read the splendid address of the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), delivered at Halifax last October before the Board of Trade of that city. It was a masterly statement of the manner in which Canada is carrying out her duty and her priviege of assisting the cause of the Empire in this great war. Tributes were paid by leading business citizens of that city to Sir Thomas White's administration of the Department of Finance.

Mr. G. S. Campbell and Hon. G. E. Falconer, were hearty and spontaneous and evidently voiced the feelings of all the business men of Halifax.

The minister pointed out that within two years, Canada had recruited, equipped and was now maintaining an army of 360,000 men, of whom 250,000 had been sent overseas to fight for their King and country. Besides this, we have floated in our own market loans aggregating $200,000,000, with $300,000,000 offered by the public. To quote the minister:

> At the outbreak of the war, with our adverse balance of trade and our foreign obligations for interest, it was the obvious policy of the Dominion to borrow as much as possible abroad to prevent gold exports. We consequently borrowed from the Imperial Government for our war expenditures and arranged loans in New York. There came a time, when with our trade balance favourable and our savings increasing, we were able to place the first domestic war loan in Canada. We asked for fifty millions. The public gave us one hundred millions. In September of this year, we asked for one hundred millions. The public offered us two hundred milllions.

And in these trenchant words, the minister summed up his address:

"What is the important question from a financial standpoint with relation to the war". And he answered his own question by pointing out that, with the Dominion Government spending $750,000 and the Imperial Munitions Board spending over $1,000,000 a day in this country, the important point is, how is this high expenditure to be financed? The Imperial Government cannot pay for munitions made in Canada by drawing cheques on the Bank of England. It can do so only by establishing dollar credits in Canada, and that can be accomplished only by the people of this country placing large sums to the credit of the Imperial Government. "If we give them the money we can get all the orders we want, and more," said Sir Thomas, "but we must save." Here, Sir, is a striking tribute to the patriotism and generosity of our people, and one that proves, beyond all dispute, how willing we were to spend our means and strength for the Empire.

In times like these, when rigid economy is the watchword, it is surprising and most gratifying to find that the revenues of Canada are abounding, and that so far the pinch of war has not been felt to any appreciable extent in this country. In the course of the coming few years, the question of where to obtain sufficient governmental revenue in Canada is likely to become a matter of serious discussion. If this anticipation is realized, the great public debt which Canada is now assuming will not be entirely a misfortune. Somehow, the debt will be met—or the interest on it will—and nothing terrible will happen. The soil of this country is rich enough to yield a living to all who are able and ready to put it to the test. Had it not been for the development of war business, yielding, in many instances, exceptional profits, the Federal Government would have been put to it to devise taxation to produce the necessary revenue. These profits, it is presumed, will, in the course of a few years, disappear, and the Government will again have to seek other sources of revenue.

I also notice, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. J. D. Hazen, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, has been doing his bit as head of that great department, during the war. After the war broke out, the Canadian Government asked the British authorities how they could best help, and suggested recruiting men for the navy as well as for land forces. At first there was no need of these for the navy, but since then, the naval building programme has become greatly accelerated

and many new ships having been put into service, these have had to be manned and there has been an increasing call for sailors. To-day the Imperial Navy, which has swept the seas, bottled up the German fleet in the Kiel canal, and guarded the whole of the Empire, requires men. The navy at all costs must be maintained at full fighting strength.

And the Hon. J. D. Hazen, in an interview, as reported in the press says:

> As soon as Canada was made aware of the change in the situation in regard to the navy, we offered to form an overseas division of the Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve and lend them to the Admiralty for service in the Imperial army. The Admiralty was pleased to accept the offer and asked if possible that five thousand men be sent, out of which two thousand would be required by the end of the present year. Every recruit Canada gives to this force will mean the saving of one soldier for the British army, for if the necessary men are not secured, the conscripts at present serving in the army will have to be transferred to the navy.

All this goes to show how admirably the three departments of State, Militia and Marine, have been working together for our own country, in the assistance rendered to the Empire.

In the Departments of Public Works and Trade and Commerce, the showing is magnificent, and the Dominion Trade Returns record abounding national prosperity. The figures for September, completing the record for the first six months of the last fiscal year, show that in six months ending September 30, 1916, the aggregate foreign trade of the Dominion had surpassed high water mark for the best twelve months Canada knew before the outbreak of the war. For the month of September itself, our foreign trade amounted in value to $161,797,951, as against $92,687,862, for the corresponding month of 1915. For the six months from April 1, to September 30, Canada's foreign trade reached the enormous and altogether unprecedented aggregate of $1,148,809,402, as against $550,535,360, for the corresponding period of 1915. Imports for the first six months reached a total of $390,995,024, being almost double the volume of import trade during the corresponding period of last year. In September our imports totalled $68,796,262, showing an increase of some $30,000,000 over September, 1915.

But by far the greatest expansion has been in the export trade of the Dominion. For the six months it has considerably more than doubled, the total being $536,721,514 as compared with $246,392,148, for the six months ending September 30, 1915.

The greatest expansion has been in the volume of exports of agricultural products and manufactured goods. During the six months agricultural products to the value of $206,141,036 have been exported, as compared with $146,794,343 for the corresponding six months of 1915. Manufactured goods have been exported during the period under consideration to the value of $190,823,240, as against a total of something like $70,000,000 for the corresponding period of 1915.

These figures tell a tale of industrial and commercial growth vastly in excess of anything that was thought possible two or three years ago. The records establish, beyond peradventure, that the foreign trade of Canada, for the fiscal year, will be vastly greater than any record ever achieved by a country of seven or eight millions. Commercially and industrially, Canada is forging ahead at a rate which must bring pride and satisfaction to all patriotic Canadians.

I might outline some of the very important matters regarding the policy of the Government towards the province of Prince Edward Island, besides the completion of the car ferry, which make for the betterment of our people and the advancement of our province.

There are great terminals being constructed at Halifax and harbour improvements made. These are all for the benefit of trade and commerce in that part of Canada, and Prince Edward Island, being contiguous to Nova Scotia, will share to a certain extent in the benefit flowing from the vast works nearing completion there. Then there have been improvements in St. John harbour, which also will, to a certain extent, benefit the island, as it is now on the eve of being connected with the mainland.

I might also refer to the fixing of our representation in the House of Commons, whereby this province has now four representatives, although at one time it looked as if the entire representation of the province might be swept away, owing to the fact that our population was not increasing at as rapid a rate as that of the pivotal province of Quebec.

Then I might refer to the increased subsidy paid to Prince Edward Island by the Federal Government, whereby the province is given the handsome sum of $100,000 a year of additional revenue. The establishment, too, by the Federal Government of the means by which agricultural education has been brought within the reach of our

farmers and their children has been of enormous benefit. The expending of nearly $30,000 a year will thus enable professors and instructors in agriculture and horticulture to live amongst us and spend their time instructing our people in the latest and best methods regarding these two important branches of industry.

I may truly say, Mr. Speaker, that it was a red-letter day in the history of this county, which I have the honour to represent, and the province at large, when the Conservative Government came into power in 1911.

There are other important things which have taken place under Government rule, but it would take a man of more eloquent tongue than mine to enumerate them. Naturally, owing to the truce between the two parties, the people, I take it, Sir, have not been taking the same profound and active interest in party politics that they took when the Empire was at peace. I may tell you that the little province of Prince Edward Island, with only, according to the census taken in 1911, a population of 93,728 people, has nearly 3,000 of its sons enlisted in the war, or about three and a half per cent. This I consider, Sir, owing to the smallness of our province and the limited number of our people, a most gratifying showing. We have raised in that province two siege batteries and one of the most magnificent regiments, the latter being composed of 1,200 men. In that regiment the largest proportion of the men are Scotchmen. There are descendants of the men of Tipperary and there are also descendants of the men of the North of Ireland. We have had considerable talk about what the French-Canadians have done and have not done. There are only about 10,000 French-Canadians in Prince Edward Island, but I notice one name—that of Arsenault—in the regimental list about fifty times. The French-Canadians have done more than their proportion down there. It shows that they are under good political influences in that part of Canada.

Many homes throughout the island are in mourning for boys who have found their graves on the battlefields of Europe. Yet with courage and confidence our people down in Prince Edward Island, in common with all peoples of the British Empire, Canada, Australia, India and all allied nations, are facing the Huns, and assisting in bringing about their ultimate defeat in order to preserve the freedom of mankind and the liberty of the world.

I can speak with deep feeling of the sacrifices made by the people of Prince Edward Island. I feel, Sir, that I have a right to stand on the floor of this House and eulogize the bravery, self-sacrifice and loyalty of our people to our King and country. Two members of my own household are at the front, and I know that I am looking into the faces of those all around me who have sons or other relatives at the front, yet who have not hesitated to say to their boys or their girls "Go forward, do your bit, and may God be with you till we meet again."

Canada has done and is doing her part and the Government, and notably the Prime Minister and the Minister of Militia, have worked miracles in this country since the war began. I have already referred to what has been accomplished, but I feel, Sir, that this is the paramount thought in all our minds, and I desire to place before Parliament and the country the fact that the province from which I come has responded as nobly and as loyally as any other part of the British Empire.

The prosperity of the year perhaps is better told as follows:—The close of the calendar year found the revenue of Canada well in advance of last year's receipts. The Customs revenue for December amounted to $11,884,000, as compared with $9,432,000 for the corresponding month last year, an increase of $2,451,000. In the nine months of the fiscal year the Customs revenue reached a total of $106,613,000, an increase of $34,891,000. Further, I may state that Canada's total exports for the eleven months ending November 1916 were $979,646,833, as compared with $559,893,809 in 1915 and $389,467,415 in 1914. Her total imports for the same period were:

	1916.	1915.	1914.
Canada's total exports (11 months, ending Nov.)	$ 979,646,838	$ 559,893,809	$ 389,467,415
Canada's total imports (11 months ending Nov.)	698,976,783	405,949,673	450,926,446
Canada's total trade (11 months, ending Nov.).	1,078,623,621	965,843,482	840,393,861
Western grain crop (bush.)	500,000,000	750,000,000	318,419,000
Western wheat crop (bush.)	167,000,000	376,448,000	140,958,000
Value of Western grain crop	126,000,000	391,947,000	250,654,000
Bank clearings	10,564,043,329	7,797,430,809	8,063,539,898
Deposits in Banks in Canada, November 30	1,295,870,723	1,120,954,457	1,016,879,005
Failures, liabilities for 9 months	20,681,441	41,162,321	30,741,292

While dwelling on the expanding revenues of our country and the prosperity which these figures tell, we must not lose sight of the fact that conditions, although so vastly favorable to the producer, are bearing somewhat heavily upon the consumer. Not for one instant do I admit, Sir, that the Government should be held responsible for the exceedingly high price of foodstuffs to the consumer. The law of supply and demand governs these, and the prices of commodities are fixed by the increase or lessening in the demand for such. Such is the condition we find in this country today, for while there are splendid prices for all the farmer has to sell, those who dwell in cities feel that the burden for necessities is greater than before. But this Canada is largely agricultural, the farmers predominate, so all that makes for the increased prosperity of the consumer. This may sound paradoxical to some, Mr. Speaker, but with greater demand and higher prices for the producer, there will naturally follow more demand for labor and higher wages for the working-man, and the city dwellers generally. With your permission, Sir, I would like to quote the following editorial, which appeared in the Toronto "News", not long ago:

> Prices are high. Wheat merely shows the way to meat products, to vegetables, to dairy products. An unfavorable summer may have some partial influence on prices by creating local scarcity, but the main cause is the war. Russia's wheat must be reserved for home consumption. The closing of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus removes Russia as a competitor in the world's markets. Indian wheat is subjected to high insurance rates and there is a famine in ocean transport. A bad season in Argentina and a half crop in America, with tonnage scarce, make a combination that necessarily would force up the price, even though not one man was speculating in grain futures. Meat consumption is greater than ever before because fighting men are liberally fed, perhaps in many cases more liberally fed than in peace times. Millions of men are in arms and war has put an end to stock-breeding in large tracts of fire-swept countryside. So all food products are in great demand, while the supply is stationary or even lower than before the war. Other necessaries are affected. Leather is expensive, steel prices are high, every fabric is more difficult to secure.
>
> A few weeks ago, the Russian Government placed one order in England for 9,000,000 yards of woollens. The mills are shorthanded, or manned by inexperienced workers. The British Government's demands are firstly filled and rightly so. Broad-cloth is made in these days after all the khaki orders are filled, and before the new ones come in. The marvel is not that living is so expensive, but that it is comparatively so cheap. In the year 1810, wheat in England was 110s, a quarter (8 bushels). This is equivalent to about $3.43 a bushel. It was due wholly to the Napoleonic wars, and even two years after Waterloo normal conditions had not returned for in 1817 it had risen to 148s or $4.62 a bushel.
>
> People do not realize that they must suffer in some way when more than half the civilized world is enduring ordeal by battle. There can be no war without sacrifice. Undoubtedly men will be found who will seek to trade on the necessities of others in order to make unseemly and sometimes criminal profits. If such men or combinations of men can be found, it is certainly the duty of the Government to curb their operations.

Now, Sir, I believe that in the spring of 1916 this Government was spending at the rate of one million dollars a month in separation allowances. Besides this, there are some 360,000 men in arms, for which the Government must provide salaries, and all that goes to make up the complexity of the organization and equipment of a modern army. These are all rather extraordinary expenditures called forth by the war. Nobody is objecting to these, vast though they may be. But, Sir, the taxes must be increased, higher duties must be levied and the people must realize that economy will have to be practised, in order to meet the outlay. The Government must set the example in this regard. It must economize in the face and stress of these perilous times. It must use its best wisdom and see where necessary retrenchment may be introduced and operated. It must set the people an example, because, should the war continue, times naturally will become harder and unless the Government and the people begin to practise rigid economy in all departments of public service and in all personal activities, the result will be discouraging and disastrous. However, I am satisfied that the Government in its wisdom, with the wise and far seeing statesmen whom we have in the Borden Cabinet, fully realize the gravity of the present and the seriousness of the future situation, and will not only crystalize into legislation the principle of economy, wherever possible, but will also educate the people of this country to be careful in all their outlays and save, to a certain extent at least, their money, and not to now indulge in the frivolous pleasures and reckless extravagances so prevalent in times of peace.

There is another matter, Mr. Speaker, while I am referring to conditions in the Maritime Provinces, and that is with respect to ship-building, and the bonusing or assisting of individuals or companies in the construction of such. In our province particularly, the press has been printing innumerable letters from sea captains and ship-builders, besides editorials, upon the important subject of the coastwise trade and the building of ships. So keenly has

this subject been advocated that the Government appointed a commission of three gentlemen to investigate into this trade, particularly in regard to the delay of sailing vessels procuring their cargoes of coal at the coal ports. This commission held meetings at Halifax, Charlottetown and Sydney, and probably in other points of the Maritime Provinces, but the result of their deliberations has not yet been disclosed.

There can be no doubt but that the delays at the coal ports have been very serious and engendered a big loss to owners of the smaller sailing vessels. Indeed, so much so, that they have been to a great extent driven out of the trade and off the seas. I could cite instances innumerable in proof of my statement, but I do not care to weary the House by so doing. Suffice it to say that the merchant marine of Canada, from holding fourth place in the world—some contend third place—has greatly degenerated, and to-day, I am well informed that the Scandinavian flag has supplanted the flag of the British in regard to the merchant marine on the Seven Seas.

In the "Canadian Railway and Marine World" for October, 1916, a long article appears, entitled, "The Dominion Government asked to start ocean ship-building." The Quebec Board of Trade, in their action, affirmed that they thought it would be wise for the Government to take the initiative and build six or more commercial steamships of eight or ten thousand tonnage each; say two at Montreal, two at Quebec and two in the Maritime Provinces, on the basis of the cost of labour and material, plus a reasonable percentage for the builder. By doing this, they would introduce an element of competition, and at the same time establish a basis of cost to guide them in the legislation necessary to establish this most important industry.

I could easily refer to statistics which show that the United States shipyards had at that time on the stocks three hundred and sixty-eight steel steamships, aggregating more than one million tons, and that there are more than twice the number of ships carrying the Stars and Stripes than there were before the war. If they can do this, with wages for shipwrights as high as seventy-five cents an hour, surely we can do much better with the more moderate scale of wages prevailing in Canada.

For these and other reasons which I might advance, I do hope the Government will see fit to respond to the wishes of the people and take action in the near future in the matter of encouraging ship-building and alleviating the grievances complained of by the coasters.

Ship-building is bonused in Norway, Russia, British Columbia, England, New foundland and the United States, and I suppose in all the great nations. So for the good of Canada, its future and its continued prosperity, I trust the matter will be seriously considered by the House.

There is one paragraph in the Address that I wish to refer to, and that is with reference to the fiftieth year of Confederation in Canada. To me as a Canadian born, it is very cheering to see the financial condition our country is in notwithstanding the war. Let us go back to the year 1867 for a moment. The total revenue of this country then was $13,000,000. In 1873 the revenue was $17,000,000. After 1873, a great man, Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, became Premier, and at the end of his term of office, in 1878, our revenue had only increased to $23,000,000 or $24,000,000. Then there was a change of Government, and in 1896, at the end of their term, our revenue had amounted to $40,000,000. That is only twenty-one years ago. A new government came in under the leadership of the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and at the end of his term of office our revenue amounted to $100,000,000. I am given to understand that this year our revenue will amount to $180,000,000. I am sure the wonderful advance we have made in the last fifty years must be cheering to every Canadian.

I should also like to call the attention of the House to the debt of Canada. In 1911, after those fifty years, the net debt of Canada was about $346,000,000. When the war commenced, after three years of Conservative rule, the debt amounted to not one dollar more, which is very gratifying. At the end of those fifty years, after providing for the expenditures of the various departments, there was a surplus of $250,000,000. But for that surplus of $250,000,000, our debt instead of being $346,000,000 would be $596,000,000. This is most gratifying to every Canadian.

I do not want to be controversial, but I wish to say a word in regard to some of the remarks of the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) the other day. I perfectly agree with him in what he said about the French Canadian people. I am often down in the province of Quebec, at fairs and public gatherings of one sort or another, and I am quite satisfied there could not be any better people in the world than the French Canadians. The hon. mem-

ber also said that he was in Toronto once, and went into an Orange Lodge and I am satisfied from the gracious way in which he spoke, that the lodge had done him very much good, and I think he ought to go there again. The next time he goes up there I would suggest that he take with him the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) and persuade him to take the Royal Arch degree in the Orange order. He would learn something then about brotherly love, for we teach it in the Orange Lodge, and then the hon. member for Rouville would not stand up in this House and say that three educated young gentlemen, members of this Government, were traitors. That is the statement he made the other day, and I was very sorry to hear him make it, although probably he made the remark in haste. If he will take the Royal Arch degree in the Orange Order he will learn something of brotherly love, and hereafter speak more kindly of his brother. I would certainly advise him seriously to consider taking this degree, so that he would treat his brother a little more courteously in future.

I do not know that I shall ever be here again; I do not care much about this job; I do not know whether I will run again. The present situation reminds me of the time England was at war with a foreign country, and when her people were divided something like we are in Canada, and the Scotch poet addressed the following lines to her:

> Let us not like snarling tykes
> In wrangling be divided,
> Until an unco loon
> With a snap divides us,
> Be Britons still, to Britain true,
> Among ourselves united,
> For never but by British hands
> Will British wrongs be righted.

Mr. EMMANUEL B. DEVLIN (Wright): Mr. Speaker, will you permit me to join with others in tendering you my sincere congratulations upon your elevation to the dignified position which you now occupy in this House? I have listened with considerable pleasure to my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. Nicholson), and whilst I cannot answer on behalf of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) and the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), I am sure there will be members in the House who will extend to them his very cordial invitation, and with them, as with every man in this country, I think the idea that my hon. friend has expressed will, if put in practice, bear fruit; I speak now of brotherly love. I have known the two hon. gentlemen to whom he has referred for a great number of years, and I can assure the hon. member that both in their private life as well as in their public life they have never forgotten the principle of brotherly love. I am sure the hon. gentleman will pardon me and not consider me discourteous if I do not follow him any further in his remarks, but in listening to the precept of brotherly love which he was expounding I thought it might very well apply to a number of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who have taken part in this debate. I refer particularly to the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys), and the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt); also to the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Best), in connection with certain statements he has made as a public man outside of this House. It was not at first my intention to take part in this debate. I did not see that there was any strong compulsion of duty upon me to engage in the discussion. With such speeches as have been delivered by hon. gentlemen opposite, especially those of the hon. members to whom I have referred, I waited patiently to see if any member of the Government from Quebec, or any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House representing a constituency in that province, would repudiate the statements which have been made. But none of these gentlemen have spoken, and that fact, I think, makes it incumbent upon me to say a word, I am going to speak very plainly for a very few minutes. The thought uppermost in my mind has been that the course of events in this country at this moment tends to disrupt the good feeling which ought to exist between the different races, and this tendency is accentuated by speeches delivered in this House as well as by speeches of some hon. members when addressing audiences outside.

If we expect to make of this country such a nation as was conceived by the Fathers of Confederation, a country with provinces united by common ideals of freedom within the Empire, it is imperative that the members of this House and all who ask the attention of the people to their utterances shall try as much as possible to unite the provinces and not to cast slurs the one province at the other. There is a movement which was started in the province of Ontario and which was referred to by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) and which is known as

the bonne entente. I understand that this is a movement taken part in by men of both political parties with the object of creating a better feeling between the sister provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Let me say here and now that I cordially join forces with that movement. A great deal has been accomplished already, and a great deal more will be accomplished. For, as one member of that movement said to me, "If we cannot succeed in uniting the two parent races of this country, then what becomes of all the other races that dwell within our boundaries?" I do not wish to place myself upon record as a doctrinaire; but, if, before I leave this House, or before I leave public life, I shall have said some word or done some thing to aid even in a small way to make better feeling between the English-speaking races and the French-speaking race in this country, I shall feel that I have not laboured in vain.

Hon gentlemen opposite have cast slurs at the distinguished leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I would ask these hon. gentlemen in all sincerity: Do you think that at a time like this, when it is so necessary that the efforts of all the Overseas Dominions should be united with those of the Mother Country and the Allied nations in the defence of civilization and freedom, you contribute toward good feeling among the races in Canada by constantly attacking the right hon. gentleman? I am still quite a young man, but I have known the leader of the Opposition in the closest intimacy for the last twenty years. It has been my privilege on many occasions to stand with him upon the same platform. And I venture the statement, and challenge contradiction in this House or out of it, that, throughout the career of the right hon. gentleman, whether he spoke in Canada or outside of Canada, whether speaking here, or in England, or in France, or in the United States, he has always shown that he felt it his paramount duty to work for harmony and good feeling between the races in this country. And along with that he made the effort to strengthen the attachment between this country and the Empire. Why talk of the loyalty of any province in this Dominion? Are not the men of each province who go to the front fighting for the same object and the same ideals, and doing their best to make prevail that cause which you and I believe to be just? How shall we measure loyalty? Is it to be measured by the number of men that any particular province sends out to the front? Or is it to be measured by the deeds performed upon the battlefields of Europe in this war? I prefer, for one, to believe that the only measure of loyalty in this case is the loyalty of the men who are doing their best at the front and the loyalty of the men who are doing their best to unite the races in this country. We have seen in cable reports and in the press, we have heard it said in this House, that the French-Canadians have done nobly on the field of battle. If you listen to Ralph Connor, or to any other man who has been at the front you will hear praises of the French-Canadians, if for no other reason than for their supreme bravery at Courcelette.

Why, then, should it be stated that the English-speaking people of the province of Quebec gave more to the Patriotic Fund than did the French-Canadians? Why should it be stated that the province of Ontario is furnishing more recruits than the province of Quebec? Upon what are those statements based? I have tried, by inquiring of the Militia Department, and through listening to speeches in this House, including the statement of the right hon. Prime Minister, to find the exact number, by nationalities, who have left this country. Not that I thought that it was the work of a very great mind to advance the argument to which I have referred; but I thought in view of the attacks that had been made, that it would be useful to have this information. The first statement given to the House in this connection was that of the right hon. Prime Minister. He said that the enlistments were as follows: For overseas service, 392,647; in the active militia, called out and under orders, 9,052; permanent force, 2,470 in Canada—total, 404,169; Canadian Naval Service, 3,310; British Naval Service, 1,600; Imperial Mechanical Transport, 1,200; in the munition works in Great Britain, 3,000; in the British Army Reserves, 2,750; British Naval Reserves, 1,000; French Reserves, 2,750; British Naval Reserves, 1,000; French Reserves, 5,000; Russian Reserves, 7,500; Italian Reserves, 5,000—a total of 434,529 men supplied by Canada to the cause of the Allies. I confess that I sometimes think that it is not prudent to give information which might show the enemy how many men we have sent and how many we are sending. What prompted the right hon. gentleman to make the statement that Canada would supply 500,000 men? The statement was made on December 31, 1915, when he said, speaking from his sick-room:

> On this, the last day of the old year, the authorized forces of Canada number 250,000, and the number enlisted is rapidly approaching that limit.

Then he goes on to say:

From to-morrow, the first day of the new year, our authorized forces will be 500,000 men. This announcement is made in token of Canada's unflinching resolve to crown the justice of her cause with victory and an abiding peace.

When the Prime Minister made that statement the people concluded that he had information which would lead him to believe that he could easily send 500,000 men overseas. He tells us now that he sent 434,529. Let us analyse those figures for a moment. On active militia duty in Canada there are 9,052 men; in the permanent force, 2,470; in the munition works in Britain, 3,000; in the British Army Reserves, 2,750; British Naval Reserves, 1,000; French Naval Reserves, 5,000; Russian Reserves, 7,500; Italian Reserves, 5,000; making a total of 35,772 to be deducted from the 434,529.

I proceed with an analysis of the right hon. gentlemen's figures. He tells us that up to December 31 there were overseas 280,562 men; in the Imperial service, 9,550; in the Imperial and Allied Reserves, 17,500; in the Canadian Naval Service, 3,310. Therefore, according to the right hon. gentleman's figures, the total number that left Canada was 310,922. There are training in Canada at the present time 48,312; active militia on guard duty, 9,052; permanent force, 2,470, making a total in Canada of 59,834. The total number enlisted for service is stated to be 434,529 and the total number sent overseas and remaining in Canada, 370,756, leaving a balance of 63,763 who have not been sent overseas and who are not now in Canada. The Prime Minister did not tell us where they were.

The right hon. gentleman tells us that at the front there are 110,000 men; under orders for the front, 10,000; and doing sundry services in England, 17,383. The casualties are 71,263, making a total of 209,646. If, as the right hon. gentleman's figures show, the total number sent overseas amounts to 280,562 and the total number accounted for only 209,646, what has become of the 70,916? I have no doubt that before the House adjourns and the right hon. gentleman goes away he will explain this discrepancy, because it is necessary that we should have some accurate statement from him upon which we may base our calculations. If the Prime Minister gives the people to understand that there are overseas 434,000 of the 500,000 whom he intended to send, they will say: since the Prime Minister asked for only 500,000 men, why so much energy with a view to further recruiting? If he does not, and we must deduct over 70,000 from the figures that he has already given, there is necessity for even greater activity in recruiting. On the other hand, some hon. gentlemen who occupy the treasury benches are telling the people of the province of Quebec that it is important for them to keep the men upon their land and to increase production.

And then, if they followed that advice, there are hon. gentlemen opposite who would come into this House and tell the members and the people of Canada that because the province of Quebec, forsooth, listened to certain ministers, they were therefore disloyal. I hold absolutely no brief from the province of Quebec to defend it in connection with its system of recruiting, absolutely no brief; but I should like, in justice to those who might feel disposed to go overseas and who have not gone, or to those who are overseas doing their best, to point out to this House the exact status of the province of Quebec as compared with the province of Ontario. I did say this afternoon that men from the adjoining counties of Pontiac, Wright, Labelle and Argenteuil were included in military district No. 3, the Kingston military district. That is the information which is given to me; it may not be absolutely correct. What I wish to convey to the House is that every man who comes from one of these counties in the province of Quebec and enlists here in the city of Ottawa, where the recruiting offices are, is put down as coming from the province of Ontario, and Ontario is given the credit, whereas they should be allotted to the province of Quebec. That is the point I wished to bring out when the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) was speaking. I said that I wanted to make a comparison between the two provinces, for the better understanding of those who are interested in the recruiting movement and who are disposed to believe that the province of Quebec is not doing what it should. In Quebec in 1912 we received 50,602 immigrants. At the same time Ontario received 100,000. In 1913 we received 64,835 in Quebec, while Ontario received 122,000. In 1914 we received 80,000 in Quebec, while Ontario received 123,792. In 1915, when immigration had fallen off, Quebec received 31,000 and Ontario 44,000. So that you have more of the immigrants who came into the country to draw from in Ontario than you have in Quebec. You have more of the

men who were born in the British Isles and who are resident in the province of Ontario to draw from than we have in the agricultural province of Quebec. You have, to begin with, 500,000 more people to draw from in Ontario than we have in Quebec. You have, according to the statistics of 1911, 71,000 more families in the province of Ontario than we have in the province of Quebec. What does that mean? If you take only one man per family, you would have right away 71,000 more men in the province of Ontario who would be eligible to go overseas than we have in Quebec.

Mr. MORPHY: You have bigger families down there.

Mr. DEVLIN: There is another point. I grant you that the families are somewhat bigger. It is not uncommon in the province of Quebec to find a family with ten children; indeed I have known families of twenty children.

Mr. MORPHY: Mostly boys?

Mr. DEVLIN: Providence has not given to each family only boys; a great many families include several girls. But take the ordinary family: there is the father, who is working the farm; he cannot work it alone, he needs one of his sons to work with him. My hon. friend knows that labour conditions in this country are very stringent at the present time. If the farmer keeps just one son we may find that the remaining members of the family are not eligible for service. I know any number of families situated in that way. So that, following out my hon. friend's statement of larger families, while that is true, there are a great many more young children. But there are 71,000 more families in Ontario. I am not making an argument out of this, I assure my hon. friend; I am simply putting the facts as I have been able to gather them. My hon. friend and other hon. gentlemen will draw their own conclusions. I want to further say that in the province of Ontario, according to the statistics of 1911, there were 348,681 inhabitants who were born in the British Isles, while in the province of Quebec there were only 67,920. Now, if credit is going to be given to Canadians for going abroad, if that is the argument in measuring loyalty to the Canadian born, you have got to eliminate the 67,000 from the province of Quebec who were born in the British Isles, and you have got to eliminate the 348,681 British born in Ontario. I simply want to point that out, and hon. gentlemen in this House will draw their own conclusions. I make no argument of it, because I have not yet been able to obtain from the Militia Department the number of soldiers by nationality who have gone across the sea.

Let me instance one further fact in speaking of Quebec, and that is that in 1916 when there was a call made to contribute towards the Patriotic Fund, by a population of 2,600,000 (the estimated population at the present moment of the province of Ontario), there was contributed $1,750,000; and I for one would like to say that I heartily congratulate the province of Ontario for having made such a noble contribution to the Patriotic Fund. In the province of Quebec, with a population of 500,000 less, we gave $1,675,000. In other words, we gave per capita a contribution of 80 cents, whereas Ontario gave a per capita contribution of 68 cents. It would not be logical upon my part to try and make an argument out of this statement, as I hardly think that that is the way in which we ought to measure loyalty in this country to the British Empire, but there the statement is.

Mr. MORPHY: Is the hon. gentleman referring to Governmental grants, or to grants from all sources?

Mr. DEVLIN: I am speaking of all grants in 1916. These are the figures I have. If I were to speak of this year I would point out that the Government of the province of Quebec had donated $1,000,000 to the Patriotic Fund. I believe they did perfectly right; I make no argument out of it, because I do not measure loyalty thereby.

I have made reference to a statement made by the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Best), and before closing my remarks I should like to further deal with it. The statement appears in the press, and I hope the hon. gentleman will correct me if my citation from his speech is not as he delivered it. Speaking in the county of Carleton the other day, he said:—

> In the province of Quebec the church was keeping its people in a feeling of enmity against those who were delivering them in the present war.

Reading that, I thought that a member of this House might eliminate such talk in war time. That statement is altogether false. In the churches in the province of Quebec—and I do not except any denomination in this statement—every Sunday prayers are asked for the cause of freedom and for the success of British arms. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Best) went on as reported:—

Touching upon the Dorchester by-election he declared the best thing that could happen would be that the Government candidate be defeated for it would show Quebec up for what she really was. He referred significantly to certain agitation going on for a purpose, to cope with which all English-speaking Grits and Tories should throw their political differences to the winds and stand out as true British subjects. If there was an election held the Conservative party would win because he believed every intelligent English-speaking elector would vote for the Government. He said the French-speaking and the dissatisfied Germans would vote against them—

He excepts the Germans who are not dissatisfied and whom he thinks would therefore vote for the Government. He proceeds:

—and he asked where would the English-speaking people be if the Government changed. The next Premier would have been elected by the French and Germans and he would legislate for them. The English-speaking people should face the situation squarely and throw political differences to the wind.

When I read that statement, my mind went back to the report of Lord Durham made in 1839 upon the state of affairs in this country. Lord Durham, among other things, reported the fact as an instance of the state of feeling at that time, that there were two lines of steamers plying between the city of Montreal and the city of Quebec, one line owned by English capitalists, and the other line by French Canadians. There was considerable feeling between the rival companies, and the French papers advised their friends not to take the English boats, and the English papers retorted by asking the English-speaking people not to take the French boats because those boats were owned by radicals, rebels, and disloyal people. The best answer I could give, if I wanted to find an answer, as to whether the province of Quebec was doing its duty in this war, and as to whether gentlemen occucupying seats on this side of the House were doing what they believed in their consciences to be right, would be found in a notable speech which was delivered by an hon. gentleman who till recently occupied the position of Postmaster General. I refer to the late Hon. Thomas Chase Casgrain, a gentleman for whom I had a very high personal regard. The speech was delivered by him at a luncheon given in his honour by the Canadian Club of Vancouver, B.C., on the 16th August, 1915, and this is the note he sounds:

I am not giving these different figures and instances in any vainglorious spirit, or because I believe that the loyalty of the French-Canadians can be attacked or doubted, but coming through the other day on the train I was pained to read in one of the western papers the following statement: "Liberals believe that the anti-war feeling in Quebec will give them at least fifty seats in that province, and they seem to be determined to risk their political fortunes on this sentiment in that province." I hold no brief for the Liberal party, but I am enforced to say, in the face of the statement contained in this newspaper, that there is no anti-war feeling in the province of Quebec. At the very outset, in company with Sir Wilfrid Laurier, my predecessor, the Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, Sir Lomer Gouin, Premier of the province,, and Mr. Maréchal, K.C., I addressed a tremendous patriotic gathering in Sohmer Park, in the city of Montreal, and all of us, laying aside our political differences, told the people that the sole pre-occupation of everybody should be the proper means to be taken by Canada to fulfil its duty and take its share in the great war of aggression which is being waged against the Empire. The result of this meeting was the immediate recruiting of the 22nd French-Canadian Regiment under Colonel Gaudet. Not only was the voice of French-Canadian public men heard in this connection, but the voice of the Roman Catholic bishops of the province, who, in a collective pastoral letter, gave the proper direction to their flocks and impressed upon them their duties and their obligations.

I am sorry that I have been obliged to go beyond the grave to find testimony to the patriotic policy of the Liberal party of Canada at the present time. I thought that hon. gentlemen in this House would credit us with some degree of sincerity and with wishing to do our level best in this awful time of struggle, but, Sir, in going beyond the tomb, I go to an authority which I think no hon. gentleman on the other side of the House will gainsay. Whilst my distinguished leader, (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) the hon. member for Rouville, (Mr. Lemieux) the hon. member for Bonaventure, (Mr. Marcil) and many other members from the province of Quebec were out doing what they could to aid recruiting, what was one Cabinet minister doing? A truce had been proclaimed. The present Minister of Militia (Mr. Kemp) stated in the city of Toronto that there never had been a truce. There was a truce and that truce was in full operation in the month of May, 1915. The hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) went to the town of Aylmer, in the county of Wright, which I have the honour to represent and I was very glad to see the Minister go there. But, was he there to speak for recruiting, was he there telling the people what their ideal should be, was he there telling the people that there was a truce? No, he was not. Here are some of the things that he did say:

"While the Borden Government has been heart and soul at work looking after the war, Sir Wilfrid and his supporters have been kicking at petty thefts which, by the way, were

perpetrated by Grits left in office by the Laurier administration, instead of standing shoulder to shoulder with us in this fight for civilization.

"Speaking about the boots scandal, do you wonder that mistakes were made, when this country, which had often talked of and played at war, had to gather together and equip an army of 33,000 men for the front? Mistakes must surely be made by us all; I make them every day."

The speaker then went into a résumé of pre-election promises that the Government has carried out during the three and a half years they have been in power, and took a heavy dig at the Senate, whom he dubbed as "a bunch of old fossils," who were at the beck and call of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who put the majority of them there.

He sent his audience into roars of laughter by giving an imitation of the mannerisms of some of the senators, and wound up with an exhortation to the new association to dig in, and produce a fighting organization which would result at the next general election in placing Wright county in the ranks of the Blues, where she belongs.

At a moment when the two political parties were supposed to have a truce! I will leave to the consideration of the House whether the attitude of the Minister of Labour is to be commended; he speaking in the town of Aylmer and delivering election speeches, whilst the leader of the Opposition is addressing big meetings in the province of Quebec and calling upon the young men to enlist in this great struggle for liberty and civilization. I would like to say a few words more but, in view of the lateness of the hour, might I suggest the adjournment of the debate?

On motion of Mr. Devlin the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Rogers the House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

Tuesday, January 30, 1917.

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

REPORT.

Copy of the evidence taken before the Hon. Sir Charles Davidson, Kt., Commissioner appointed to inquire into the purchase by and on behalf of the Government of the Dominion of Canada, of Arms, Munitions, Implements, Materials, Horses, Supplies, and other things for the purposes of the present war, and as to the expenditure and payments made or agreed to be made therefor; together with the report of the said Commissioner concerning the Sale of Small Arms Ammunition; purchase of Submarines; and Military Cloth (Auburn Woollen Mills Co.)—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

WAR CONTRIBUTIONS, MONTREAL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, by your leave may I be permitted to read a telegram which I have just received, and which has been sent to me in order to correct a statement which was made a few days ago by the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Best), with regard to contributions made in Montreal by the French Canadian people in connection with the war. The telegram is as follows:

Montreal, January 29, 1917.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier,
Ottawa.

As chairman of day's pay Committee which last year secured subscriptions exceeding five hundred thousand dollars from employees in Montreal, I can safely say that at least half of this amount was contributed by French-Canadian workingmen and women. The English and French-Canadian citizens of Montreal are at present working hand in hand in the organization of another campaign to raise two and a half million dollars here in February. All interests are working together in the most energetic and harmonious manner for its success.

J. W. McConnell.

RECRUITING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. BURNHAM: May I ask if any provision has yet been made or permission granted by which recruiting can be done for specific battalions at the front instead of in the ordinary way?

Hon. A. E. KEMP (Minister of Militia): The matter to which the hon. member for Peterborough refers is under consideration. A large number of battalions are still below strength and these are being filled up as rapidly as possible.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. G. C. Wilson (Wentworth) for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Monday, January 29.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright): (Resuming.) Mr. Speaker, when the debate adjourned last night I was saying that I believed it was the duty of every man in this House and every man in public life in this country to work for the harmony of the races which compose the people of Canada. I was speaking of the attacks which have been made upon the province of Quebec, and of attacks which have been especially directed

against the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I spoke also of the testimony which had been given at the banquet in the city of Vancouver by the late hon. the Postmaster General, Mr. T. C. Casgrain, when he said that there was no anti-war feeling in the province of Quebec, and that he could testify that at the very outset of the struggle my right hon. friend and others on this side of the House had laid aside their political opinions and had appeared with him upon the public platform of that province to advocate recruiting. I could have gone further and instanced testimonials of loyalty which were given to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition at different banquets in the city of London, notably at the banquet at the Imperial Institute in June, 1897, which was presided over by the then Prince of Wales, afterwards King Edward VII. I do not think that it is absolutely necessary this afternoon to do so, and I shall content myself simply with stating, in answer to hon. gentlemen opposite, that one of the present ministers, the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sévigny), speaking in the county of Dorchester——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. DEVLIN: That "hear, hear" is very weak. However, we will let that pass. Here is what Mr. Sévigny said:

> After explaining National Service as usual, Mr. Sevigny said that he was ready to retire and leave the field to Mr. Cannon if anybody present was ready to say that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had not advised the people to sign the National Service cards.

Sir, I give that testimony to the House for what it may be worth.

The second thought that was in my mind, and with that I shall conclude my remarks this afternoon, was the attempt which is being made by gentlemen opposite to make political capital out of this war so as to satisfy the prejudice of political opinion. We have had instances of that in this country unfortunately, both in the public press and in the utterances of men in public life. I did tell you last night, that when the right hon. leader of the Opposition was in the province of Quebec urging the young men to join the colours, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) was out in the town of Aylmer trying to incite his friends to find somebody in the county of Wright who would redeem it to the Conservative cause. Let me instance another case. The whole province of Ontario, and in fact the Dominion of Canada, was thrilled by the words of Mr. Ralph Connor in the city of Toronto calling upon the people of this country for national unity and saying that there was only one thing worth while, and that was winning the struggle. Yet the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) sat back and contented himself with dismissing the idea by saying: "Well, Ralph Connor, after all, is only a Grit." Now, Sir, we have other gentlemen who have the honour of having seats on the treasury benches who are trying to make political capital out of the war. Let me begin with the right hon. gentleman who leads this Government. The House was amazed and the country was amazed the other night when the right hon. gentleman who, generally speaking, has the reputation of being broad-minded, thought it necessary to cast aspersions on the right hon. leader of the Opposition for some attitude, which he did not thoroughly explain, mark well, but which would give the impression to friends opposite and to others in the country that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was disloyal to the Empire during the South African war, when the history of the case, when all the facts of the case, are directly against such a contention. Is it surprising, then, that other members of his Cabinet stoop so low as to try and make political capital out of the war. We have the hon. Minister of—What is he now? He is Postmaster General, Mr. Blondin. Speaking in the county of Dorchester a few days ago, and what was he doing in the county of Dorchester? Was he advocating recruiting?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh; it hurts.

Mr. DEVLIN: It hurts? I have no doubt it does hurt hon. gentlemen opposite. What was the Postmaster General saying in the county of Dorchester? Does it cause merriment upon the other side? It did not cause as much merriment with the right thinking people of Canada after they had read the words which were uttered by the Postmaster General. He was not advocating recruiting, but a policy of emigration from this country to the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh, "take it back"; "that's exploded."

Mr. DEVLIN: Let me give his words; I am quoting now from the Montreal Gazette of January 26:

> St. Germaine, Dorchester County, Quebec, January 25th: The following affidavit was given out to-night by the Liberal chiefs here:
>
> We, the undersigned, declare that we heard last night at Ste. Rose, January 24, 1917, the Hon. P. E. Blondin make the following declara-

tion: "As for the Allison scandal and others of the same nature, let us suppose that if these thefts have taken place, it has no importance for the people of Ste. Rose, because it was English money that was stolen."

Speaking of the danger of conscription, Mr. Blondin declared that, even if conscription was put into force, that would mean little to the people of Ste. Rose, because they had only to go across the frontier to get away.

That language was intended for home consumption, but when he found that these words had gone abroad, Mr. Blondin thought he would manufacture something else; so he immediately sent a correction, and I take his correction from the Ottawa Evening Journal, another good Tory paper. Here is what he says:

The statement which has been sworn to by certain Liberals with regard to my utterances are a distortion of my words. I never by any means intended to convey—

Mark well, that he did not intend to convey.

—the meaning which they have attached to my speech.

So it was not plain speaking.

Mr. Cannon had been stating in his speeches that the Conservative party had been grafting from the Canadian treasury in connection with munition contracts.

No man in this House or in the country can deny that.

In my speech at Ste. Rose I explained that it was not true that the Allison scandal had to do with Canadian money, pointing out that the money paid for the shells was the money of the British Government.

It was all right to steal the money because it came from the British Government; it would have been a crime if the money had come from the Canadian Government.

In regard to the conscription matter I told the people of Ste. Rose that I did not believe conscription would be necessary because so many Canadians were eager to go and fight for the cause of liberty and humanity. I added that if any of them were afraid of conscription, if conscription should be passed and they did not want to go to the war, they had a remedy left. They could go across the United States line which is near Ste. Rose and escape military service.

Will hon. gentlemen opposite now applaud these words? There was another statement made by the hon. gentleman, only it was for exportation. It is contained in the wire which he sent to the right hon. gentleman, the Prime Minister, on the morning of the election. Mark well, for therein lies the danger. Here is an hon. gentleman in the Cabinet who makes a statement sworn to by electors of this country. He finds that that statement is creating disturbance in the Conservative ranks, and he makes a correction which is worse than the original statement. Then he lets matters go on until the morning of the election when he sends a telegram to the Prime Minister in which he does not refer to his words upon conscription. I hold a copy of the telegram in my hand, and not a word in it refers to conscription. He does not deny that he advised the people of Dorchester County to go across the line to the United States. And yet hon. gentlemen opposite say that they are not making political capital out of the war.

Let me say to my hon. friends opposite that their press, backed by the party, is creating the same sentiment in this country as that to which I have referred. The chief organ of the Conservative Party in the province of Quebec is L'Evenement, and here is a sample of what that paper was publishing during the Dorchester campaign. I quote it for the sake of my merry friends opposite:

I may first state, however, that the idea of L'Evenement was this: If conscription was adopted in Canada it would not be due to any action on the part of the Conservative party; the sole blame was to fall on the head of my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition. L'Evenement prints in very large type for distribution throughout the county of Dorchester words that were signed by my right hon. friend's friend of 1911, Mr. Henri Bourassa, the friend of the Postmaster General of the present day (Mr. Blondin), of the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sevigny), and of the Secretary of State (Mr. Patenaude). The statement published in L'Evenement is as follows:

If England were, I will not say in danger, but simply at grips with one or two or several of the great powers of Europe, the Prime Minister could demand not $35,000,000, but two, three, or four times $35,000,000. We would put all the resources of Canada at the disposal of England. There would not be a single discordant voice.

These words were not given to the electors of Dorchester county as those of the Prime Minister of this country; they were given as the words lately uttered by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition. Again in big type, we find this in L'Evenement:

It was Sir Wilfrid Laurier who had passed in 1904 the Militia Act which would permit of the establishment of conscription in Canada. This Act is found in Chapter 41 of the Statutes of Canada of 1906.

And the article ends:

If we shall ever have conscription, it would be put into force thanks to a law passed by Laurier. Electors of Dorchester do not forget that.

I submit, Sir, that the Government have been making all the political capital possible out of this war. The Prime Minister made a statement and gave figures, which I quoted last night, purporting to show just what the Government had done for the Allied cause. He took credit to himself for having sent a large number of young men across the ocean. He stated that he had sent some 17,000 Russian, Italian, and French reservists. I want to tell my right hon. friend that if he or his Government had never existed, and the war went on, those French, Russian and Italian reservists would have had to go anyway under the laws of the countries whence they came.

Mr. BURNHAM: I ask my hon. friend if he is in favour of conscription under any circumstances?

Mr. DEVLIN: Will it materially aid my hon. friend if I enter into a dissertation upon conscription? The question will come up in the House when it will be discussed fully.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. DEVLIN: At the proper time, I will give my views upon the question of conscription, and I will be very happy to listen to my hon. friend when he gives his views. But I assure my hon. friend, that if I had to go to fight I would go to fight, and would not come back to Canada unless I came back wounded.

Mr. BURNHAM: You evidently won't go at all.

Mr. DEVLIN: I want to give the Government credit for what they have actually done in this war, and I want to remind the Government at once that they are now existing upon a life that has been borrowed from us and which we lent them. They have occupied their short time in filling positions in this country with active partisans. They have filled positions upon the bench, they have filled positions in the Senate with partisans, and whilst the country, or certain sections of it, is calling upon the Government for a national Government, we find this Government inactive, sitting back, preaching discord amongst races and claiming for themselves credit for what they have not done. But, they have done certain things. We had a man in the Cabinet, Sir, the former Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes). I see him sitting in his seat. Men on both sides of the House may differ from him in political views but I want to say right away that from the beginning I always gave him credit for doing what he believed he could do to aid our young men in going across the sea. It is not the Government that has helped in this case. The Government did not send the young men abroad. The men, women and boys of this country are the ones to whom credit should be given for what has been done for the allied cause. The Government, it is true, in order to satisfy, apparently, political friends outside, thought they were working for the Allied cause in dismissing the hon. gentleman from office. That is their business, but it is also the business of this country, and the country will want to know the reason from the Prime Minister. The right hon. gentleman who leads the Government has not yet told the country just why he chose the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence for dismissal after he had asked the country for an extension of Parliament to sanction the acts of the former Minister of Militia. The country will also want to know why it is that he did not dismiss other hon. gentlemen from the Cabinet for the same offences which he charged against the ex-Minister of Militia. The country, it seems to me, would like to know why it is that the ex-Minister of Militia was dismissed from office when his programme is now being carried out, when his appointments still remain, when his whole scheme of military organization remains, when the only difference apparent between the Government and the ex-Minister of Militia is that the ex-minister thinks that he could do alone the work that the Prime Minister believes it takes four other men to do. The Government have appointed two active ministers of militia and two inactive ministers of militia. The Government have appointed one overseas in the person of Sir George Perley, one here in the person of my esteemed friend the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) and two others in the person of the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) and the hon. member for Queens and Shelburne (Mr. McCurdy). The right hon. gentleman has not given to this House or to this country a statement of why it is necessary that he should have done so.

Will you let me conclude by urging upon the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government and other hon. gentlemen opposite that the country feels that the time has come when the question of the war

should be taken out of our domestic politics, or, rather, when our domestic politics should be taken out of the war. We are now about to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of Confederation. Our one thought should not be to cast aspersions upon different provinces, but it should rather be to celebrate the harmony which exists between the people of these different provinces and to preserve Canada's constitution and the authority which secures to all of us that same liberty, that same freedom for which men are now going to the front, for which men are now fighting, and for which men are now dying upon the battlefields of Europe.

Lieut.-General Sir SAM HUGHES (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, permit me to join with the House in congratulating you, Sir, upon your elevation to the important and dignified position which you now occupy. Knowing you from experience in the past, knowing your military training and your self-control under trying circumstances, I believe that you will be entirely successful in the task of managing the affairs of this House. I want also to join in congratulating the mover and seconder of the Address upon their eloquent utterances and upon the material which they presented to the consideration of this House. I also want to associate myself with the House in commending Their Royal Highnesses for the good work which they accomplished during their stay in Canada. To the present occupant of the gubernatorial chair, the Duke of Devonshire, I extend a most hearty welcome. He comes of a family in English history long known as staunch in upholding the liberties of the common people.

At the outset, lest I should be misunderstood, I want to take this opportunity of placing on record my high appreciation of the splendid assistance given by Lord Kitchener, by Mr. David Lloyd George, by Mr. Bonar Law, and by Lord Derby; in fact, by the entire British Cabinet, in from time to time helping to the best of their ability to remove any friction, to smooth down difficulties which may have arisen and to advance the cause of the colonials at the front to the best of their ability. Where differences have arisen between their interpretation of the Constitution and mine, in every solitary instance, I may say without any egotism, they have joined with me in bringing about the best state of affairs that possibly could exist after explanations had been given them. I want, also, to express here, lest any misapprehension might arise from what I may say later on, that General Robertson, Chief of the General Staff; General Whigham, his chief assistant; General MacDonough, in fact all the senior officers of the War Office, including the permanent Under Secretary of State, Sir Reginald Brade, have been insistent in season and out of season in recognizing to the fullest extent the powers and responsibilities of the Canadian force and the limited powers and responsibilities of the British Government and the British War Office in relation to our military force.

I also want to take this opportunity of placing on record my high appreciation of the splendid services of Sir Max Aitken, now, I am pleased to state, Lord Beaverbrook, and of General Lord Brooke, who is well known to our Canadian volunteers, for their intermediary and diplomatic work in connection with the management of our forces in England and overseas. To the efforts of these two gentlemen, more than to any other cause, is due the splendid harmony that, taking it all in all, has existed between the Canadian and the British forces at the front.

Sir, I find myself in a very peculiar position to-day. As Robbie Burns says:

> Wad some power the giftie gie us,
> To see ourselves as ithers see us.

During the past few weeks I have been the recipient of scores of letters from supporters of both political parties, and I shall take the liberty of giving a few extracts, alternately from each side. One friend, very likely a Conservative, says, "Go slow and do not give the Grits any ammunition." Another gentleman, whom I should take to belong to the other political persuasion, writes—and I may say that with one or two exceptions they all sign their names: "That Tory gang have slated you. Give them something hot." Another writes, and this is from a gentleman who last year was insistent in trying to get me to desert my friends: "Stand by your friends. Be loyal to Borden and the Conservative party." The next one says: "See how your Tory colleagues have knifed you. All one needed to do to get Borden excited was to write him a letter finding fault with you; then he would go back on you. You are a fool to be loyal to him and the crowd." I had a sort of suspicion that I kept my hat on my own head last year. A gentleman of the opposite political persuasion writes: "See how Grit papers attacked you over the Shell Committee matter last year, trying to fasten blame on you and your friends; but they failed. Our friends stood

firm then. Do not trust the Grits." Then comes quite an extract from a communication to me:

> Now is your chance to get even with the Finance Minister and the High Commissioner, or Overseas Minister of Militia, for their intrigue and undermining you. Can't you see the ring against you? The Montreal Daily Mail, the Montreal Evening News (both owned by a half brother of the Finance Minister), the Toronto Telegram, on which the Finance Minister served for years and which is regarded as his Toronto organ, whose editor is reported about to be knighted for viciously attacking you; whose representative and nephew in London, connected by marriage with the High Commissioner, or Overseas Minister of Militia, has been constant in misrepresenting you, and slobbering over your enemies in the Associated Press notices from England, paid for by Canadian money—these Tory papers and people have led in the vicious attacks on, and attempts to undermine you.

And he writes a lot more that I will not read. Even the dear old Toronto Globe gives advice and warning against the Tory pitfalls, and the Ottawa Journal-Press urges me to beware of the wily old politician from Quebec, under whom the editor of that paper so long served. It is very pleasing to receive such good advice. But some of those now urging me to stand to my friends were, within a year, active in urging me to desert friends as true, as honourable, as capable, as patriotic, as self-sacrificing, men who have done as much for the cause of humanity and the Allies in this war, as could be done; while others now professing friendship and offering advice were then busy in their efforts to discredit me. All good advice, but Sam Hughes now, as then, stands by principles and by every honourable man, rather than in wasting his time attacking mere creatures of the hour. Men are transient and soon forgotten, but principles are eternal.

Many people—and I am sorry to see by reading the Hansard debates, even some members of this House—seem to forget that we are engaged in a struggle for our very existence. Now, Sir, I am a firm believer in responsible government, which means party government. I always waive non-essentials for party, but always as certainly do I waive party for essentials. With me, country and cause come first. I have differed from party leaders in days gone by, but the verdict of history has vindicated my action in every instance. Party government involves intelligence, instruction, and independence on the part of the electorate. Party government involves the same conditions for members of Parliament, and let me also say, party government involves the same conditions for a cabinet. Party government does not imply autocracy either in the leader or in the cabinet. The danger of party government is where members lose their independence for any cause—for hope of office, or reward, or for any other reason sacrifice their individuality for temporary, selfish and incompetent leaders. The party should always assert itself; its members should not be mere slavish followers.

Now, as to loyalty. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has claimed that it is a vice or a weakness in me that my heart gets the better of my head. I have studied history and have observed that no man has ever benefited humanity whose heart did not greatly overbalance his head. But there is not much danger in some quarters of any such over-balancing. My way is not strewn with milestones to abandoned friends. The Prime Minister has stated that he has always been loyal to his colleagues, and his colleagues have been and are loyal to him. I think it is quite unnecessary that I should take up the time of this House for a single moment in reviewing my loyalty to the Prime Minister of Canada, but it might be not amiss to inform the public and the House that Canada and Great Britain are engaged in a war to the death, and that I shall stand by party where party interests are the people's and the soldiers' interests—but, where the party fails in its duty, especially in regard to the war and to our soldiers, then I shall not hesitate to have duty done and self-sacrificing patriotism rewarded.

I am strongly urged by some to stand true to my friends. Why, the reproach to me by many is that I never desert a friend. I may be deserted; but to break with the dear good fellows of the great Liberal-Conservative party would wrench me almost as much as losing the war. It pains me to see, however, that party feelings, party prejudices, are so strong in Canada over non-essentials.

I have been asked by some—not officially by Liberal leaders; I want to make that distinctly understood—to cast in my lot with Laurier and the great, time-honoured Liberal party. In all love and kindness, let me say that the idea shocked me. To assist in placing a statesman of even his high character and power, with the principles enunciated by his authorised supporter in Dorchester, and have Canada depend on his ideals for the conduct and the

settlement of the war, would be repugnant to my very soul, although everyone knows my personal admiration for the right hon. leader of the Opposition.

"Canada has done enough in this war for England," and so forth, are the utterances of the acknowledged, the endorsed henchmen of the right hon. leader of the Opposition. Canada is forced into this war, not for or by Britain; for Britain never asked a man, never hinted for a man; but Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific sprang to arms because the liberties of this fair land were and still are threatened.

Whatever my course to-day may be, and whatever the effect to me may be, you may rest assured, Sir, that my aim, my purpose, my determination, has but one conclusion: the active, energetic conduct of the war to a victorious issue. Men and munitions, and still more men and more munitions, is the cry. Our hearts go out to the gallant boys at the front, and also to their mothers and other loved ones at home who long for the return of the lads; or if they be not among those returning, to get a chance some time to see the spot where the beloved boy did his duty and gave his life for human liberty and dear old down-trodden humanity. These people, as well as our soldiers themselves, ask, what is Canada doing? Canada has a higher duty to perform, a more important duty in the war, than gathering harvests, assisting in making munitions and helping to furnish bread to the soldiers. And yet, as reported by the Montreal Gazette and the Ottawa Journal-Press, the hon. Mr. Sévigny, in a speech delivered by him, stated that the only duty of Canada was to gather harvests, assist in making munitions and help to furnish bread to the soldiers. I have no hesitation in saying that I think the right hon. leader of the Opposition, unless he could prove that his candidate in Dorchester had not uttered the words he did, should have called him off in that contest or repudiated him publicly, and I have also no hesitation in saying that the right hon. leader of the Government, when he read these words uttered by Mr. Sevigny and when he read the speech delivered by Mr. Blondin, should have, without any delay, repudiated those gentlemen or called for a cancellation of their statements. I wonder why the good people of Dorchester county did not throw both candidates out of their riding, if the piffle we hear was really uttered amongst them. I have always claimed that the people of the province of Quebec have never had a real opportunity of showing what they can do. They have had this party and that party. In 1896 it was the Liberal party, with the cry: What, going to put Tupper in and spend three million dollars to send your sons off to fight? A few years later it was the Conservative party going through the ridings of the province and proclaiming the same sort of doctrine, appealing to the passions and prejudices of the people. My experience of the people of the province of Quebec is that, when they hear the proper side of a case, they act like men, and when they get an opportunity to go to the front and fight, they fight like men; and it annoys and maddens me to see the two great parties of the Canadian people tell them all that little tittle-tattle that was reported in the papers in connection with the Dorchester election.

Argentine and the United States both supply harvests and make munitions and furnish bread for our soldiers. Canada should do a little more. What action is being carried on by Canada? We must go forward and not backward. Let action be the mandate.

It is well known to the members of this House and the people of this country that my policy has been for many a long year and still stronger is than ever before: Full partnership of Great Britain and her colonies throughout the world, with the great Central Government dealing with what concerns the Empire, and each of the component parts of the Empire dealing with what concerns itself in various degrees, and one not interfering with the other. Therefore, any stand which I may take to-day for the protection of our Canadian soldiers at the front, for the up-building of our army, and for the success of the cause, will, you may rest assured, be along the lines of my love and admiration for all that is great and good in the motherland, but the motherland should take her own position in relation to her soldiers, and Canada should have absolute control of her soldiers.

In the addresses of both the right hon. leader of the Opposition and the right hon. leader of the Government reference was made to participation by Canada in the South African war. May I be permitted to mention one or two particulars in that connection? Let me frankly say that I was the one who had the honour of first bringing up this subject in the Parliament of Canada, and I was brow-beaten by my honoured

leader at that time, the late Sir Charles Tupper, who objected to it, and who did the same thing in Europe. I could not get one man on either side of the House as late as the year 1896 to second a resolution bringing the matter before this House. The late Colonel Tyrwhitt, the son of a British admiral, was the only one who did it, and he did it, as he expressed himself, as a matter of courtesy, merely to give me an opportunity of stating my utopian ideas, but he would not endorse it. Therefore, when I meet a man who does not get as enthusiastic over our duty to the Empire as I do, I am always willing to give him the same right as I claim for myself of doing my own thinking, and my policy is always not to blackguard a man, but to show him the advantages of my side of a case.

In order to do justice to a young man who has been much maligned in this country, may I say that Col. Armand Lavergne has for upwards of two years been insisting on being given permission to raise a regiment to go to the front. His only objection was that we had not enforced the compulsory clauses of the Militia Act as he wanted us to do. Our policy was purely voluntary enlistment, and Mr. Armand Lavergne very properly pointed out that long before the war he had been opposed to sending troops voluntarily to Great Britain, and that if they were sent they must be sent by the Government of Canada under the Militia Act.

At the time of the South African war mine was the only offer made officially or unofficially from the Dominion of Canada, of troops to serve in that war until long after it broke out. No official offer was made. The right hon. leader of the Opposition, then Prime Minister, will remember that I annoyed him considerably by endeavouring to get him to send over a contingent. He objected to any precipitate action, and told me I was rather presumptuous; that I did not represent anyone except the people of my constituency, and he was not very sure that I represented them. I am willing to give him every credit for the position he took. He took the ground that the leader of the Opposition might come to the House at the next session and condemn him if he consented to send troops. I asked him if a telegram from Sir Charles Tupper strengthening his hand would be of any service to him. He said it would, and the telegram which was recently published in the Journal-Press, sent to the Prime Minister by Sir Charles Tupper, was the result. I wish to place this on the official record in case history might not be inclined to deal kindly with the matter in the years to come. The ex-Prime Minister will remember that when he made that statement I promised that I would endeavour to get a telegram from Sir Charles Tupper. I went to the telegraph office and wired Sir Charles Tupper at Halifax; but he was at some place in the country—Bridgewater or Berwick; I forget the name, but I know that it commenced with B. I sent a telegram to Sir Charles Tupper and he immediately replied, sending me a wire stating that he had done so. Later the Prime Minister informed me that he had not heard from Sir Charles Tupper. That same day I received a bill from the telegraph office for the telegram. I went to the telegraph office and demanded that the matter be looked into. It seems that there were two offices in Halifax, and, through some mistakes which occurred in transmission, the telegram had been held up in one of these offices for a day or two. The telegram eventually came to the then Prime Minister, and strengthened his hand. At a dinner some few years ago Sir Charles Tupper mentioned this fact himself in the presence of Sir Thomas White, Minister of Finance, Sir Collingwood Schreiber, Sir George Perley, and to a number of others later. I mention that merely to show that I was carrying out a diplomatic role at that time in an endeavour to smooth matters over with both parties.

I shall not take up the time of the House in discussing the causes of the war; hon. gentlemen are already familiar with them. But before I proceed to the main part of my address I may remark that my friends say that my terribly quarrelsome disposition is one of the many points that I must make clear to the House. I enjoy a fight as much as any man living. I shall enumerate a few—all, in fact—of the troubles that I can recollect in connection with which even a ripple of temper was shown since the beginning of the war.

At the outset of the war the Prime Minister enunciated the principle that there would be no political patronage in this war. That met my view exactly, and I proceeded to carry it out. After I took office I religiously carried out that principle, and in connection with contracts, supplies, promotions or any other matters having to do with the war, I gave no regard to political considerations in any sense. I know that that policy meets with the approval of both Liberals and Conservatives throughout the length and breadth of Canada. However, not understanding the matter, a couple of

my colleagues at that time took ground against me for not resorting to political patronage in the matter of contracts. As soon as I explained the position of affairs to them their actions in that respect immediately ceased and everything was harmony and peace from that time onward.

A number of agents whom I regarded as German agents were at one time going around the country and endeavouring to stir up trouble with people in Canada, especially with myself, in order to prevent recruiting. Among the many little tricks of the trade, as we may call them, was that of telling people who had any cause of complaint whatever to "write to Borden." They seemed to have the idea that by writing to the Prime Minister they would create trouble. However, that passed over; I think the Prime Minister, sooner or later —I do not know at exactly what period— became wise to this sort of thing.

The next trouble I had was with a very able young politician who had a quarrel with his colonel and brigadier. I am asked by my friends to explain all these things, and there is no harm in doing so. Because I would not override the brigadier and the colonel, with whom I had no quarrel, this gentleman turned on me, although I offered him a better position in another battalion. The matter was afterwards amicably arranged, and to-day that officer commands one of the best regiments in Britain.

On another occasion a very distinguished ecclesiastic came to me and objected to any Salvation Army chaplains being appointed. The senior chaplain, who happened to belong to the same church as he did, had appointed representatives of the Salvation Army to act as chaplains. This ecclesiastic, claiming that he spoke in the name of the great religious denominations of Canada, demanded that I dismiss these Salvation Army chaplains. I was somewhat busy that day, and I did not waste much time on that matter.

Another officer who raised a great deal of noise was a gentleman who had something to do with the organization for the prevention of cruelty to animals. He wanted me to appoint him and forty others, all of whom I considered to be physi-
4 p.m. cally fit for active service, to look after the animals in the military service. I told him that in war, where a question of life and death was concerned, a horse was not to be compared with a man, and I declined to have anything to do with him. He made charges, which I repudiated, about one of my officers having burned a horse, and that sort of nonsense—then he got out of the camp.

I wish to relate another incident. One day I drove 15 miles through the Valcartier camp, and I found 21 officers on duty out of some 1,500. Having made inquiries, I found that the fishing was good up in the mountains, and that the company was very genial at the summer hotels. In other words, the whole camp had degenerated early in the game into a huge picnic party. I called a meeting of some fifteen or sixteen hundred officers the next day, and told them in plain Anglo-Saxon language what this war meant. I told them that they were not there for picnic purposes, and that if I found them absent from the camp or from duty I would take it as an intimation that they wanted to return to their homes. I pointed out the seriousness of the war, and the need of the officers making themselves efficient in their duties. All but about fifteen or twenty rolled up their sleeves, and the splendid record of the Canadian officers has been the result. Many of them told me that that occasion was the first time that they took the matter seriously. I may say incidentally that a few of them did get return tickets to their homes, the result being a very beneficial effect upon the service.

Another matter that I had a little trouble about, and concerning which I understand there was a good deal of complaint, was the contention that I did not concede to the permanent corps what they claimed to be their right to the road. For instance, it was claimed that if a part of the permanent force should come along, any non-permanent corps must take the ditch. I rectified that one day in short metre and I heard that very serious complaints were being lodged along these lines. I want to say here that so far as I am concerned there is no permanent force at the front and there is no non-permanent force. There are officers, non-commissioned officers and men of the great Canadian Militia, and be it said to the eternal credit of our citizen soldiery that the permanent forces have not by any means surpassed men of the non-permanent forces in their work at the front, in the field, or in any capacity in which they may be working.

As to my relations with my colleagues, we never came to holds or fought like blazes. Perhaps if we had done a little more fighting, things would have been better. We have had our differences. On one occasion the Finance Minister, in his anxiety to

keep down expenditure and to keep track of erring boys like the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Railways and Canals, myself, and others, wanted in the early days to interfere in matters connected with the details of our expenditures. To this I objected. I was a minister of the Crown and I resented the interference of anybody except the Prime Minister and the Cabinet in the petty details of administration. If the estimates had to be cut down, I said, let us know the lump sum that has to come off and the apportionment to the different departments. I remember telling the Finance Minister that it was not his function to meddle in these little matters but to carry out a policy of raising revenue and of keeping the country buoyant and prosperous. I was very sorry that I myself had to lead the way later on and show him how that should be done. These are the only rackets that I can recollect. If anybody can recall any others, I would like to hear them.

The only overseas troubles we had, arose from unsettled views regarding the status of the Canadian forces in Britain. No one will charge me with bowing and kow-towing to a man because he happens to be a British officer. It is worth that I stand for. There is a tendency to bow to everything labelled "British officer."

Another grave charge, I understand, that is laid against the department and my officers, is extravagance. I shall not say anything about that here further than this: that I challenge the world to produce an equal record of economy, good buying, and careful management, with one or two exceptions in the case of the initial purchasing in connection with supplies for the forces when we had no orders in council, or no tenders, when everything was done under the direction of special officers selected for that purpose. I might refer to one instance where things did not go quite right and that was in connection with the purchase of trucks, bicycles, etc., by Mr. Russell, who was recommended to me by his old friend, Sir Thomas White, who, I believe, had been associated with him in the Canada Cycle Company and the Russell Motor Car Company. I believe that the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) discovered that these articles had been purchased, some at 25 per cent off and then had been turned in to the Government at 10 per cent off, and some petty details like that—I have not had time to read it up yet; I may have time now.

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

I wish to take up the status of the Canadian forces and to discuss two matters of military law which every one seems to dodge, viz: the right of Canada and the duty of Canada to introduce compulsory service, and the status of our boys when they are serving with British soldiers. Section 15 of the British North America Act says:

> The Commander in Chief of the Land and Naval Militia, and of all naval and military forces, of and in Canada, is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the Queen.

The Queen here means, of course, the Governor General in Council.

The British North America Act, section 91 says:

> It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons, to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of Canada, in relation to all matters not coming within the classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the legislatures of the provinces; and for greater certainty, but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing terms of this section, it is hereby declared that (notwithstanding anything in this Act) the exclusive legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada extends to all matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated; that is to say,—

That is all the British North America Act has bearing on the subject. The Militia Act goes further. The interpretation clause, section 2 says:

> (b) 'Emergency' means war, invasion, riot or insurrection, real or apprehended;
>
> (g) 'On active service,' as applied to a person subject to military service, means whenever he is enrolled, enlisted, drafted or warned for service or duty during an emergency, or when he is on duty, or has been warned for duty in aid of the civil power;

Then section 4 deals with the command in chief and says:

> The command in chief of the militia is declared to continue and be vested in the King, and shall be exercised and administered by His Majesty or by the Governor General as his representative.

Governor General means, of course, the Governor General in Council. Section 69 deals with active service and provides:

> The Governor in Council may place the militia, or any part thereof, on active service anywhere in Canada, and also beyond Canada, for the defence thereof, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency.

Section 72, dealing with command in time of war is as follows:

> In time of war, when the militia is called out for active service to serve conjointly with His Majesty's regular forces, His Majesty may place in command thereof a senior general officer of his regular army.

Section 74 of the Militia Act (Army Act and regulations) is our charter for our service beyond the seas, just as the British North America Act covers the Administration of Canada. Section 74 is as follows:

The Army Act for the time being in force in the United Kingdom, the King's regulation, and all other laws applicable to His Majesty's troops in Canada and not inconsistent with this Act or the regulations made thereunder, shall have force and effect as if they had been enacted by the Parliament of Canada for the government of the militia.

Thus Canada has full authority to enrol her militia at any time and to train them. The Government could call out 300,000 men to-morrow and train them if they chose to do so. Canada has authority to send them overseas, for the defence of Canada, in an emergency, and "war" is an emergency, according to the interpretation clause of the Act.

Canada has full authority to equip, officer and manage her forces as she pleases while they are within her borders. Beyond her borders and within her own laws, Canadian authority for management and control is wanting, except by adopting the Army Act. Canada has no constitutional authority, as I interpret it—and of course I am giving my own interpretation—to administer or control our men once we send them beyond our border until we adopt, as the law provides, the Army Act and the clauses relating thereto.

But British military law, especially the Army Act, gives that authority to Canada. The statesmen and war officers of Great Britain have foreseen such situations as now present themselves. Not only in cases where the colonial governments raise the troops and pay the cost, but even where Britain enrols and pays colonials, the British Government has by law safeguarded in every conceivable instance the rights, privileges and liberties of the colonists. Therefore the Canadian forces are in no sense "British regulars."

I may say that I take the blame of that clause upon myself, for not enforcing the law, but as I regard this matter, we did not know how long the war was going to last, and I expressed my views again and again on the principle and they were understood, and we, rather than have any trouble, decided to pass along in a quiet way and everything seemed to go fairly well and in good working order, in so far as relationship between the two forces is concerned. So we did not raise any trouble.

I come now to a consideration of the British military law, 1914. I refer first to the Army Act, section 190 (sub-section 23) page 557 which says:

The expression "colony" means any part of His Majesty's dominions exclusive of the British Islands and of British India, and includes Cyprus and any British protectorate, and where parts of such dominions are under both a central and a local legislature, all parts under the central legislature shall, for the purpose of this definition, be deemed to be one colony.

I want you to observe how carefully the British statesmen and officers have guarded our interests in every case.

Chapter XI, page 194, Military Law, provides that the military forces of the Crown shall consist of three classes, British, Indian, and Colonial. Colonial forces are defined by section 3 as follows:

The colonial forces are of two classes, namely, the forces raised by the government of a colony, and the forces raised in a colony by direct order of His Majesty to serve as auxiliary to, and in fact to form part for the time being of, the regular forces. The first class of colonial forces—those raised by the Government of a colony—are only subject to the Army Act when so provided by the law of the colony and when serving with part of His Majesty's regular forces, and then only so far as the colonial law has not provided for their government and discipline, and subject to the exceptions specified in the general orders of the general officer commanding the forces with which they are serving. The Army Act, however, (s. 177), provides that the colonial law may extend to the forces, although beyond the limits of the colony where they are raised.

The second class of colonial forces—of which the West India regiment, the Royal Malta Artillery, the West African regiment, the non-Europeans of the Fortress Companies, Royal Engineers, at Hong Kong and Sierra Leone, and the Hong Kong Singapore battalion, Royal Garrison Artillery, are examples—is referred to by ss. 175 (4) and 176 (3) of the Army Act. Their pay and maintenance are voted annually by the Imperial Parliament, and they are in fact Imperial forces, although serving in a colony.

The section of the Army Act, section 177, which I am about to read is the section which I quoted to Lord Kitchener. It is the section which gives to Canada supreme control of her troops, not in Canada, as we have it here under the British North America Act, but in England and at the front:

The Army Act, Section 177, Page 539, provides:

Where any force of volunteers, or of militia, or any other force, is raised in India or in a colony, any law of India or the colony may extend to the officers, non-commissioned officers and men belonging to such force, whether within or without the limits of India or the colony; and any such law may apply, in relation to such force and to any officers, non-commissioned

officers, and men thereof, all or any of the provisions of this Act, subject to such adaptations, modifications and exceptions as may be specified in such law, and where so applied this Act shall have effect in relation to such force, subject to such adaptations, modifications and exceptions as aforesaid; and where any such force is serving with part of His Majesty's regular forces, then so far as the law of India or the colony has not provided for the government and discipline of such force, this Act and any other Act for the time being amending the same shall, subject to such exceptions and modifications as may be specified in the general orders of the general officer commanding His Majesty's forces with which such force is serving, apply to the officers, non-commissioned officers, and men of such force, in like manner.

This section shall not apply to any officer belonging to any such force when attached to or doing duty with, or to any non-commissioned officer or man belonging to any such force when attached to or otherwise acting as part of or with, any portion of the regular, reserve, or auxiliary forces in the United Kingdom.

Inasmuch as I have a number of paragraphs from the military law which are more or less lengthy and very technical, I would be very pleased if the House would excuse me from reading them and permit me to place them on Hansard.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Perhaps my hon. friend could state in a few words the effect of the sections which he is not going to read?

Sir SAM HUGHES: They are merely explanatory and declaratory. They are explanatory of sections 175 and 176 which refer to colonial troops paid by Britain. I am quoting them to show that Britain safeguards the colonies. Take for instance any colonial regiments raised and paid for by Britain; when in England they are absolutely under their own laws. They go as far as that in Britain to safeguard the interests of the colonies and to preserve their own self respect.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend might indicate the numbers of the paragraphs that he desires to put in.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Notes 2, 3, 4, and 5 refer to section 177.

Mr. SPEAKER: With the unanimous consent of the House it is permissible, according to custom, to place such statements on Hansard; if there is any objection, it cannot be done.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I desire to place on Hansard notes 2, 3, 4, and 5, relating to section 177, as follows:

(2) This section applies to what may be termed strictly colonial forces, that is to say, forces raised on the responsibility of the government of the colony. The amendments made by A. A. A., 1909 and 1912 are intended to make it clear that colonial legislatures can apply the whole of the Army Act, or any part of it, to the forces of the colony, subject to such adaptations as may be necessary to make them applicable.

(3) So long as such forces are within the colony their discipline can be provided for by the law of the colony. This section removes any doubts as to whether that law would apply to such forces when outside the limits of the colony.

(4) In order to prevent difficulties arising from deficiencies of the colonial law in cases where the colonial forces are serving with the regular forces, the section provides that such deficiencies may be remedied by the application of the Army Act, subject to any modification made by general orders of the general officer commanding the regular forces in question.

(5) "This section shall not apply", etc. The effect of this provision (added by A. A. A., 1909) is that where the Army Act applies to colonial forces serving with the regulars (see, for instance s. 175 (11) and s. 176 (8. A.), it will apply to them as if they were regulars.

Then there is an explanatory clause:

The last paragraph of section 177 beginning "this section shall not apply," etc., had also in view, when it was added, the control of bodies of militia or troops from the colonies visiting the United Kingdom.

My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition will remember this because it was passed when he was Prime Minister. He may remember that soldiers went over to Britain for athletic purposes, or to the Coronation, or for some other purpose, and they went around England in uniform without any control; and this clause was added: Then in regard to colonial forces, Class 2, not only are colonial forces, Class 1, under colonial law in any part of the world, but colonial forces, Class 2 are exempted from the Army Act where a Colonial Act is in existence applying thereto. Army Act, section 175, relating to officers, subsection 4, and section 176 relating to soldiers, subsection 3, are as follows:

Section 175, subsection 4, page 534:

(4) "All such persons not otherwise subject to military law as may be serving in the position of officers of any troops or portion of troops raised by order of His Majesty beyond the limits of the United Kingdom and of India, and serving under the command of any officer of the regular forces. Provided nothing in this Act shall affect the application to such persons of any Act passed by the legislature of a colony."

Section 176, subsection 3, page 536:

(3) "All non-commissioned officers and men serving in a force raised by order of His Majesty beyond the limits of the United Kingdom and of India, and serving under the command of an officer of the regular forces: Provided that nothing in this Act shall affect the application to such non-commissioned officers and men of any Act passed by the legislature of a colony."

Page 536, note 1, paragraph 4, section 175:

"This is not meant to include strictly colonial forces, but **only forces raised at the Imperial expense.**"

Subsection (8. A.), section 176, page 538:

"All non-commissioned officers and men belonging to a force raised in India or a colony when attached to or otherwise acting as part of or with any portion of the regular, reserve, or auxiliary forces in the United Kingdom."

Page 538, section 176, note 2, paragraph (3): "This is not intended to include strictly colonial forces, but only forces raised at the Imperial expense, whose maintenance is voted annually by Parliament. It might, however, no doubt extend to a force raised under a Colonial Act, but under the Imperial control. But strictly colonial forces are dealt with by section 177."

Now, Sir, I wish to take up the question of service under the Militia Act. At the time of the census of 1911 the male population of Canada between the ages of 18 years and 45 years, was 1,720,000. Married men in Canada of all ages numbered 1,332,000, and married men over 45 years of age numbered 650,000. The number of married men under 45 years of age was estimated at 682,000. Duduct from the total of 1,720,000 the 682,000 men, and you have 1,088,000 single men in Canada between 18 years of age and 45 years of age. The number already enrolled is 400,000, 100,000 married men and 300,000 single men. Therefore according to the census of seven years ago, there are 788,000 single men in Canada, who have not enlisted. We can apply the Militia Act and get for home training and defence, any number we like, say, 300,000 men. Then in the spring we could call for volunteers for overseas, and I am satisfied that there is not a district in Canada that would not furnish its quota. If we did not get enough volunteers for overseas we could send them under the law as militia, each district being credited with the men already enrolled therefrom. Here let me point out what I found in the course of my visits to Quebec. One gentleman would say: why should my sons go away to the front and perhaps be maimed for life if my neighbour does not allow his sons to go. There was one case of a gentleman who had four sons. They wanted to go, but he would not let them. He asked whether it was fair that he should let them go and run the chance of becoming maimed for life while the fellows who went into the munition factories remained at home and earned their $4, $5 and $6 a day. We are all human, and there is a good deal of logic in the position taken by that man. I am satisfied that you would meet the wishes of the great mass of people of the province of Quebec, as well as of every other part of the Dominion, by applying the Militia Act and by saying: "We will take so many men for home defence, and then when we want more soldiers to go overseas we will call for volunteers. If there are not enough, we will send them under the Militia Act." I am satisfied that these men would do their duty fearlessly and well.

The rule from time immemorial in Britain has been that the man becoming a soldier loses no rights of citizenship. On the contrary, special privileges have been conferred upon him as a soldier. I may point out that while in England last summer, the question arose as to the right of the soldiers of British Columbia to vote in the provincial election. Those I talked to were men high up; they were not underlings. I asked them what right they had to refuse permission to the soldiers of British Columbia to vote. I asked under what authority they meddled. I pointed out that the province of British Columbia was a self-governing province and that Canada was a self-governing country, and that if British Columbia wanted her soldiers to vote all she had to do was to notify the Prime Minister of Canada and he would arrange the matter through whatever diplomatic channel he chose. I quoted. also, that the rule from time immemorial in Britain was that the man, in becoming a soldier, loses no right of citizenship, but that on the contrary special privileges have been conferred upon him as such soldier. I fail to see why the soldier at the front should be disfranchised, while the slacker or the munition worker at home should exercise his franchise. The Home Government appoints the Governor General of Canada; Canada has the right of appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The command in chief of Canadian forces rests with His Majesty through the Governor General, which, of course, means through the Governor General in Council. Thus Canada has absolute control of her soldiers in Canada, in the United Kingdom, and at the front, subject to any general order of the Commander in Chief, but such order must be in conformity with the laws of Canada and subject thereto. Canada, therefore, has the absolute right to provide her own equipment, arms, ammunition, supplies, transport; in short, everything for her troops at the front. Further, the appointment and promotion of officers rests entirely with Canada for her troops in any part of the world. Any association with the War Office in any of these regards is merely a matter of convenience, courtesy, and for exchange

of ideas. The Canadian forces are in no sense British regulars. The wisdom and foresight of British statesmen and War Office officials in framing the Army Act and amendments thereto have left nothing unguarded in the interests of the colonies. Where the practice has differed from the law the fault lies with those concerned for not understanding, or, if understanding, for not applying the law. It was different in the case of the contingents we sent to South Africa. There Britain paid while Canada, as agent of Britain, enrolled. Now, Canada as Canada, not as an agent, enrolls, pays and controls. I am not casting that up as any reflection upon the ex-Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I may say here that the plan to be followed in relation to our Canadian troops was laid down by me with Lord Lansdowne two years before the South African war broke out. Lord Lansdowne has the plans which I laid down in the month of December, 1897, for colonial assistance before war broke out, and the Sydney Daily Telegraph, an Australian newspaper, on the occasion of my visit there in 1897, published a statement exactly bearing out the line of policy I had laid down.

I see some of my Liberal friends opposite looking as if they thought that I was finding fault. I am responsible for the plan that was carried out. In view of the opposition there was in Canada and in other parts of the world to the colonies serving for the Motherland, I thought the best plan would be at the start to let the troops be paid by Britain and thus one objection would be removed. I had taken the matter up previously with Lord Lansdowne and the identical plan that I proposed was the one that was carried out. Canada furnishes her own uniforms, weapons, equipment, hospitals, nurses, and doctors' staff, and yet, when I sent over the dentists, the first time the system had ever been introduced, they were thrown out by the medical service of Great Britain and attached to the British hospitals up and down the line; they would not have them. We put our foot down and finally, after a great deal of struggling, they were recognized. They were to have one dentist with every hospital. They were bound that the dentists should be under the control of the medical officers, and I was bound that they should not be. I did not see why a dentist who was over twenty-one years of age should not be allowed to pull a tooth without having to do it under the authority of a medical officer. I take the ground that it is none of the business of Great Britain if we chose to use wheel-barrows for our transport service at the front. We must take it for granted that we know our business and that Canada will have the best things that are going as we have the best things that are going, and that it is our privilege to say what is good and what is no good. In this connection the Prime Minister made a statement the other night and the ground which he took then is the ground which has been taken by others. In bringing this up I am not divulging any secret. Without actually quoting the right hon. gentleman, he said that wherever a committee of the British service examined goods and threw them out he was ready to abide by the decision of that committee. That, I think, is a fair interpretation of the right hon. gentleman's remarks.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Well, I did not just put it in that way.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I will quote—

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is immaterial.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I will quote what the right hon. gentleman said:

> On the other hand, I do not propose, I have not proposed in the past, and I do not propose in the future to set up my judgment or the judgment of this Government against the opinion of military experts who may say that it is necessary that the type of equipment, of transport, or of anything else necessary in this war ought to be uniform and that the war cannot be carried on effectively unless it is uniform.

That is the ground taken by the Prime Minister. I am not finding the slightest fault with his taking that ground, but it is not the ground I take. The halo had gone off a lot of these fellows so far as I was concerned long ago, and I did not see why the opinion of a young sprig of a captain about twenty-two years of age, who threw out our equipment should prevail as against the opinion of a young Canadian officer. I am not impressed with any man who shuts out any Canadian stuff, such, for instance, as our Canadian wagons. Our little Canadian two-horse wagons in South Africa would carry a heavier load than the British wagons with four teams, and we could out-distance and out-travel them. In the Northwest Rebellion the ordinary farm wagons which were used there travelled more miles up to their axles in mud than the heavy British wagons travelled on the good roads of France and Belgium. When our wagons went to Eng-

land they were thrown out by these young officers, yet, I may say that many of our trucks and wagons were running after many of those sent to the front from England were thrown out.

But, let us see for a moment how these inspections are made and what they amount to. Here is a letter that was addressed to me as Minister of Militia:

Hotel Cecil, London, W.C.,
March 15, 1915.

Major Genl. the Hon. Sam Hughes,
Minister of Militia and Defence,
Ottawa, Canada.

My dear General,

Re Motor Lorries:

The main fault that the Mechanical Transport Department of the War Office had to find with our Motor Lorries was the fact that we had five makes in use, three of which were being sent over to France, and which necessitated carrying over spare parts for all these various makes.

When I heard that everything else had been thrown out, I naturally raised Cain with my officers here and found that everything was all right.

As I advised you before, when our 1st Division were ready to go to France, the British Mechanical Transport Department supplied us with 51 motor lorries and 9 motor cars to make our equipment complete.

The motors they rejected cost us about $2,800 each, and they charged for the ones they gave us $5,241 apiece.

I have been endeavouring ever since I got back here to get details of these lorries and cars; these have just been received by me and I am more than astonished to find that six English makes of motor lorries were supplied to us as follows:—

Leyland	5
Halford	4
Wolseley	6
Daimler	9
Albion	7
Seabrooke	20

and two makes of motor cars as follows:

Sunbeam	9
Vauxhall	2

These people do beat me! They impressed on me in no uncertain terms that we must positively get down our makes of motor lorries to if possible two, as the question of taking spare parts to the Continent and keeping them in stock was a very serious one indeed, and here they are doing the very thing that we were instructed not to do and doing it to a much greater extent than we had ever dreamt of doing. These things are rather difficult for me to comprehend, and I intend to take the matter up with the War Office officially tomorrow, but do not expect that I shall receive any more satisfaction than usual.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd) John W. Carson.

So that the claim was all moonshine that we must have a uniform system in regard to the trucks because they themselves had nothing of the kind.

I take the stand that the soldiers who fought and won at St. Julien, Festubert, etc., are fit to furnish soldiers and officers for any service, and that we have inspectors in Canada who can determine what we shall have and what we shall not have. I did not know there were any people in the universe who would revive that old, exploded idea, but to show that there are such pre-historic people, I may say that the auditor general on his return recently brought back the old question which I explained last year, as to why our transport wagons and that sort of thing had been thrown out. I do not want to repeat what I have already said, but I may say that the objection to our wagons was based chiefly on the ground that they could not turn on the narrow roads of France. Why, Sir, the British wagon takes 35 feet of a circle in which to turn, while ours takes 31 feet 9 inches. That was put before the Government in May 1915, or earlier, and yet we find a British officer in our service here bringing it up again a short time ago. The thing is nonsense. Our wagon turns in 31 feet 9 inches, while theirs takes 35 feet and, as I have already pointed out, our wagon has proved better and has outlasted theirs. My stand is that Canada should decide as to what she herself shall use.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Before my hon. friend leaves that matter, could he say what was the value of the equipment which was thrown away?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I forget; it was millions. We did not look at the value; we were so busy swearing we had no time to figure up the value. Now, Mr. Speaker, my object in bringing this matter up is this: I am anxious that this Empire shall rest upon a stable foundation. I have given the best years of my life to advocating the cause of full partnership union. I have taken part in two wars for the Empire, and I am going to stand or fall by the rights of Canada under its Constitution.

In the first year of the war Canada had no say whatever. In the appointment of General Carson to go over there and represent me, I brought in my Order in Council. My idea was that he should represent the minister over there, and look after the soldiers' interests, and things of that kind, but he was only allowed to look after supplies. I am not blaming anybody; this is not a new thing. I had the same trouble in South Africa, where it was pointed out

that the British did the paying, and I did some very vigorous kicking at that time on the rights of Canadians. In this war we are doing the paying, the equipping and outfitting of our men, and the ground I take is not in the interests of Canada alone, but in the interests of the whole Empire, because unless we have a proper understanding things are going to go wrong. Why, at the very time I have been speaking of, when these motor trucks were being purchased, every man that came home invalided, and every letter from the front, talked of another Boston tea party. It went so far that some fellows on the staff drew lots as to who should punch the head of the officer who had been offensive to them. Can I be blamed for standing to the law? Carson was not to interfere in any way with the forces. The Pay Department was modelled after the British, and so was the medical service.

Now, my hon. friends opposite cannot make any political capital out of this, for it is the same with Grit and Tory alike. To-day, in Great Britain, you appoint a Canadian to an office and when a British officer comes along the Canadian kow-tows to him. That is the only fault I have to find with Canadians in Great Britain. They have not understood their individuality as Canadians, and have not stood up for their rights kindly and firmly. The only Canadian officer who has done it to the King's taste is Frank Meighen of Montreal. He has stood up for the rights of Canada under the law up to the hilt and he gets along better than any other officer in our force.

I am not going to enter into a discussion of the medical service to-day, but rest assured that when the time comes I shall have a hand in it, and it may be, up to the elbow. Last year when I was in the Old Country I found that under Colonel Jones' administration—and the Prime Minister will remember this—it took me three weeks to get from him a list of the hospitals scattered all over the country in which our men were being treated. I asked at the time why, when we were paying the expenses of our own men, they should be treated in V.A.D. hospitals away up in the north of England and other parts of the United Kingdom, and I asked why our good nurses with three years' training were being utilized for more than half their time looking after British soldiers. I asked why when we were paying seventy-five cents a day, we should have our fellows' brows smoothed and their hands held by nice little girls who had taken a six weeks' course in the St. John's Ambuance Corps or something like that. It was very congenial of course, but at the same time I think our boys would have liked to have their brows smoothed and their hands held by our own girls.

As to the command of the troops, I have recognized from the outset that in the field the troops should be, not that they legally are, under the command of a British officer. The general command of the troops is part of the law, and I have not sought to evade the law in the slightest degree. When it came to sending over the second division—and the Prime Minister disputed my statement the other night, that I had informed him in regard to this and I might here remind him that I showed him copies of my telegram to Lord Kitchener, and the Prime Minister drew my attention to the fact that in one of the telegrams my language was a little too strong. In other words, I received a gentle reprimand for my language in one of the telegrams.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not remember at the time. But I will look up the correspondence, and if there is any corection to be made, I shall gladly make it.

Sir SAM HUGHES: On March 20, 1915, we agreed that Steele should command, and I sent the following telegram to Kitchener:

> I purpose appointing Major General Sam Steele to command Second Overseas Canadian Division. He is splendid organizer and disciplinarian. Do you object?

Kitchener replied as follows:

> London, March 22, 1915.
>
> General Hughes,
> Minister of Militia,
> Ottawa.
>
> Reference to your telegram of twentieth March. I am sorry that in present state of warfare on the continent, it would not be possible to place General Steele in command of a division. Very experienced officers are necessary in such positions to do justice to the troops under their command.

That got me rather hot under the collar, because Steele had had a lot of these gentlemen under his command in South Africa. Some of the very best men at the front have been trained by Steele in South Africa. I am not saying that he has not his faults as an administrator, but as an organizer and trainer and commander of troops I think he would be hard to beat; and I always endeavoured to put these fellows where they would do the most good. I would not have dreamed of putting General Steele in a place of administration in comparison with some others, but I would put him in to command men. On March

29, 1915, I wired Lord Kitchener as follows:

Regret your views re Steele. Could he have done worse than at Salisbury?

I need not refer to Salisbury, where our men had to put in a winter of horror, and where the General Officer Commanding visited them only twice during the whole winter. The telegram reads:

Regret your views re Steele. Could he have done worse than at Salisbury? My opinion based on years of experience and observation in war and on manoeuvres convinces me Steele, and my brother, Colonel John Hughes, each has qualified for division as any officer in British service.—General Blank.

Then I named an officer whose name I will not repeat because he has not come to the front; he has not been heard of publicly. In other words, several names were suggested to me, and this was one of them. The telegram continues:

General Blank—seriously suggested from England. Believe I have fifty better. However, Steele could take division across and commander satisfactory to you could be named later. How would Lowther do?

Sam Hughes.

I was willing to meet him more than half way every time. On April 1, Kitchener replied as follows:

General Hughes,
Ottawa.

Your telegram of twenty-ninth. I have no objection to General Steele coming here in charge of contingent, if it is clearly understood by General Steele that when the contingent takes the field as a division, other arrangements for its command will have to be made.

Kitchener.

That got me rather hot under the collar, as if I was going to deceive Steele! So I sent the following reply, which the Prime Minister, very properly in his opinion, objected to:

Ottawa, April 7, 1915.

Earl Kitchener,
War Office,
London.

Am somewhat surprised at your 3833 cipher April 1st. Am not in habit of deceiving and Steele will certainly know exact situation. Am not dictating, merely reviewing. I know many of your major generals; some good and capable, but many absolutely reverse, far inferior for administration in office or capability in the field to Steele or a dozen other of my officers. Have calmly and loyally remained aloof from interference with Salisbury horror and disintegration of First Canadians, but please do not ask that too much be borne. Claim no authority to manage force in field but under Army Act, Canada has absolute authority in respect to appointments. Further, offensiveness and contemptuousness of some army officers in First Division became almost intolerable. I look to you to see that courtesy, even-handed justice and fair play are accorded to all my deserving officers.

Sam Hughes.

A good many hon. gentlemen have insisted that I should clear up matters with regard to contracting for supplies. My plan at the beginning of the war, so far as Canadian purchases are concerned, was that the director of contracts—incidentally he is a cousin of the Prime Minister—together with capable business men should have control of the purchasing for the Canadian forces, and that it should be done by public tender or universal service, and that supplies for Great Britain and the Allies should also be managed by the director of contracts. The first buying done for Canada was on the above lines and the results were splendid, except in the case of the trucks and bicycles purchased through the friend of the Minister of Finance. The second plan of purchasing that was adopted was purchasing through a sub-committee of the Privy Council. When I was in England in 1914, they prepared jointly the Orders in Council I do not know how they ever did it, for I tried it once myself. However, that plan gave place to another one, where the minister on the recommendation of the Quartermaster General and D.O.C. sent in an order in council, which was referred to a sub-committee of the Privy Council. This resulted in failure and delays, and gave place to the War Purchasing Commission under the Hon. Mr. Kemp, which I need not say was a much better system, although I think the plan I had at the very beginning of having the buying done by the director of contracts was still better. The War Purchasing Commission amounts practically to the same thing and its work has been very well done.

The fourth system of buying was by the War Purchasing Commission, using the Quartermaster General and the Director of Contracts to help them. The first subcommittee of the Privy Council ran the buying on the basis of patronage. Next the British commission was appointed, and then the War Purchasing Commission and the Munitions Board.

In regard to munitions, I may say that I do not hear the words "Shell Committee" mentioned now. To the Shell Committee and to your humble servant in inaugurating that committee, is due the financial success that Canada enjoys to-day, and to them and

their kindred operations is due the fact that the Minister of Finance can tell the banking institutions of this country that he wants so much money, and as their vaults are filled with it they can hand it out as required. Let us not forget the Shell Committee. The Imperial Munitions Board is a nice name, but I like the old Shell Committee, and I like the men that ran it. It was well run; it kept this country from bankruptcy, and it has helped to bring about a condition of affairs that this country will be thankful for for many a long year. The munitions were handled in the first instance by the Shell Committee, and afterwards by the Imperial Munitions Board.

I may say that a good deal of the trouble concerning all this matter has been raised by Mr. T. A. Russell, the chosen friend of the Minister of Finance and of the Chairman of the Imperial Munitions Board. He has consulted the right hon. leader of the Opposition; he has posted him, and he has written letters to the Prime Minister of Canada finding fault with the old Shell Committee, thus creating an unhealthy atmosphere.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend is utterly wrong as to Mr. Russell consulting me. I never saw Mr. Russell.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Will the right hon. leader of the Opposition let me inform him that not only did Mr. Russell consult him, but Mr. Russell handed him correspondence to put in the Toronto Globe.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Not to me.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Oh, but I know it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I accept, of course, the statement of my right hon. friend, but I can prove what I say.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member knows that the rule is very clear as to the acceptance of statements made by hon. members.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Our memories sometimes become defective. I was sorry to see the Prime Minister forget two or three things the other night and I am sorry that the leader of the Opposition is forgetting this now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend is absolutely misinformed. I never received any communication from Mr. Russell.

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

Sir SAM HUGHES: I would not dream of charging the leader of the Opposition with equivocation. Will he say that Mr. Russell did not put into his hands an article for publication in the Toronto Globe, and ask him to have it published?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Not Mr. Russell, another gentleman did, not Mr. Russell.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Well, the article was prepared by Mr. Russell.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That I do not know.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do know.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The article in question never went from me to the Globe. I kept it in my archives.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I thought it was thrown out and picked up in the waste-paper basket. The reason I am bringing up this matter is to show that all this agitation against the old Shell Committee was for the purpose of getting rid of it. Letters were written by Mr. Russell to War Office officers and shortly afterwards we find Mr. Thomas coming out here with the intention of not spending one dollar in Canada on munitions. He made a speech in Montreal—I am out of the Government now and I will talk a little—stating that Canadian prices were high. I trimmed him the next day and in twenty-four hours thereafter Mr. Thomas was recalled and Mr. Hichens and Mr. Brand were sent out here to look after the munitions, and steps were taken by which Canada received orders for munitions. All the time Mr. Russell was playing the game against the Shell Committee. Soon after the new Munitions Board was appointed, Mr. Russell secured a contract for one million fuses and the Northern Electric Company of Montreal secured a similar contract, but the price at which Mr. Russell got the contract was $339,000 more than the price given to the Montreal firm for the same fuse. Call it what you like. Mr. Russell is now employed by the Imperial Munitions Board.

I wrote a letter to the Prime Minister on May 13, 1915, and I presume there is no objection to my reading it. The faults complained in it have been rectified by the War Purchasing Commission, and I think it is in justice to myself that I should place it on record to show the life we had to lead in the Militia Department:

May 13, 1915.

Dear Sir Robert,

Since my return from England last November, I have repeatedly notified you that owing to the interference and plans of the "so-called" sub-committee and to the repeated hold-ups and needless obstructions of some of my colleagues in the affairs of this department, the Contract branch has been very much hampered and practically blockaded; delays have been very prolonged; the cost has been greatly enhanced and the goods supplied have been, in many cases, inferior. Indeed, the most ardent agents of the German Government could scarcely have been more successful in holding up the proper equipment of our forces, had they been in control.

As one of many specific examples. Take the trucks for the Second Division. They should have been ready last December, they are not ready yet. Some of my colleagues constituted themselves champions of this or that truck and brought about delays whereby untried trucks would be purchased; high prices would be paid in commissions to agents, and the Government, and the country would be treated practically as a retailer. My policy, as you may remember, in this and in all other matters, was to force dealers to give the Government wholesale, or manufacturers' rates.

At the present time there are upwards of one hundred requisitions that have long been in. The quartermaster general has over and over and over again, until his heart has grown sick, brought them before me, they have been promptly passed on to the director of contracts, and the great majority of them, when passed on to the Privy Council, have been held up in Council, or by the Treasury Board, laid aside or sent back—but always delayed; while the director of contracts and his officers have unceasingly been interfered with, delayed, and given endless and unnecessary work by the sub-committee.

I saw, by an article in the Free Press, that it is current everywhere among the soldiers and officers, that they are short of nearly every class of equipment and supplies. In fact, three times recently I have been severely reproached about shortages in supplies and equipment, by outsiders who had learned of these shortages from soldiers and officers of the force.

Further, to my surprise, I was spoken to in Montreal this week, and informed that our Medical units going over were only half equipped, while many of our combatant units are not properly outfitted.

In addition to the serious aspect of the case and from the viewpoint of the efficiency of our soldiers, there is the disheartening side. It is not only unfair to the gallant boys, who are giving and willingly risking their lives for the cause, and making domestic sacrifices, but it is absolutely unjust to me and my officers.

Therefore, as Minister of Militia, I must respectfully enter my protest, as I have frequently before entered it, at the interference and delays caused in all these things. It tends, not only to the injury and inefficiency of our soldiers, thus jeopardizing the success of British arms, but it must politically reflect seriously upon the Government.

It is charged that the sub-committee have given contracts for soldiers' clothing to be made by jobbers, who sublet them and never entered a stitch themselves. Women's linen underwear, women's blouse makers, women's corset makers and truss makers, have all been among these contractors.

We believe, we are in a position in this department to truthfully say that there never was such a volume of business so successfully and economically transacted, or under such an efficient system of purchase and inspection, as had been developed by us up to the time when I went to Europe, and when the sub-committee took control.

I may say that at that time I did not know of this truck and bicycle question. (Reading):

I feel very fortunate in having under me officers, both civil and military, in all the leading departments, in whom I can place absolute trust. They have done nobly, under very adverse surroundings, and I can conceive of no plan by which the work could have been more honestly, economically and effectively done, than was ours.

I regret to have to submit these facts once more, but in justice both to myself, as well as to the splendid, gallant soldiers we are endeavouring to equip for the front, I must ask your serious consideration of these matters.

I have but one desire, the upbuilding of Canada, the Empire and humanity.

Let me hope that you will regard this letter as written with due respect to myself, to my country, to you, as my leader, and in justice to our soldiers.

Faithfully,
(Sgd.) Sam Hughes.

The matter was taken up very shortly afterwards by the War Purchasing Commission, and the decks were cleared.

I am charged with having been autocratic. I ask any one to point to an instance where I overstepped my rights as Minister of Militia or as Officer Commanding the forces. I wish to point out further that there is nothing in law or custom, of the Constitution or in the Army Act, which prevents or forbids one regularly in authority from doing any of the following things:

1. Requiring officers to make themselves fit, active, energetic, temperate, courteous and proficient. Hon. gentlemen may rest assured that every officer, no matter who he was, or where he came from, was made just as fit as it was possible to make him.

2. Making railway and steamboat lines handle troops properly. We had to ginger the companies up a little bit; it was a question of moving, not of sitting down in armchairs. All the railway companies got together, and we showed them what they had to do. They did it splendidly, but they had to be driven.

3. Requiring contractors to fulfil their contracts properly. I did not support anybody, friend or foe, who failed to carry out his contract properly.

4. Failing to take orders on this, that or any other subject from every person constituting himself an autocrat. Thousands

of people were telling me how to do things —and I was foolish enough to follow my own lines.

5. Seeing that all ranks do not make of war an occasion for pink tea training, and that they do not turn the force into a society institution. One of the very serious complaints made against me was that I used the bands of the two permanent forces at Valcartier for the entertainment of the soldiers rather than have them entertain a lot of women who came from around the country, annoying the fellows and taking them from their work by their pink tea performances every afternoon.

6. Taking precautions that promotions and appointments are made on the basis of merit, fitness, and capability, not through social, aristocratic, society, or other irregular influences. The army that went from Canada was a democratic army, and second to none in the world.

I have a few suggestions to make. I have talked this matter over with Mr. Lloyd George, Generals Robertson, Whigham, MacDonough, MacCready, Sir Reginald Brade, Sir Douglas Haig, and every officer of standing at the front. Last year our boys were without rest for nine months, being always within sound of the bursting shells at the front. Human flesh and blood cannot stand that, and I decided that we would put six divisions at the front instead of four. The men in the supporting trenches and reserve positions are always within reach of the shells, always within sound of the guns. I was going to form two corps, and have six —possibly eight—divisions there, so that the fifth would support the first and second, and the sixth would support the other two. These divisions would be out of range of the guns part of the time until their turn came for duty in the front trenches. They would be moved up by battalions, regiments or brigades, so that the men would be gradually trained, while one-third of our boys would be resting all the time. This plan met with the hearty approval of everybody. I am making these suggestions because I want to follow positive lines. I am anxious that the war shall be successfully prosecuted; I am not after scalps—they will come quick enough.

I would promote General Byng; that would get rid of one obstacle which is in the way. He is a very good fellow; he is in command of our Canadian corps. You cannot throw men like him out; he is just as good as some of the others who command armies.

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

I did take the liberty of suggesting to Sir Douglas Haig and General Robertson that they ought to put General Byng in command of an army, so that our boys would still be under him—but in the army.

5 p.m. I have no hesitation in suggesting that General Currie, a prudent and efficient officer, should be in command of one of these new corps, and that some other Canadian should be put in command of the other. General Turner has seen fit to take up a side-show job in London. It is none of my funeral that he has gone over there; he will regret it all the rest of his days. There would, then, be at least six divisions, with Canadians in command and on the staff at the front. At the present time many of the staff positions are held by persons other than Canadians. At the outbreak of the war Great Britain had about 160,000 soldiers, who were in charge of a very insufficient staff. To-day she has about 5,000,000, and, strange to say, the small staff in charge has been swelled and stretched out so that it holds all the key positions, not only in Kitchener's Army, but in the Canadian army as well.

By some mischance an Order in Council was drafted during the absence of the Prime Minister and myself last year, and passed after my return, but also in my absence, giving absolute command at the front to General Alderson, who should have had no more to say in the matter than this ink bottle on my desk. That is the time that all these important appointments were made. These matters should be taken over by the Canadian Government; these appointments should be under our control.

Under the suggestion that I have outlined, we would have 18 brigades commanded by Canadians—and we have plenty of the finest boys that have ever faced an enemy. As I have pointed out, under this arrangement new troops would be broken in gradually, and two divisions would always be at rest. Except for the command, the forces would be directly under the authority of the Canadian Government.

I have no hesitation in saying, as I have said to the Prime Minister on other occasions, that there is no use for such an office as that of Overseas Minister of Militia. It should be abolished because it is purely ornamental, and will cost Canada about $3,000,000 a year. Poor old General Carson and Colonel Murphy had about 30 officers assisting them, at comparatively small cost —but I am told that there are six or seven hundred around the place now, and the Lord

knows how many more there will be before the war is over. My aim has been to attain the greatest possible efficiency with the least possible cost, friction and trouble. I always tried to have these questions settled as quietly as I could, but, chiefly because of the newspaper show on the other side, inspired, I assume, from Canada, there was always that little tittle-tattle creating friction and doing harm. But, in spite of all that, the boys got on well.

I should like to say a word on the subject of recruiting. When the war broke out my plan was this: The Prime Minister offered a contingent; it was decided that it should be a division. I had a telegram prepared which was sent to every officer in the Dominion of Canada, as well as to the district officers commanding, the moment that our offer of assistance to the cause of the Empire had been accepted. The result was that the boys got into harness the next day; whereas if we had proceeded in the ordinary way it would have taken two or three weeks to get them together. The system worked well, and 33,000 men prepared to embark within six weeks of the acceptance of our offer. Our troops having gone over, we proceeded to raise battalions in large centres. The next year, when we found that our task was to be even greater, I inaugurated a system of recruiting, and I challenge the world to show anything to equal it. I divided the country into areas of about 40,000 men each; in other words, we took one large riding or two small ridings as a general basis and gave a battalion to each centre. We allowed recruiting in every hamlet, village, town and city, in accordance with the number they could raise. Twenty-five was the minimum. And let me say there never was such a system of recruiting so successfully carried out in the history of the world. We raised 160,000 men in practically no time. Finding that we were still going to be about 80,000 short of the offer made by the Prime Minister—on his own responsibility—I doubled up the divisions. That is, I took areas of 80,000 to 100,000, and I apportioned battalions to a great many of these. But here another hindrance stepped in. I do not know whether it was in the interest of munition workers or not, but I stand here to say that I look on all this talk of munition workers as piffle, compared with the need of men at the front, piffle of the worst kind—this kind of piffle of considering men getting $7 a day in munition works as compared with a man in the trenches, running the risk of being blown to pieces. It is piffle, and the commonest sort of piffle.

An order in council was passed forbidding the Department of Militia from authorizing a battalion here, there or elsewhere, and it is said that the reason was that too many battalions were being raised in Toronto, Winnipeg, Montreal and other large cities.

Mr. MACDONALD: When was that order in council passed?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am not sure. It was passed in my absence anyway, you may be sure of that; I have never read it yet. The point is that they said: Here you must not have so many regiments recruiting in Toronto or so many recruiting in Montreal.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think what my hon. friend says might be misunderstood. There was not an order in council passed saying that no further battalions should be recruited, but that no further battalions should be recruited without an order in council.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The object being to prevent two or three being raised in Toronto or Montreal, for instance.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Too many being raised in one place.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Toronto has a population of 600,000. Toronto should have fifteen regiments recruiting at once; but it never had more than three. Montreal, with a population of 750,000, should have had about eighteen or twenty battalions recruiting at once. Montreal never had more than three. I do not see why my county, which has turned out nearly 5,000 men, should have one battalion being raised there with 40,000 people while Toronto should have only three with 500,000. I never could see the logic of it, and I do not now. I think that Toronto should have at least fifteen battalions going on while the counties of Ontario, Peterborough and my own county, with about 40,000 each, should be raising about one battalion each.

Mr. MACDONALD: What was the result of that order in council? What effect did it have on recruiting?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not know. Recruiting has not gone on, I know that. The Minister of Public Works wanted three battalions in Winnipeg—he was not afraid of it, and I passed the order. That was when I happened to learn that this order in council to which I have referred had geen

passed. I went to England and when I got back he had not yet started raising the battalion; authority had not been given; it was held up in the Treasury Board or some place and nothing had yet been done. Had I been running the show in the old way we would have had them raised in six weeks. We raised the troops for Valcartier in that time, and we would have got them in the same way. In other words, three months was lost, not in organizing the battalions, but in getting the power to organize them. I am not criticising, only there seems to be a desire to play to the gallery in connection with these munition workers. There was a drop in recruiting at all events. I have heard all sorts of stories, but I have never asked my officers. When I came back my officers made certain statements; they had been directed to go slow in recruiting, but I never asked; I do not know whether it is true or not.

However, seeing the falling off, seeing the need of straining every nerve we could strain at the front, when I came back I set to work to try and get the pulse of the boys. I have always been in favour of universal service, training the boys. I did not deem conscription necessary, and it was not. I could have raised 500,000 men by voluntary enlistment. I could have raised 600,000 by voluntary enlistment without any trouble, I believe. That is only a statement; but I believe I could have done it. However, this order in council stopping the authorization of regiments was passed, and the talk came on from every hand—I presume paid for by German agents—against taking men from munition works, when we have 800,000 single men between the ages of 18 and 45 in Canada, single men not doing their duty in any way except in jobs where others could take their places.

On October 17 I wrote to the Prime Minister stating that I had come to the conclusion that we must resort to compulsory service. I take the ground to-day, I have no hesitation in telling my hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin) that I would not be afraid to go into Dorchester or any other county in Quebec, to meet the intelligent electors in that county; and I am sure that they would endorse the stand I take in favour of applying the Militia Act to secure men for the army. They must know that nothing stands between them and Von Hindenburg except the British Navy. And if 50 ships of war with transports should go down, what stands between Great Britain and Von Hindenburg? If the German navy ever overbears the British, then Von Hindenburg can march to Ottawa without hindrance; and then I suppose these gentlemen who have opposed our men being trained would take to the woods and leave their wives and children.

I come now to the business end of the war, and I trust not to detain you much longer. Early in the war Lord Kitchener asked for certain things. We appointed the Shell Committee, made up of General Bertram, the Carnegie Brothers, Colonel Cantley and Colonel Watts. We made shells. Canada, I see by recent statements, has received directly and indirectly upwards of $750,000,000 from shells and munitions, and the country generally, as the result of that, has been prosperous. The use of basic instead of acid steel in the manufacture of shells was introduced, and billions of pounds —not millions—but billions of pounds of basic steel, made in Canada, have been used in place of acid steel which we would have had to import from the United States. That was done through the action of Colonel Cantley and your humble servant in the premises; and, I make no bones about it. We claim the credit, the Shell Committee and your humble servant claim the credit of introducing good times into Canada through the Shell Committee and munitions work. Bankers would not lend a dollar at that time; they were very adverse to lending money for the purpose. The manufacture of tri-nitrotoluol was introduced into Canada, as was also that of gun-cotton, acetone from the distilleries, and other materials necessary for the production of munitions. Copper was refined in Canada for the first time. Zinc also was refined, and on the first order for zinc the British Government saved $4,000,000 owing to the difference between our price, 15 cents, and the American price, 42 cents. Hundreds of thousands of tons of lead were produced in Canada, and steps have been taken for the manufacture of nickel. Then the fish industry in Canada has been greatly stimulated and expanded. We have no conception of the value of the stimulus that has been given to the fishing industry. It is estimated that $100,000,000 a year can easily be brought into Canada through the supplying of Canadian fish to the soldiers of Canada, Great Britain and France. I am informed that the French Government—and I took this matter up direct with the French Minister of War and the Minister of Munitions—has now placed a contract for fish in Canada, and that delivery of these fish will

start very soon. I took the matter up with the British Government in connection with the supply of fish for their soldiers, and the British Government, as well as the Canadian Government, is giving large orders for these fish. Then we had plans laid for the development of our timber trade with the Motherland, and also for agricultural products and manufactures. Why should we not supply munitions? We are supplying men, why not munitions too?

Mr. PUGSLEY: There is a point in regard to which I should like some information, because I think it is important. My hon. friend, in one of his letters to the Prime Minister, as quoted upon page 62 of Hansard, refers to the organization in England, and he makes the statement that it is now proposed to go back to the old conditions as at the end of the first five months of the war, which my hon. friend states he is sure would produce a chaotic condition of affairs. Has the hon. gentleman any information as to what the result of that has been in England?

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is a question of hearsay, and I am not going to butt in. I have my own views and data, but I have no official authority.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend in one of his letters makes the statement:

> As you are aware, it took us four months in the midst of this great war to fight through the principles of purchasing, for the Second Division, trucks at the lowest wholesale prices.

When was it that the four months were lost?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I read a long letter —was my hon. friend not listening?—showing that the motor trucks should have reached England in December.

Mr. MACDONALD: Do I understand my hon. friend to say that that is what he refers to in the letter which he addressed to the Prime Minister in regard to the delays in purchasing?

Sir SAM HUGHES: It is distinctly stated in that letter that those trucks should have been ready in December, and they were not ready in May.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That letter was not in the correspondence published.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It is not.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would like to see it.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It is on Hansard. I am asked to back the Tory Government and party. Yes, I will gladly back the Tory Government and the Tory party—I have done so for a good many years—but the platform must be broader than "keep Laurier and the Grits out," and action must be something different from epileptic utterances and theories re the labour wanted at home and the National Service Commission. I will back any party whose interests are the best for the welfare of our soldiers and the energetic, active, successful prosecution of the war to a victorious conclusion at any cost. There are in Canada millions of mothers, fathers, sisters and children of the 300,000 boys across the water who are wondering what Canada is doing to support these lads in every legitimate way. Canada wants another 100,000 men, maybe 300,000. They can be raised. They must be raised. Less than half a hundred battleships and their consorts of the British navy stand between Germany and sea supremacy. The right hon. the leader of the Opposition hopes for victory through famine and exhaustion; others for victory along similar lines, but should famine and exhaustion fail to materialize, and should by any mischance disaster befall Britain's navy, then there is nothing between Von Hindenburg and Ottawa, and we will have to take to the woods. Let me point out that the German papers are proclaiming that even Canada is getting near the famine stage. People are talking about compulsory thrift and that sort of bugaboo. That is published in Germany, and Germany thinks that Canada with all her resources, and with the United States at her door, is exhausted. It is the same in England with those agitations about food and meatless days. They are all published in Germany, and the German people are wondering if Britain is not on the verge of a food shortage.

Let us not live in a fool's paradise. This thing is serious, and must be treated seriously, not by theorizing but by energetic action. I have no dread of Quebec province and compulsory service. In my heart I feel that should the Militia Act be applied, our compatriots of Quebec province, following their wish for an even-handed compulsory service, will not merely be enthusiastic in volunteering, but be found to respond loyally and well. I have one aim above all others, the winning of this war; but the winning of this war will never be accomplished by theorizing; it can only

be accomplished by action, action, and still more energetic action.

Hon. Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, it had not been my intention to participate in this debate upon the Address, but the ex-Minister of Militia, (Sir Sam Hughes) has made some remarks regarding myself and his relationship to the Government of which he was a member, which seem to call for a reply on my part. At the outset of his remarks he read some letters. I do not understand him to claim the opinions expressed in his correspondence as his own, but I was struck with the political wisdom of these letters. We have heard of the letters of Chesterfield, and it seems to me that the advice which was given to the ex-minister in these letters contained more political wisdom than even the letters of Chesterfield.

In one of these letters, reference is made to intrigue on my part against the ex-Minister of Militia, who was my colleague for so many years. There are some things, Mr. Speaker, which a gentleman will not discuss, and one is his own honour. I believe I have the confidence of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House and I believe that I have the confidence of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. Outside of the ex-Minister of Militia I do not believe that any one in this House is of the opinion that I am capable of intriguing against any one, much less a colleague. I say further that if the ex-Minister of Militia believes—and I really do not believe that he believes—that I intrigued or conspired against him, all I have to say is that the strain of the last two years has impaired the powers of what was once a very strong mind. The ex-Minister of Militia referred in the letter which he read to the House, to the Montreal Daily Mail, and to its attitude towards him. He stated that the president of the Montreal Daily Mail is my half brother. That is correct. Mr. Nichols is my half brother. His profession is that of journalism. He is president and manager of the Montreal Daily Mail, but I have no interest in the Montreal Daily Mail. I do not even know the shareholders of that paper, and if my brother, in pursuance of his judgment and discretion as editor in chief, or as president, of the Montreal Daily Mail, attacked the ex-Minister of Militia, it certainly was not at my instigation, but was, I have no doubt, in pursuance of what he believed to be his duty to the public whom he is serving to the best of his ability, as I am in the position which I have the honour to occupy.

The hon. ex-Minister of Militia also referred to the Toronto Evening Telegram. He says that I had a connection with the Toronto Evening Telegram. So I had, thirty years ago, from twenty-five to thirty years ago, to be accurate. The ex-Minister of Militia has not, I think, read very carefully the Toronto Evening Telegram during the last five years, because I do not believe that there is any public man who has come more frequently under the animadversion of the editor of the Evening Telegram than myself. I was connected with the Toronto Evening Telegram for many years, and I desire to say to the ex-Minister of Militia, and to the House, that there is no man outside of the proprietor who controls that paper. The Toronto Evening Telegram is an absolutely straight, independent paper, and if the action of a public man is such that the Evening Telegram can approve of that action it will approve. If the action of a public man is, in the opinion of the editor or the proprietor of the Evening Telegram, such as to call for criticism, criticism will be passed upon that public man. So far as concerns any attacks which have been made on the ex-Minister of Militia by the Montreal Mail, or by the Toronto Evening Telegram, I have had absolutely nothing whatever to do with them and I have no responsibility for them and never had.

My hon. friend has dealt with his relationship with the Government. He was my colleague for five years and I always gave him a generous measure of support in regard to his policy and his plans for the improvement and development of the Canadian militia in which, in common with him, I have always had a just pride. Not only that, but I always regarded the ex-Minister of Militia as a gallant soldier and a true patriot and I regard him so to-day. I do not believe that the ex-Minister of Militia has been quite fair to me but I believe he has been misled. I am going to be scrupulously fair to him and any statements I make here will be made in that spirit. My hon. friend has stated that he was on some occasions brought into conflict with me because I took the view that I should exercise supervision over the estimates of every department. In a certain degree that is true. That is the duty of the Finance Minister. The Finance Minister, more than any other minister, is responsible to the public for seeing that ex-

penditures are kept within reasonable bounds. That must be so for two reasons. In the first place, he is the minister who is most likely to know what the revenue of the country will probably be, and, secondly, he knows what are the resources available by way of borrowing to the government of the day. The result is that he occupies a rather unique position towards his colleagues. Every Minister of Finance has taken the position that he is charged with a special responsibility as to the matter of expenditure. I do not believe that I was singular in that regard. I remember that, some three years ago when, on my initiative, it was determined that instead of the Estimates being considered by Council as a whole, they should, for convenience, for the saving of time, and for their better consideration, be brought first before the Treasury Board, the ex-Minister of Militia did not readily fall in with that idea. He did not desire to come to the Treasury Board. Well, I said: The main thing is not to come to the Treasury Board; the main thing is to get these Estimates right and if the mountain will not come to Mahomet, Mahomet will go to the mountain. The ex-minister will recollect that instead of his coming to see me in my office, I went to see him in his, he received me, with that courtesy and cordiality which have always characterized him and we got the Estimates in a condition which was entirely satisfactory to both of us. I always gave the ex-Minister of Militia good support, loyal support, generous support, in connection with his policy for the improvement of the Canadian Militia and it is not a question of my word against his word although I would not expect him to deny that. The Estimates for 1912, 1913, and 1914, show that what I am stating is correct. The ex-Minister of Militia had my support in regard to his plans for inaugurating a cadet service, he had my support towards the purchase of rifle ranges throughout Canada, he had my support for the establishment of training areas and the Estimates of 1912, 1913 and 1914 will show that what I state to-day is correct.

When the war broke out all the members of the Government, including the ex-Minister of Militia and myself, were in entire accord with the policy of the Prime Minister, that Canada should prosecute this war to the very utmost of her ability. That was the policy of the Prime Minister, that was the policy of the ex-Minister of Militia, that was the policy of the Minister of Finance and of every other member of the Government without any exception whatsoever. The policy that we have followed from that day to this has been to prosecute this war to the utmost of the power of Canada, and our actions have been such as to attract the admiration of the world outside of this House of Commons. No one believed at the time that the war would last so long or attain the magnitude that it has since attained, but the intention of the Government from the first has been to leave nothing undone which could assist in the great cause.

The ex-Minister of Militia assembled some 30,000 or 35,000 men at Valcartier. He did it in record time. I always gave him credit for it and I give him credit for it to-day. It was a great achievement on the part of the ex-minister, an achievement which will stand out in times that are to come—to assemble these men from all parts of Canada within a few weeks, organize them, equip them, give them preliminary training and send them overseas. It was not only of great assistance at the time from a military standpoint but as a matter of fact it drew attention to the Dominion of Canada throughout the world. It was a great national achievement on the part of Canada. In that organization and at that time the ex-Minister of Militia had the support of every one of his colleagues from the Prime Minister down. He said very truly that this Government, unlike the Government that was in power a few years ago, did not fight like blazes amongst themselves.

Mr. PUGSLEY: He says that he himself swore.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I did not understand him to say that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: **Yes.**

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The ex-Minister of Militia got generous and loyal support —and I am sure he will say it here to-day —from every one of his colleagues in connection with sending forward the first contingent. Why, the ex-Minister of Militia and myself were on such good terms that he actually—and I regard this as an evidence not only of esteem but almost of admiration—offered to make me an honorary colonel. But, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say that I was obliged to decline because I felt that I had not the necessary military qualifications. So that, upon the matter of policy in regard to the Militia Department before the outbreak of the war, and in regard to the prosecution of the war after the war broke out, the ex-Minister of Militia

and myself and all the members of the Government, as far as I know, always saw eye to eye and did everything we could to assist in winning the war. Occasionally we had differences as to methods. Temperamental differences sometimes exist. The minister might desire to do things in one way and I might think that these things should be done in another way. Particularly did those differences arise with regard to the matter of expenditures under the War Appropriation Act of 1914. Hon. gentlemen will recall that a special session of Parliament was summoned in August, 1914, and Parliament, without a dissenting voice, voted the sum of $50,000,000 in a War Appropriation Act. There was this difference between that vote and the vote for the ordinary estimates: the vote for the ordinary estimates sets out the amount that shall be expended in respect of the separate services, but this vote was a lump sum. It was proper that it should be voted that way. Parliament reposed a great deal of confidence in the Government that was to expend that $50,000,000, but nevertheless provided as a safeguard that the money, and this is the express wording of the Act, should be " expended by or under the authority of the Governor in Council." We all realize that in the hurry of getting the first contingent away we could not stand too strictly on legality. The ex-Minister of Militia went ahead, through his director of contracts and other officers of his department, and gave orders for equipment, and was never interfered with.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Might I point out that not only was he not interfered with, but he had the direct sanction of the Prime Minister of Canada.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Not only was he not interfered with, but he had the direct sanction of the Prime Minister of Canada, and he was not interfered with either by the Finance Minister or any other colleague in connection with the equipping of the first contingent. The question of the expenditure of the $50,000,000 voted by the Parliament of Canada was first raised, so far as I am concerned, about the 20th of August, 1914. It was drawn to my attention that large expenditures were being made from this $50,000,000 vote, and that in all cases competitive tenders were not called for.

Mr. MURPHY: Was that in 1914?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is 1914 that I am speaking of. On August 27, 1914, I wrote the following letter to the Prime Minister, and I intend to place it on Hansard, because I want the ex-Minister of Militia to understand the position I have taken, and I think when he knows the facts he will commend the position I took:—

Ottawa, August 27, 1914.

Military and Naval Expenditures.

My dear Sir Robert,—As instructed by you I have asked my deputy to convene this afternoon a meeting of the chief officials of my department of the Militia and Marine Departments and the auditor general for the purpose of considering the question of the procedure to be adopted, in order that the public interest may be protected on the one hand and no necessary delay occur on the other, in connection with the authorization and audit of expenditure under the provisions of the Act appropriating a war credit of fifty million dollars.

Under this legislation it is clearly provided that no expenditure shall be made save under the general or special authority of the Governor in Council. It is apparent therefore that all contracts of every kind—for transport, munitions of war, food, clothing and other supplies —must be sanctioned by order in council. Personally I realize that in the emergency which so suddenly confronted us on the outbreak of the war prompt action had to be taken by the Militia Department, which evidently proceeded to give orders for supplies and let contracts in accordance with the custom of the past. This custom should, however, no longer be followed because of the very large amounts involved and the necessity for the Government seeing to it that large contracts should only be awarded after tenders have been called for and duly considered. Any other method of procedure can only result in improvident contracts with great waste of money to the national loss and the enrichment of individuals. What I am contending for is that the vast expenditure which we must make for military and naval defence be authorized by Council in the usual way before it is entered upon. The statute expressly provides for this and the auditor general will not be able to certify payments unless its terms are strictly complied with. What I have to suggest is this:

(1) A complete list of contracts and expenditure already entered into and made to be laid before Council for ratification.

(2) All future contracts and expenditure to be entered into and made only after Council has passed the necessary orders (general or special) under the authority of the Act.

No delay of any consequence can possibly arise in carrying out my second suggestion. The ministers are all here and likely to be here for many months to come and we are holding Council meetings once or twice daily.

If the course I have indicated is not adopted expenditures amounting to almost one-fourth of the total annual outlay of the Dominion will be made by the officials of the two departments in question, notwithstanding that responsibility for such expenditure devolves upon all members of the Government individually and collectively.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) W. T. White.

What was the motive that actuated me in sending that letter? My motive was to pro-

tect the treasury of Canada, and in my present position I conceive that to be my duty. On January 11, 1915, I addressed the following letter to the Prime Minister:—

Ottawa, January 11, 1915.

My dear Sir Robert,—During the past few days I have been outlining my budget speech, and have consequently been examining carefully into our financial situation. Frankly, on account of the huge expenditure of the war and our uncontrollable expenditure upon capital account for railways and public works, I have become exceedingly apprehensive as to our finances for the coming year. It may be necessary for us to consider the shutting down of some of our larger works, but I hope this may not occur, as it is an object to us all to continue to afford as much employment as possible. So far as our war expenditure is concerned the fact that we can obtain the money readily from the British Government should not blind us to the fact that it has to be repaid, and that in the meantime interest is running upon it. Our borrowing under this heading to the end of March will amount to sixty million dollars, upon which interest charges next year will be two and a half million dollars. If we borrow one hundred million dollars next year, the interest charge will be four million dollars, which added to the two and a half millions referred to will make a total fixed interest charge of six and a half million dollars. The additions will of course go on as long as the war lasts. I am only drawing this to your attention to show how rapidly our fixed interest charges will mount up. When we issue our Canadian war loan to repay the British Government, an even higher rate of interest will have to be paid, because our credit is not so good as that of the Imperial Government.

As you know I have been strongly desirous from the beginning that we should put forth every effort to bear our share in the burden of the war notwithstanding the expense involved. What I desire to ask now is that you will give particular attention to the matter of saving unnecessary expenditures in connection with the administration of the Militia Department during the war. No doubt a great deal of such expenditure is inevitable, but it appears to me that everything that might be considered as an extra and not really required for the equipment or substantial comfort of our troops should be omitted. Suggestions will no doubt be continually brought to our attention for the purchase of accoutrements or equipment or for other expenditure which might fairly be regarded as useful, but at the same time not indispensable.

I could mention certain equipment of that character if I so desired.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think the Minister ought to do that.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I would respectfully ask the Finance Minister to do so.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: What I had in mind when I wrote that was a shovel.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I was mighty well aware what the hon. gentleman had in his mind.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The letter continues:—

All items of this kind should be scrutinized most carefully. I do not care to take the matter up with the Minister of Militia myself, but would suggest that you do so in view of the foregoing grave financial situation which I have drawn to your attention. I have been doing my best with the estimates, but notwithstanding all our efforts they are bound to be exceedingly large.

Yours faithfully,

W. T. White.

I now come to the month of June of last year. The ex-Minister of Militia has criticised the appointment of an Overseas Minister of Militia as unnecessary. In that I do not agree with him. I propose to read to the House certain letters which will show clearly my views with regard to the necessity, as I regard it, of the appointment of an overseas minister. When I say necessity, I mean necessity from a financial standpoint, the necessity of safeguarding the enormous expenditures of the Dominion which have been and are being made in Great Britain:

Ottawa, June 23, 1916.

Dear Sir Robert,—

On account of the immense volume of business now being transacted by the Militia Department both in Canada and in England and the magnitude of the expenditure involved, it has occurred to me that it would be in the interests of the Government to appoint some outstanding firm of chartered accountants for the purpose of advising respecting the administrative system of the Militia Department both here and abroad and upon the matter of safeguards upon expenditure such as auditing, etc. I understand that Hon. Mr. Kemp employed the firm of Price, Waterhouse & Company with good results in establishing the excellent business system of the War Purchasing Commission. The Imperial Munitions Board has also engaged firms of auditors for the same purpose. Firms such as Price, Waterhouse & Company, Touche, Niven & Company, and Marwick, Mitchell, Peat & Company have organizations in Canada and England and would no doubt be glad to undertake such duties as I have outlined at a reasonable rate of remuneration, although the question of price for services of such importance is really of secondary character. If the idea generally commends itself to you I would suggest that you discuss it with the Paymaster General and other officers of the Militia Department. In my view nothing but good could result from such action on our part and it would I think meet with the approval of Parliament and the country.

On July 27, 1916, I directed another letter to the Prime Minister:

Ottawa, July 27, 1916.

Dear Sir Robert,—

While Sir George Perley is here I think we should consider carefully the question of our war expenditures in England. From a statement presented to me this morning by the

Dominion accountant it appears there are large outstanding liabilities and unadjusted accounts running into the millions. Personally I feel that there should be some further check upon the expenditures. No doubt the officers in charge have been doing their best, but with the responsibility of their actions devolving upon us here I feel there should be a closer connection and a more rigid supervision than has prevailed in the past.

On August 30, 1916, I directed a further letter to the Prime Minister:

Dear Sir Robert,—

I am somewhat concerned over the fact that the Governor in Council exercised no control, except through officials, over our growing military expenditures in Great Britain. We must have one hundred thousand men there and we are borrowing from the British Government for military expenditures at least a million pounds a month or sixty million dollars per year. A considerable part of this sum is of course for pay, but I am satisfied that there are large expenditures for supplies and equipment. This expenditure should undoubtedly be subject to authorization by or on behalf of the Governor General in Council. As it is not practicable for the Government to deal with such expenditures here I think we should appoint a commission somewhat like the War Purchasing Commission, whose authorization would be required before any contract for supplies or equipment is entered into or any expenditure made for construction or other purposes.

That I may say was my first idea of overcoming the difficulty which we had in checking and safeguarding our war expenditures in England.

If this is not done there will be opportunity for irregularities which will undoubtedly be taken advantage of; in fact rumours of irregularities have reached me from time to time recently. My idea is that this commission should be directly responsible to the Governor in Council and should have at its head Sir George Perley, acting high commissioner. With such a commission we would have every confidence that this large expenditure was being made properly and that waste would be practically eliminated.

There is another suggestion which I have to make, namely, that a firm of chartered accountants, such as Price, Waterhouse & Company, or Marwick, Mitchell & Company, should be engaged to audit all our accounts in Great Britain. When it is considered that our expenditures there are equal to the entire expenditure made by Canada only a few years ago, the necessity for the closest possible check is apparent. Such an audit should not only cover future transactions but past expenditures also in order that we may be assured of the regularity of the transactions which have already taken place. My view is that the auditor general should also have a representative in England as I do not believe his office here can properly audit expenditures made abroad.

As the question of expenditure so closely concerns my department I had intended making a submission to council embodying the above suggestion, but upon reflection it appeared to me that any submission should be made by yourself. I hope you will take the matter up at an early date as I am frankly anxious about the situation.

[Sir W. T. White.]

This is the letter I submit of a minister of the Crown who is desirous of safeguarding the money of the people of Canada, and throwing all proper checks around expenditures in Great Britain. It was at my suggestion that the auditor general went to England during the past year for the purpose of looking into the situation and, if he found it necessary or desirable, of establishing a branch of his department in Great Britain. I submit that my course in that regard was proper from every standpoint, and I have no apology whatever to make for it. It was the sound and proper course. The auditor general went over to England, and with him and Sir George Perley we looked into the question of the expenditure of the pay office and the organization there, and I am glad to say that I came back very much reassured as to the situation in Great Britain. The administration in Great Britain has, on the whole, been an honest one. The officials there have, as a general rule, done excellent work, having regard to the difficulties with which they had to contend.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I did not know that the Minister of Finance had all this data here. I had intended to touch on this very aspect of the case. At the first the financial situation on the other side could not have been more rotten than it was, but I changed that in the year 1914-15. I appointed Mr. Dowie in charge of remodelling the pay office in Great Britain; I afterwards strengthened it by sending across Mr. Ross, an expert accountant of Montreal, and I could have told the hon. Minister of Finance, if he had asked me, that he would find things there better than in the city of Ottawa.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am not at all clear as to that; but I am quite clear as to this, that if we are spending sixty or eighty million dollars in Great Britain, we cannot surround that expenditure with too many safeguards.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is the hon. Minister of Finance not aware that almost every dollar of that money spent in England is statutory expenditure?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: A great deal of it is for pay, but a great deal of it is expenditure otherwise. Let my hon. friend make no mistake about that. The position I take in that letter is a sound course and one that will commend itself to every member of this House.

On October 6, 1916, I wrote another letter to the Prime Minister with regard to

the appointment of a Minister of Overseas Services. I produce the letter because I do not believe that the ex-Minister of Militia knows my true attitude with regard to that appointment. I believe he has been misled with regard to my attitude.

Mr. MACDONALD: By whom?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It might be by some of his good friends on the other side. I do not know.

On October 6, 1916, I wrote this letter to the Prime Minister:

Ottawa, October 6, 1916.

Dear Sir Robert,

On August 30 I wrote you stating that I was concerned over the fact that the Governor in Council exercises no control except through officials over our growing military expenditures in Great Britain. This expenditure will soon reach an amount equal to the total annual expenditure of Canada ten years ago. After giving the matter my best consideration I am of the opinion that the time has arrived when we should have a Minister of Overseas Services who will have direct supervision and control over all our expenditures abroad and be responsible therefor in the same way as a minister here is responsible for the administration of his department. No system of administration through officials will be satisfactory, as the principle of responsibility to Parliament and the people will be lacking and grave irregularities are bound to arise for which the Government and every member thereof will be accountable. For myself I feel that the matter is vital and that I cannot assume responsibility for the acts of officials not under the immediate supervision and control of a member of the Government. In my view it is not possible for a minister here to exercise the necessary degree of supervision and control over officials carrying out such extensive and constantly increasing operations as are involved in our transactions in Great Britain. I feel that it is particularly my duty to call your attention to this subject and to express to you the opinion which I hold respecting it, as the Department of Finance is more immediately concerned and has probably, in the eyes of the public, a higher degree of responsibility for the effectual control and safeguarding of our expenditures than any other department of the Government. I commend these representations to your most earnest consideration.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the minister read the answers to any of those letters?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There are no answers. I sent them to the Prime Minister, and no replies came to hand, except, possibly, acknowledgements. It was perfectly clear to all of us—not only to me as Minister of Finance, but to the Prime Minister and to the Government as a whole—that the time had arrived when, on account of our great expenditures, of the enormous forces that we had in Great Britain and of the necessity for co-ordinating the services in Great Britain and on the Continent, a Minister of Overseas services had to be appointed. No man, I care not who he is, could administer from Ottawa military affairs three thousand miles away, and involving as much expenditure as the whole Parliament of Canada administered ten years ago. No minister could do it successfully and as it should be done, having regard to the necessity for safeguarding the public interest. I say further that if I had been Minister of Militia, I should have insisted upon the appointment of an Overseas Minister of Militia; so that I have pretty clear views as to the necessity for taking that course.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Why not appoint an Overseas Minister of Finance?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Because the situation does not demand it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is finance we are dealing with.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I beg my hon. friend's pardon. So far as general finances are concerned, the work over there has not been very greatly increased; it is the expenditure in connection with the military situation that has increased.

My hon. friend has animadverted to the appointment of an Overseas Minister; he has been disposed to criticise it. Well, if I read correctly the correspondence, he was willing that an Overseas Minister should be appointed. He wanted Sir Max Aitken to be appointed.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Never.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The correspondence seems to indicate that. If the hon. gentleman, however, says that I am wrong, I shall be glad to withdraw my remark at once.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The hon. gentleman can read the English language; that is all I have to say. There was nothing of the kind in the correspondence.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The hon. gentleman made a reference to me; if he does not wish me to say anything, I shall have to sit down.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Go on.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I have been using Sir Max Aitken as an intermediary—a gentleman who is capable of carrying out any job that is handed over to him, unlike the other gentleman who was put in there. My suggestion was not that Sir Max Aitken should be a Minister of the Crown, but that

he should have rank or title to give him authority.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: As Minister of Finance I consider it my peculiar duty to the citizens and taxpayers of Canada to safeguard our expenditures both here and in Great Britain to the utmost possible extent, and upon these letters that I have read to the House I may rest my case before this Parliament or before any body of citizens in Canada.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (resuming): Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I had placed before it certain letters which I had addressed to the Prime Minister, during the years 1914, 1915 and 1916, with respect to safeguarding the war expenditure of the Dominion. I may say that in the suggestions which I made to the Prime Minister I had always his entire support and the support of my colleagues. The letter of August 27, 1914, which I read first, referred to instructions received from the Prime Minister himself; and the suggestions which were made to the Prime Minister in the letter of August 27, 1914, were acted upon. That is to say, all orders which had been given without the express authority of the Governor in Council, on account of the necessity for haste in getting forward the first contingent, were ratified by order in council, and all subsequent orders were sanctioned by the Governor in Council before being given. Those letters embodied the principles which have actuated myself, as Minister of Finance, and actuated the Government since the outbreak of this war. I spoke in one of the letters of the matter of equipment. I stated that, having regard to the large expenditures which the Government was making and to the general financial position, it was advisable, in my opinion, that all purchases of equipment, unless clearly indispensable, should be scrutinized closely. Now, I do not mean to suggest for one moment that the then Minister of Militia was bringing forward or was about to bring forward any proposals for the purchase of equipment which he did not regard as desirable. On the contrary, I believe this, that in the case of no belligerent in this war or in any other war has there been less waste in the administration of the war than there has been in connection with the administration of this Government since the war broke out. War makes demands upon governments and governments must act quickly. The real question is whether the Government has acted, on the whole, with good judgment and in good faith. The ex-Minister of Militia brought forward many proposals for equipment, always in good faith. Patents were placed before him. The minister, pressed with the multitudinous duties of his office, came forward with what he thought might be of use for the purpose of protecting the lives of our soldiers at the front or giving them greater efficiency in their work at the front. So I say, with regard to this matter of equipment which I touched upon in one of the letters, I was not suggesting for a moment that any equipment had been purchased, or was likely to be purchased, that was not, in the opinion of the minister, necessary or advisable. What I was contending for was that all things that were not clearly indispensable should be scrutinized closely. I think it is only fair to the ex-Minister of Militia that I should make that explanation. I repeat that if you take all the nations that are engaged in this war, and have regard to the scale of their operations, the mode of purchase, the administrative acts which have been taken, their financial operations, having regard also to the proportion which must be observed between their operations and ours, in my belief there has been less waste in connection with the administration of the Militia Department and this Government of Canada than in connection with the administration of any other belligerent in the world. I say that not only with regard to the present war but in regard to any war of the past. I say it has been possible because the Prime Minister and all the ministers of this Government, including the ex-Minister of Militia, while we have been desirous of doing our whole duty, doing everything possible to carry on this war, we have at the same time been desirous of eliminating waste so far as possible and carrying on the war in such a way that our finances would stand the strain; because this war had not been long under way before it was apparent to most of us that it would be a long war, that it would probably be determined on the principle of attrition, by the exhaustion of the combatants, and that it

was necessary to preserve, so far as possible, our credit and our resources. Apart from that, making large demands as we have been upon the tax payers of the country, borrowing heavily from the patriotism of the people, it is desirable in a large degree that the utmost economy should be exercised, having regard always to the exigencies of the war.

I have spoken briefly with regard to the office of Overseas Minister. Some reflection has been cast upon Sir George Perley, who is not in the House. I have been desirous for a long time of paying what I regard as a much merited tribute to Sir George Perley. Sir George Perley went over to England in 1914 intending to stay as acting high commissioner for a few months only. But war broke out, and at great inconvenience to himself, because he lives here, and his interests are here, he remained at his post. I wish to say that the services of Sir George Perley in the office of acting high commissioner since the war broke out have been, in my judgment, simply invaluable to Canada. I do not think that anyone in this House, outside the members of the Government, have any idea of the extent of the negotiations that have taken place between the Government of this country and the Government of the United Kingdom since the outbreak of war, of the cabling which necessarily takes place, of the financial and other transactions which have been carried out through the mediation of Sir George Perley. I was gratified in the highest degree, but not surprised—because I knew the man—to find the high standing which Sir George Perley enjoys in official, financial and other circles in London. I make bold to say that no representative, either of this Dominion or of any of the overseas Dominions, ever enjoyed a higher standing than that enjoyed by Sir George Perley as acting high commissioner of Canada in London.

Reference has been made also to General Turner. I was in England during the month of November, and it was during that month that the retirement of the Minister of Militia occurred. Sir George Perley consulted with me a good deal about the situation existing in Great Britain. He reached the conclusion, I think soundly, that a commander in chief was needed in Great Britain with an adjutant general, quartermaster general, inspector general, and other officers of a general staff. It was necessary, not only from the standpoint of the efficiency of the Canadian forces in the United Kingdom, but, in our judgment, and in the judgment of the Government, in order that the work of the forces in the United Kingdom and on the Continent might be properly co-ordinated. The problem over there is to train the contingents that are sent from here, first in England, and, after they have been trained sufficien'ly, to send them forward to reinforce the men at the front. Reinforcements have been required on a scale undreamt of at the outbreak of the war, because the casualties have been so heavy, and if there is anything that appears clearly to me it is that, having regard to the extent of the forces in Great Britain and on the Continent at the present time, it is desirable that there should be a staff with a commander in chief, a man who knows the situation in Great Britain and on the continent, and who will assist in coordinating the British situation with the continental situation. That is precisely what the commander in chief, who has been appointed in Great Britain, will help to do. In selecting that man, regard was had to the troops at the front, and, so far as I know, no more popular appointment could possibly have been made, no better man could possibly have been appointed than General Turner. I was surprised and delighted on my visit to the front in talking with the brigadiers and colonels to find the high esteem in which every divisional commander was held by all the men at the front—General Turner, General Currie and General Lipsett. I was delighted to find the high esteem in which they were held by all the officers and men with whom I had the privilege of talking while I was there. General Turner is a man who won the Victoria Cross. He is a man of the highest standing, and is beloved by his division, and, as far as I could ascertain, by all the other commanders, brigadiers and officers in France; and, so far as I am concerned, I have no hesitation in saying that I do not believe that any better appointment could have been made. General Turner was not desirous of leaving the front. Let me make that plain. Nothing but a letter from the Prime Minister of this country asking him to accept the position, which was deemed of great importance, the position of commander in chief in Great Britain, induced him to leave the front. I think it is only fair to General Turner, as a gallant officer and a man who would much rather have remained at the front than have returned to England to assume the duties, and important duties they are, of commander in chief of the Canadian forces in Great Britain, that that explanation should be made in this House.

This afternoon the ex-Minister of Militia made a statement, which I am sorry to say reflected upon myself, with respect to Mr. T. A. Russell's connection with the purchase of motor transport. The ex-Minister of Militia stated that Mr. T. A. Russell had been recommended to him by me for the purpose of purchasing the motor transport. This statement is absolutely incorrect. I did not recommend Mr. Russell to the ex-Minister of Militia for the purpose of purchasing the transport for the first division. If the ex-Minister of Militia had asked me whether I would recommend Mr. T. A. Russell for the position, I would have said without any hesitation that I would, because I believe him to be a thoroughly honourable and capable man. But, as a matter of fact, I did not recommend him. As I understand it, Mr. Russell came to Ottawa to try to get an order for the Russell Motor Company, of which he was the managing director. The minister desired the transport quickly for the first contingent, and he said to Mr. Russell: I want you to buy the motor transport; you have three weeks in which to do it; and, as I understand it, Mr. Russell did the work in three weeks. Unless I am mistaken, that was the evidence given before the Public Accounts Committee.

Sir SAM HUGHES: By whom?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: By Mr. Russell.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Will the hon. gentleman allow me to make a correction? I had several names before me, and I remember I took the matter up in the presence of the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister. I knew that Russell had been recommended. A number of the heads of the departments had been looking for men, and I stated that Russell had been recommended. The Minister of Finance said, "An A1 man," or words to that effect, and the Prime Minister also said he was a very good man.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I only wish to say that the memory of the ex-Minister of Militia is not clear. If he had asked whether I would recommend Mr. Russell, I would unhesitatingly have said that I would; and if to-day I were asked if I would recommend him, I would say without hesitation that he is as good a man as we could get, a capable man, an honourable man. I stand by that. The reflection that has been made upon me is that for some reason of interest to myself I recommended Mr. Russell, and that Mr. Russell's company made a profit upon the purchase of the transport. I repeat that I did not recommend Mr. Russell, and I did not know of Mr. Russell's appointment until after it had been made. But after he was appointed, I decidedly said that Mr. Russell was a good man. If the matter were left there, if there was no other evidence upon this point, the position would be that the ex-Minister of Militia says the Minister of Finance recommended Mr. Russell. Mr. Russell, according to his statement, made a profit for the Russell Motor Company and the Minister of Finance was a friend of Mr. Russell. It was stated further that the Minister of Finance had some transactions with Mr. Russell in connection with the Cycle Motor Company. I desire to say that I never had a business transaction with Mr. Russell in my life, not to the extent of one copper.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Were you not connected with the Canada Cycle Motor Company?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The company of which I was general manager acted as transfer agents for the Cycle Motor Company. If any body wanted to transfer shares of the stock he came into the office of the National Trust Company and transferred, in the books, of the company the shares of the Cycle Motor Company. We had scores, if not hundreds, of transfer agencies and I do not know of any trust company that has not transfer agencies. Mr. Russell is connected with the Cycle Motor Company, as I understand. I never had a dollar's worth of interest in the Russell Motor Company. I want to say further, because I want to clear this thing up—I believe in clearing the air—that when I became Minister of Finance I proceeded to sell out every security of every kind whatsoever that I had in Canada because I did not want any one to be in the position of saying that the Minister of Finance is interested in this industry or in that industry, or in this company or in that company. That may be quixotic but I want to make that statement; it is true. Just to clear this up a little more——

Mr. GRAHAM: I wish we had all sold about that time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: We should have all sold out just about the time this Government came in.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If my hon. friend will look at the quotations on the stock exchanges to-day, and I have no doubt he is fully posted on them——

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is owing to the war.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If he will look at the quotations, I think he will find a degree of prosperity that this country has never had before.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is what they call war bride stocks.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Now, one word on another matter referred to by the ex-Minister of Militia, because I do not think he wants to be unfair to me. After the transports had been bought for the first contingent, it was brought to the attention of my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) that a commission had been paid in connection with the purchase of transport to a firm in Ottawa on a sale by the Ottawa Car Company of certain transport. It was alleged that Mr. Russell had bought this transport and the implication was that he had been a party to the paying of a commission. We did not know the circumstances under which that commission was paid. Mr. Russell having concluded his work in purchasing the transports for the first contingent, I had given to him, as I had given to scores of business men in Canada, a letter of introduction to Sir George Perley because he was going over to England to see if he could sell some transports to the British Government. I heard that Mr. Russell had been appointed a purchasing agent for the British Government. I had every confidence in Mr. Russell but nevertheless, as soon as I heard the suggestion that a commission had been paid which might have been improperly paid in connection with the purchase of transports from the Ottawa Car Company, I sent this cable to Sir George Perley:

Ascertain and cable whether T. A. Russell whom I introduced to you has been appointed as purchasing agent for British Government as reported here. Sorry to state there has been grave criticism of his buying for Militia Department here. If he is purchasing for War Office ask him to see you and show him this cable. Important.

I got a cablegram back from Sir George Perley, in which he said that:—

Have seen Russell who says he has not been appointed purchasing agent for British Government except that he arranged through another firm to buy in United States some goods for War Office about which he wrote fully to Doctor Reid but which for war reasons ought not be generally known. I am writing you some particulars by to-day's mail. Russell has also been asked by War Office report on some large machines when he returns home early in December.

The letter to Doctor Reid refers only to matters of customs. When Mr. Russell came back from England I asked him to come to Ottawa and we held a Treasury Board meeting, at which the Solicitor General was present. We asked him for an explanation of the commission of the sale by the Ottawa Car Company. He gave a full, direct and entirely satisfactory explanation and I wrote to Sir George Perley as follows:—

Ottawa, January 5, 1915.

Personal.

My dear Sir George,—At my request Mr. T. A. Russell, to whom I gave a letter of introduction to you some time ago, appeared to-day before the Treasury Board with reference to purchase for the Militia Department of transport necessary for the first contingent. In view of my cable to you I think it only proper to say that Mr. Russell's explanations were not only entirely satisfactory to the members of the Committee but such as to entitle him to the thanks of the Government for the untiring intelligence and zeal displayed by him in arranging for the purchase within a period of twenty days of the entire transportation equipment of the first contingent. There has been much ill-founded criticism by interested parties but we are all satisfied that Mr. Russell's conduct throughout has been wholly exemplary. He had a most difficult task to perform and carried it out, in my judgment at least, with very great ability. As Mr. Griffith saw the cable which I sent you I shall be glad if you will acquaint him with the contents of this letter.

With kind regards.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) W. T. White.

Hon. Sir George Perley,
London.

That looks as if I were interested in Mr. Russell making commissions for the Russell Motor Company. If the ex-Minister of Militia, in view of the correspondence and of the statement I have made, believes it, all I have to say is that I am sorry for him.

Before six o'clock I stated that I understood the ex-minister had been willing that an overseas minister should be appointed, provided that the minister was Sir Max Aitken. I accepted the statement that the ex-minister made, that that was not his intention, but the statement made in his letter of October 26, 1916, which possibly has been before the House, is this:—

But I will be more than proud to support the proposition, with all my heart and all my power, if you fill in the name of Sir Max Aitken. It is a question of the man and not the office.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Read the next letter.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Which one?

Sir SAM HUGHES: The hon. gentleman must know that if there is one letter there

must be others. Read the next letter. Be fair.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Very well; but, however, I accept the explanation of my hon. friend and I am quite willing to take his statement that he was opposed to the appointment of an overseas minister of militia. I think I have cleared up nearly all the matters touched upon by the ex-Minister of Militia except the question of delay in the purchase of transports. My own recollection in regard to it, although, as a matter of fact, I had very little to do with it, is that there was some delay as to whether Kelly-Springfield or some other truck was the better truck. But my recollection is that the ex-Minister of Militia appointed a committee for the purpose of determining that, and whatever delays took place were delays inseparable from making a decision on the very important subject of motor transportation. That is all I desire to say upon that.

There are one or two observations I desire to make upon the general debate. I do not propose to generalize, but I am sorry, and I think many members of this House are sorry, as well as many people of this country, that in some respects this debate has degenerated into a petty political controversy. I have no desire to generalize, I say, because it would be unfair. Some notable speeches, some serious speeches, some earnest speeches have been made, but it seems to me that there has been a lot of idle talk about patronage and appointments and Nationalists. Here we are in the midst of the greatest war in the world, a war in which we are engaged as belligerents; the flower of our youth at the front; others of our sons in the United Kingdom ready to go to the front, and thousands in Canada ready to cross the seas. We are at the very crucial period of the war—the third and probably the decisive year, the year in which the greatest battles in the history of the world will be fought, the year in which the greatest strain will be imposed upon the belligerents, the year of defeat or of victory, and yet in this House some of us are talking about patronage, appointments, and Nationalists, and assailing the Government for trying to make capital out of the war.

Mr. PUGSLEY: For making political capital out of the war, not for trying to.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There has been a good deal of talk about lack of leadership, and slackness in carrying on the war, but I say, and history will confirm what I say, that there is absolutely no room for national self-depreciation. Canada, and the Government of Canada, have played a great and noble part in this great war. Take your minds back two-and-a-half years ago, when the ex-Minister of Militia was assembling his troops at Valcartier. I gave him credit for that this afternoon, and I give him credit now. It was a great achievement. Let any man in this House or in this country ask himself what he would have thought at that time if it had been suggested to him that this country, peace-loving Canada, unprepared for war, composed of mixed races, diverse nationalities, a heterogeneous population of eight million, scattered over a territory as large as Europe, as large as the United States of America, would in two-and-a-half years, recruit, organize, equip, and train an army of 425,000 men. The only people who belittle that achievement are partisans. The organization of this great army has commanded the admiration of the world. Go to New York; what do they think about it there? Go to London; what do they think about it there? They never hear of it without greeting it with cheers. What room is there for national self-depreciation? What room is there for criticism of this Government in connection with the raising of an army of 425,000 men under the conditions I have mentioned? It is wonderful. There is not a man here, I do not care what his imagination, that could have forecasted it or would have believed it possible.

What about finance? Canada, a borrowing country before the war, a country that had never made a single loan of more than six million pounds, and borrowing in London a million dollars a day, or three hundred million a year, for the Dominion Government, Provincial Governments, railways and other companies, borrowing in Great Britain principally, and also in the United States, Canada was suddenly confronted with the war, and the dislocation of business that it caused. From the very beginning, so far as it has been possible to me, and so far as it has been possible to this Government, we have aimed to maintain financial and industrial and commercial stability. We have aimed to maintain confidence, and confidence lies at the very root of prosperity, and the prosperity of this country to-day is the best evidence of the confidence

we have succeeded in maintaining in this country. Six months dislocation of business at the outbreak of the war. And yet what have we succeeded in doing? The hon. member for Pictou, (Mr. Macdonald) is worrying as to who is to get the credit. We never stopped to consider who was to get the credit. This is not a boys' school. Sufficient for us if the thing is done. The main thing is to get the big things done and that is what the Prime Minister has been doing, and what his ministers have been doing. We have not worried about who is to get the credit.

I have spoken of the effect on the world of the raising of an army of 425,000 men in Canada. Let me speak now of the effect on the world of what Canada has done in a financial way. Canada was a borrowing country before the war. A loan had never been made in Canada, except perhaps a little currency loan thirty or forty years ago. What have we done since the outbreak of the war, and by "we" I mean the people of Canada. I always give the credit to the people of Canada. The Government are the instruments; we take the initiative; choose the time for the loan; see that market conditions are favourable, and the people do the rest. I do not care whether you call it leadership or not. All I want is results, and we get the results. What have the results been? In 1915 we asked the people of Canada for $50,000,000, and they gave us $100,000,000. Last November we asked the people of Canada for $100,000,000, and they offered us $200,000,000. Canada has financed her war expenditure on this side of the Atlantic since the outbreak of the war and that in itself is a notable achievement, but that is only the beginning of what she has done. What else has she done in a financial way? The Dominion of Canada has advanced $150,000,000 to the Imperial Treasury to purchase munitions on this side of the Atlantic, and in addition to that, we have arranged for a credit of $100,000,000 from the chartered banks of Canada, making a total of $250,000,000, which we have placed to the credit of the Imperial Government for the purpose of purchasing munitions in this Dominion. Is not that an achievement? Consider the prosperity of this country to-day. There are high prices, of course, for agricultural and other products. But what of the munitions output, so large a portion of our exports? The prosperity of the country is related to agriculture and our other productions and to the production of munitions.

Now, I am going to give the ex-Minister of Militia a good deal of credit in connection with the establishment of the Shell Committee. He and I sometimes differ, but we always differ in an open way. The ex-minister deserves credit for originating the idea. An idea may be developed, but the man who originates it deserves a great part of the credit. The ex-Minister of Militia believed in the industries of this country and he started the Shell Committee, and I give him credit for starting it; but at the same time do not let us altogether lose sight of the fact that the financing of it has had something to do with the result. An exchange situation exists to-day, by reason of the fact that Great Britain is importing so much from this continent, by reason of the fact that the exchanges have partially broken down, under which Great Britain can purchase munitions on this side of the Atlantic only if she can raise money with which to pay for them on this side of the Atlantic. That statement is absolutely true; in fact, it falls short of a full statement, because she not only has to borrow, on this side of the Atlantic, all the money required to pay for her enormous purchases on this side of the Atlantic, but she actually has to borrow money on this side of the Atlantic to support the exchange, so that it is a fact that Great Britain can not purchase in Canada unless Great Britain is financed in Canada. Finance lies at the basis of Great Britain's purchases in Canada just as finance lies at the basis of Great Britain's purchases in the United States. What does that mean? That means that the $250,000,000 that we provided for the Imperial Government has meant that she was able to give the orders for munitions in Canada during the past twelve or fifteen months. No leadership! I do not care whether you call it leadership or not. What would leadership be under those circumstances? Would it do more than provide the $250,000,000 or $300,000,000? If there is anything more that leadership would do, I would like my hon. friend the member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) or any one else to tell me. No leadership! No one would have dreamed of such a thing happening. Ask any financial man in Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, or any other place you like, if two or three years ago he would have believed the Dominion of Canada would pay her own war expenditures, amounting as it does to the tremendous sum of $1,000,000 a day, and would, in addition to that, have been able to provide $250,000,000 for the Imperial Government for purchasing

in Canada. He would have laughed at you. Is there any room for national self-depreciation? Has there been no leadership? The prosperity of this country is to-day abounding. There is no belligerent country in anything like the condition in which we are, financially, commercially or industrially. Not a man who will work is out of work in this country to-day; wages are higher than they have ever been, and yet it is said that there is no leadership. Our hon. friends opposite accused us of lack of leadership. I cannot help but think of the story that is told of Abraham Lincoln and General Grant. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who is fond of history, the other night accused the Prime Minister of indecision.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Amongst other things.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is a great admirer of Abraham Lincoln. Let us bear in mind what has been accomplished. We have recruited 425,000 men; we have financed ourselves and Great Britain, and let us also remember the prosperity that exists in this country to-day. And yet my right hon. friend says that the Prime Minister is guilty of indecision. Abraham Lincoln appointed General Grant as Commander in Chief of the forces of the United States. Grant had some enemies who sent word to Lincoln: "He drinks!" Lincoln replied: "What brand of whisky does he use? I want it for my other generals." If that brand of leadership has produced that magnificent result, why, lack of leadership would not be a bad thing for the Prime Ministers of Canada from this time forth, to say nothing of those in the past, such as my right hon. friend. My right hon. friend has an imagination. Let me appeal to it. Years ago we used to talk of the total trade of Canada as being $500,000,000. The year before the war the total trade of Canada, exports and imports, amounted to $1,000,000,000, and we congratulated ourselves upon the fact. It was wonderful that the total trade of Canada should be one-fifth of the total trade of Great Britain. Canada was coming on. For the first six months of the year just past the total trade of Canada exceeded $1,000,000,000, which was the high-water mark for the year preceding the war, and this year we shall have a total trade of over $2,000,000,000. And yet my hon. friends say there is no leadership. Of course, being modest men, we give the credit to the public. If my right hon. friend had found a condition like it he would take the credit for the party. We say that under our administration the favour of Providence, and the energy and intelligence and patriotism of the Canadian people, all these things have been accomplished.

In 1912, 1913 and 1914 the balance of trade was against us, $300,000,000, $200,000,000 and $140,000,000, and there has been a balance of trade against us for many years past. This year, however, there will be a balance of trade of probably three or four hundred million dollars in our favour. Yet, my hon. friends say there is no leadership. Well, if no leadership gives such magnificent results as that there is a good deal to be said for it. Now, I am not particular whether we get the credit or not. After all, this is not a boys' school.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It looks like it.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It does sometimes, when I look at the other side of the House, not only a boys' school, but when I hear some of the followers of my right hon. friend speak I think it is an infants' class. We are content with the results.

What is required of Canada? We are in the third and crucial year of this war. Talk all the election talk, talk all the partisan talk you like in the House of Commons, but we are in a year of the greatest events in the history of this war, and talk of that kind will make but little impression and will not last long. I was in England during November—

Mr. GRAHAM: So the ex-minister said.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: —and I want to tell hon. gentlemen that the seriousness of this situation dawns upon one when he visits England and France. We are 4,000 miles from the western battle-front, but when you are in England, France or Belgium you realize what war means. You see the fleet, as I saw it—and in my opinion the fleet of Great Britain, which is the greatest human agency to-day between the Hohenzollerns and the domination of the world, was never actually or relatively as strong as it is to-day. When you see that fleet; when you see the great body of clean-cut, strong men who, day in and day out, in summer and in winter, in heat and in cold, maintain that monotonous and weary vigil which means the safety of our commerce and the preservation of our civilization, you realize that the Empire is at war. And when you go to the front and see the men there—the officers living in dug-outs comprising two little rooms, cold

and damp; when you see the men going into the trenches and coming out encased in mud; when you observe the uncomplaining, cheerful demeanour of these men who daily walk with death, you realize what this war means, because these are our boys. There is little patience at the front with talk of patronage, appointments or Nationalism, and there will be less patience with it as the war goes on. No thinking man can visit the fleet and visit the front without coming away profoundly impressed with the terrible seriousness of this war, and that impression will grow more and more upon the people of Canada, of the Emprie and of the world as the war proceeds during the present, as I believe, crucial year. That is the spirit in which we should give consideration to the important matters of public business before us, and that, I believe, is the spirit in which the great majority of the members of this House are approaching them—a spirit which exemplifies a realization of the seriousness of the war and which is manifested in its deepest sense by men who have sons there and by men who have lost their sons.

It devolves upon every member of this House and every citizen of Canada to do his part. The Prime Minister cannot be on every platform of Canada, week in and week out. He has spoken scores of times since this war broke out; so have I, and so have other members of the Government. We have been necessarily oppressed with business since the war broke out. Transactions with the Imperial Government, matters relating to the troops in England and at the front, the organization of our troops in Canada, matters arising out of the dislocation of business which is inevitable when a war is proceeding, international questions, matters of the utmost moment and importance—these are the burdens which from day to day, from week to week, morning, noon and night, Saturday and Sunday, have been borne by the Prime Minister and his colleagues. We are not complaining; it is our duty, and we do it. But it is open to any member of this House to do his best to impress the public mind with the necessity for men and munitions and the necessity of saving for the purpose of assisting the financing of the war. I believe that most of the members have done this, and I am quite sure that they will continue to do so. What is required at the present time, not only in Canada and the United Kingdom, but throughout the entire world, is organization and the creation of a certain attitude of mind on the part of the public with relation to this war. The great majority of the people are seized with the importance of the war, but many are not, to the same degree. There must be man organization; there must be organization of vital industries; production must be stimulated and increased as much as possible. There should be no personal or public extravagance, and there should be national saving, because in the last analysis it will be money and resources as well as men that will win this war. There must be self-denial and there must be self-sacrifice. The men at the front are undergoing sacrifices cheerfully and uncomplainingly; it is not too much to ask every person to exercise self-denial and self-sacrifice in
9 p.m. order that he, too, may contribute to the utmost of his power to the winning of the war.

A great number of important questions are mooted from time to time—important, but secondary and subsidiary questions. The real question before the Empire to-day is the winning of the war, and nothing else. How do governments, oppositions, individuals, measure up against the great question of winning the war? That is the question to which the governments of all the communities in the Empire must direct themselves. The British nation was slow in getting organized for the war, because it was so entirely unprepared at the outbreak of hostilities. In Great Britain these questions were met as they arose, and to-day I believe that the nation is very highly organized. Millions of men have been sent to the front; no one ever expected that more than 200,000 or 300,000 men would be sent from England to Europe. The loans that have been raised by the British Government would have staggered the imagination of men before the war broke out.

The Government since the outbreak of this war has addressed itself to the utmost of its ability and power to the great questions that have been presented for its consideration. The successes which we have met with—with the co-operation and support, of course, of the Canadian people, because the Government can do nothing without that—are exemplified in the statements which I have made to the House with regard to the recruiting of our forces and our finances and trade. I repeat that there is absolutely no room for national

self-depreciation, but I am the first to say that we can do better. We can all do better. We have gone so far; we can go much farther. The Government will continue to put forth its best efforts as in the past, and I am perfectly confident that, putting forth our best efforts, with the rest of the overseas dominions putting forth their best efforts, with the mighty effort which Great Britain is putting forth, with the heroism and the sacrifices of France and the efforts which she will put forward in the future, this war is going to be won this year.

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (St. John City): Mr. Speaker, there are some remarks which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) has made with which I am sure we will all agree. The one that strikes me as being the most important is that all the people of Canada should be united in a determination to do the utmost that is possible in assisting in bringing this war to a successful conclusion. My hon. friend has very frankly stated that we could all do much better than we have done. With regard to the Government, Sir, I think we will all be disposed to agree with him. We will all agree that the Government, if it applied its mind, if it applied the united efforts of its members, could do a great deal better than it has done in the past, and, may I add, Sir, the hope that after the expression which my hon. friend has used, that the Government can do better than it has done, it will make a sincere effort to do better and to perform a service which will entitle it even in some measure to the gratitude and confidence of the people of this country, because, Sir, let me assure my hon. friend, as I believe, that no one upon this side of the House is desirous of seeing this Government lost the confidence of the people of this country merely in order that my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and hon. gentlemen upon this side of the House, may assume the seals of office. We have no especial personal desire for that. Speaking for myself, I would assure you, and I do assure you most earnestly, that I never was so happy since the day I first entered political life as I have been in opposition; and my pleasure has been increased by the fact, Sir, that I have been engaged in the worthy cause of attacking a Government which, I believe, is not deserving of the confidence of the people of this country. That, Sir, is a worthy object for any body of men. To do one's duty as a member of His Majesty's loyal Opposition is to perform one of the noblest services which a public man can render to his country. Therefore, in all sincerity, I express the hope that from this moment this Government will turn back upon its tracks, will reverse the course which it has pursued in the past, and will endeavour well and faithfully to serve the people of this country. It may be too late for them to regain the confidence of the people; it may be, but still it is not too late for them to try.

Now, Sir, my hon. friend says that in this House and in this country there is an attempt to make party capital. I interjected a remark to that effect when my hon. friend was speaking. If I were asked for proof, I should give it in the fact that ever since this war broke out this Government and its supporters throughout the Dominion have endeavoured, so far as they could, to make their conduct of the war the means of increasing their party influence and a stepping stone to their return to power. The Minister of Finance says that, being now in the third year of the war, the most strenuous year in the history of the war, our attention should be entirely directed to the winning of the war, and that we should not stop to give consideration to such questions as patronage, and partyism, and nationalism and questions of that kind. What does that mean, Sir? It means that the Government should not be criticised for using patronage in the making of war contracts; it means that they should not be criticised for the effort to strengthen their party with the people of this country by passing money and patronage into the hands of their supporters or those whom they hope will become their supporters. And this, Sir, when there are in that Government, members of the Nationalist party. We have the evidence before us that in 1910 the Nationalist party of Quebec first took the unpatriotic ground, laid it down as a matter of policy for the people of Canada which they at all events were determined to support in Quebec; that Canada should take no part in the wars of the Empire, that neither the money, nor the men, nor the ships of Canada should be sent beyond the confines of this Dominion; and they appealed to the prejudices of the people who had confidence in them to stand by their policy as against any participation in the wars of the Empire. From that day to this we have seen the Nationalist party in Quebec adhering to that position, and, Sir, only two or three days ago, we had the spectacle of the Postmaster General (Mr. Blondin) going

down into a constituency in the province of Quebec where a by-election was being held, and declaring to the people there that they need have no fear of conscription, because, if it came into force their young men could easily cross the boundary into the United States and so escape from the effects of the war. And yet we find that gentleman, so far as we can judge from the statements of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance, still enjoying the confidence of his colleagues. So it comes with ill grace from the Minister of Finance to taunt us with speaking of Nationalism and condemning Nationalism on the floor of this Parliament.

Then, Sir, what further have we so far as patronage is concerned? We have the statement made in this House, we have the statement made in this country, made without contradiction, because it is impossible to contradict it, that even in the case of soldiers, even in the case of our boys who have gone to the front prepared to make the supreme sacrifice for their country, when they have returned wounded and have asked for positions which they could properly fill, they have been referred by the committee having the matter in charge to the patronage committee representing the Government of this country, speaking for the Conservative party in this country, and they have been obliged to get the recommendation of this patronage committee before they could be appointed to fill any position! Sir, only a few days ago, in the city of St. John, there was a meeting of the recruiting committee, and I am now going to quote from what took place at that meeting as supporting the statement which I make, and not merely the statement, but supporting the charge, a charge which this Government ought to be ashamed to lie under, supporting the charge that even in the case of the returned soldier the question of whether a man has belonged to a Liberal or to a Conservative family is to determine whether he is to get employment, is to determine whether or not his country is to recognize the sacrifice which he has made for the flag. Well, Sir, this meeting in St. John was presided over by a gentleman whom the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) knows well, presided over by one of the most prominent Conservatives in the province of New Brunswick, a gentleman who not long ago was appointed by the Conservative Government in the province of New Brunswick as one of the directors of a company which is constructing that important line of railway known as the St. John Valley railway; I refer to Mr. Richard O'Leary, of the county of Kent, in the province of New Brunswick. At that recruiting meeting in the city of St. John, on the 3rd of January last, as reported in the St. John Telegraph of 4th January, Mr. O'Leary said:—

> In spite of the resolution, it still is necessary for even a returned soldier to secure the recommendation of the patronage committee before he can secure a Government appointment.

That was the statement made by a gentleman who has been closely identified with recruting in the province of New Brunswick, who was chairman of the recruiting meeting for that province; a gentleman of the very highest standing, who has given of his wealth and time to every patriotic cause in New Brunswick since the war began; and that statement is simply confirmatory of what hon. gentlemen have stated on the floor of this House as to what is going on in this country. And yet my hon. friend the Minister of Finance says: Oh, because the war is on, and because our united effort should be directed towards the winning of the war, you must not speak of patronage; you must let us exercise it to the fullest extent in respect to our supporters throughout the country, and you must not make any complaint or criticism. Why, not long ago, the newspapers reported my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) as having gone to the city of St. John and given a banquet to his patronage committee who are making these recommendations for the filling of positions of this character and of other positions which come under the control of the Government.

We have had an extraordinary exhibition this afternoon and evening. Although Parliament has been sitting now for some days, we have had no explanation by the ministry as to the reasons why the Minister of Militia was dismissed from office. The ex-Minister of Militia is not in the position of one who resigned; he was dismissed from office. The letter of the Prime Minister to him shows clearly that this is the position in which he stands. Ordinarily, in such circumstances, ministerial explanations are made. Ordinarily, the Prime Minister takes Parliament and the country into his confidence, and gives the reasons for ministerial changes; but the Prime Minister has not done this House or the people of this country the courtesy of giving the explanations which a Prime Minister always thinks well to give in such circumstances. It has remained until this

afternoon and evening for us to hear something of the reasons for the change which has taken place. The statements made by the ex-Minister of Militia and the Minister of Finance lead us to believe that very many more statements might have been made and very much more information might have been given to the people of this country as to the reasons why the change took place. My hon. friend, the ex-Minister of Militia, is clearly holding himself in leash. It would break his heart to separate from his dear Conservative friends, he says.

Mr. WILCOX: Hear, hear.

Mr. PUGSLEY: He says it would almost give him as much anxiety and as much sorrow to do that as if we were to lose the war. Loving his Conservative friends as he does, he holds himself in apparent restraint in order that he may still have a bridge across which he may walk backwards and again get into the confidence of his party. Perhaps between the time when he informed the public through the newspapers that he was going to make a full statement, and to-day, he has heard rumours which have come across the Atlantic that it will not be long before there is a change in the high commissionership, and that some other gentleman, possibly one who stands high in the Government of this country, may take the place of the gentleman who now occupies that position. It is not impossible that my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia may think that when the changes that may come about in the whirligig of time, possibly within a few weeks, take place there may be an opportunity for him to go back. Perhaps he feels that it is due to himself that he should not say too much or say anything that would prevent him from returning to the fold. But he tells the House that, for the first ten months of his administration of the Militia Department, he was continually hampered in his work; that he was treated as a responsible minister ought not to be treated, and that in the Cabinet he had two enemies. He uses polite language, the language of Parliament, but he tells us there were two enemies who constantly intrigued against him and prevented him from carrying on the great work which he felt he ought to do in his department in the interests of Canada and of the Empire.

How does my hon. friend the Minister of Finance answer that? Does he give us an explanation? He says there was something relating to trucks in regard to which the ex-Minister of Militia made some recommendation. He was getting information as to the Kelly truck or some other truck, and that it took some time to decide. That is what my hon. friend the Minister of Finance says. But that is not the charge made by the gentleman who for five years was the trusted colleague of the Prime Minister, the gentleman who for five years was entrusted by this Government with the duty of managing the military affairs of this country. I will read what he says in his letter to the Prime Minister dated May 13, 1915. So far from agreeing with my hon. friend the Minister of Finance in what he states regarding the little matter of trucks and the delay that was caused, this is what the ex-Minister of Militia says:

> Dear Sir Robert: Since my return from England last November, I have repeatedly notified you that owing to the interference and plans of the "so-called" sub-committee and to the repeated hold-ups and needless obstructions of some of my colleagues in the affairs of this department—

Will the Minister of Finance take notice? If the Minister of Public Works were here I would ask him to take notice also.

> —the Contract branch has been very much hampered and practically blockaded; delays have been very prolonged; the cost has been greatly enhanced and the goods supplied have been, in many cases, inferior. Indeed, the most ardent agents of the German government could scarcely have been more successful in holding up the proper equipment of our forces, had they been in control.

Mr. Speaker, did you ever read a more serious charge than that made by a retiring minister against his colleagues with a war on? When a few weeks' delay might mean the cost of thousands of lives, and might materially affect the fortunes of war; when there was necessity for the utmost haste, the ex-minister says that he was not only not given a free hand, but was not even allowed to do that which other ministers claimed the right to do, to carry on the detail work of his department. But, by means of this sub-committee, which was appointed apparently behind his back, appointed for the purpose of taking control really of his department and, may I not also say, Sir, appointed for the purpose of enabling those gentlemen who were hostile to the then Minister of Militia to succeed in eventually driving him out of office—by means of this sub-committee—I say, contracts were held up, our soldiers were delayed and the most serious results

therefore necessarily would follow. Has the Minister of Finance, in whose presence that letter was read, any answer to make to that charge? If that charge is true, Sir, it ought to bring upon this Government the strongest possible condemnation of the the people. Every man, every woman, every boy, whether at the front or in Canada, whether still fighting the battles of the Empire, or whether he is one who has returned after doing his duty and being wounded is no longer able to be at the front, must feel that if that charge is true the Government must stand condemned at the bar of public opinion. Yet, Sir, notwithstanding that most serious charge, made in this House of Parliament, made before the people of this country, a charge which, to-morrow morning will go broadcast in the press of this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, the Minister of Finance has either not found it possible, or has not deemed it desirable, to attempt to give to this Parliament and the people any answer. Then, the ex-Minister of Militia gives an example. He says:

> As one of many specific examples, take the trucks for the second division. They should have been ready last December.

Think of that, Mr. Speaker, this sub-committee apparently has had the matter of the trucks in charge since the previous December. Although the trucks ought to have been ready in December they are not ready even as late as the 13th of May.

> They should have been ready last December, and they are not ready yet. Some of my colleagues constituted themselves champions of this or that truck, and brought about delays whereby untried trucks would be purchased; high prices would be paid in commissions to agents, and the Government, and the country, would be treated practically as a retailer. My policy, as you may remember, in this and in all other matters, was to force dealers to give the Government wholesale, or manufacturers' rates.

If there is any answer to be made to that letter, any answer to be made to these two paragraphs, if any reply can be made, to the most serious charge which is contained in these two paragraphs, is it not due to this House, to the people and to the Government themselves that they should make an answer to that charge to which the Minister of Finance should have made a reply while he was addressing the House this evening? Not one word of a reply has been made. If the ex-Minister of Militia is the kind of gentleman whom this Government must have thought him to be when they placed him in charge of this most important department, if he is the man they have thought him to be for five long years in the midst of the greatest war in history, and in the midst of the first great war in which our country has been engaged, if they have allowed him to control that important department having an expenditure of millions upon millions of the people's money and if he is the high minded gentleman whom we must believe him to be, and whom they believed him to be, surely there is a duty cast upon the Government to endeavour to answer the most serious charge contained in these two paragraphs. Then, he says:

> At the present time there are upwards of one hundred requisitions that have long been in.

These are requisitions for the soldiers; these are war supplies which are necessary to be issued to the soldiers before they can go to the front.

> The Quartermaster General has over and over again, until his heart has grown sick, brought them before me; they have been promptly passed on to the director of contracts, and the great majority of them when passed on to the Privy Council have been held up in council, or by the Treasury Board, laid aside or sent back —but always delayed; while the director of contracts and his officers have unceasingly been interfered with, delayed, and given endless and unnecessary work by the sub-committee.

Where is the answer to that? Has the Prime Minister any answer? No, apparently not. The Minister of Finance has not attempted to give any answer and we have a right to assume that it is because no answer can be given, because these hon. gentlemen must know it is true. Is it not too horrible to conceive of, to think that when our boys needed these supplies, no proper effort was made to furnish them? The ex-minister states that more than one hundred requisitions have long been made, that the Quartermaster General, whose duty it is to furnish the supplies, has over and over again, until his heart had grown sick, brought them before him, that they have been promptly passed on to the director of contracts by the minister, that they have been forwarded to the Treasury Board and they have been held up, laid aside, or sent back and always delayed. Is it not a sad thing to think that when these articles were required—were absolutely required—in order to enable Canada to take her part in the carrying on of this war, they, simply through apathy, the indifference of the ministers, through some of them, as the ex-Minister of Militia says, wanting an article purchased from one manufacturer and others wanting an article purchased from another

manufacturer, and not being able to come to a conclusion for months and months, have been held back and the director of contracts has not been able to get his wants supplied? Could you think of a more serious charge to make, one which reflects more strongly upon the indifference and inefficiency of the Administration, than the charge made by the ex-Minister of Militia contained in the paragraphs which I have just read? Then, he says:

> I saw, by an article in the Free Press, that it is current talk everywhere among the soldiers and officers that they are short of nearly every class of equipment and supplies. In fact, three times recently I have been severely reproached about shortages in supplies and equipment by outsiders who had learned of these shortages from soldiers and officers of the force.

Here is another very serious charge regarding the medical department:

> Further, to my surprise, I was spoken to in Montreal this week, and informed that our medical units going over were only half equipped, while many of our combatant units are not properly outfitted. In addition to the serious aspect of the case, and from the viewpoint of the efficiency of our soldiers, there is the disheartening side. It is not only unfair to the gallant boys who are giving and willingly risking their lives for the cause, and making domestic sacrifices, but it is absolutely unjust to me and my officers.

There is the wail that goes up from the heart, apparently, of the ex-Minister of Militia demanding that his boys, as he is proud to call the Canadian soldiers, should be promptly and adequately supplied with those things which they required to enable them to perform their duty to their country. He tells the Prime Minister that these requisitions are tied up by the sub-committee of Council or tied up in Council until it has made him heartsick and until it has made the Quartermaster General heartsick as well. Yet there is no reply. There is no attempt on the part of the Prime Minister to explain or excuse, and no attempt on the part of the Minister of Finance to deny or excuse. The ex-Minister of Militia goes on:

> Therefore, as Minister of Militia, I must respectfully enter my protest, as I have frequently before entered it, at the interference and delays caused in all these things. It tends not only to the injury and inefficiency of our soldiers, thus jeopardizing the success of the British arms, but it must politically reflect seriously upon the Government.

I need not read any more from this letter, as it has been read by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia, and will appear in Hansard. I think I have read sufficient to show that it discloses a most serious state of affairs during the time the ex-minister was a member of the Government. It was written as long ago as May 13, 1915, and yet for a year and a half after that time, a year and a half after the ex-Minister of Militia had made this heart-rending appeal to the Prime Minister to assist him in seeing that necessities were supplied to our soldiers promptly, the minister continued as a member of the Government, and still had the confidence of the Prime Minister, and still, apparently, enjoyed the confidence of the majority of his colleagues. We must believe that the statements he makes here he would not make except from positive knowledge. We must believe those statements are absolutely correct, and as I said before, if they are correct, I want to know what more damning accusation could be brought against a government? In the face of these charges, does it lie in the mouth of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to tell us we ought not to criticise the Government, but ought simply to join with them and do our part in winning this war; that we ought not to criticise, or find fault, or point out defects in the Administration. Sir, I would want nothing more than this letter of the ex-minister to justify my conscience in bringing these matters to the attention of Parliament. If any member of Parliament under these circumstances declined to bring a matter of this kind forcibly to the attention of the House and country, he would not be discharging the duty he owes to the people he was sent here to represent. I do not know that I need deal further with the statement which was made by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia, and the very unsatisfactory statement made by the Minister of Finance, but just let me say this in passing, that it is a habit with hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, when fault is found with them, when it has been shown that they are wasting money, or distributing patronage for party purposes, at once to begin to talk about the bravery of our gallant boys at the front. As if the fact that upwards of 400,000 of Canadian boys have shown their willingness to shed their blood in defence of the Empire was a defence of the shortcomings of the Government! But that is what they do. That is what my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has done to-day. Instead of answering the just criticisms made by the ex-Minister of Militia, he tells us what has been accomplished by our brave boys; he

tells of the sacrifices that are being made by the mothers, fathers and sisters of the boys who have gone to the front, as well as of the sacrifices which the boys themselves are making.

The Minister of Finance says we ought not to criticise the leadership which this Government has given the people. Well, I do not know that we are debarred from doing that, if we honestly think they might have done much better than they have done. If we honestly think they have mismanaged the affairs of this country since the war began, I do not think we ought to hesitate, I do not think we should be discharging our duty if we did hesitate to criticise the Government. But the Minister of Finance says: If you do not like our military leadership, see how splendidly we have led you in finance. See how splendidly we have led you in the way of borrowing money, and increasing the revenues and trade of this country. He even boasted of the fact that whereas some three years ago we only had a trade of between $500,000,000 and $600,000,000 in the current year our export and import trade will be in the vicinity of $2,000,000,000. Sir, I think that trade is not a trade for us to rejoice in. It is a trade that is washed in blood. It is a trade that tells many a tragic story of many a broken heart. It is a trade that is dependent entirely upon the war. We bring our imports of the comparatively raw materials from the United States; we manufacture them in our munitions factories and other factories throughout this country, and then send them forward as manufactured goods at a higher valuation, which includes the labour that has been put upon them. That is how our present exports are largely made up.

Mr. CARVELL: What about profits?

Mr. PUGSLEY: And the profits which have gone to the munition manufacturers are also counted in the value of the export. When the war is over matters will get down again to a normal condition, and these fictitious exports and imports will no longer be a factor in the prosperity of our country. Look at the United States. Some politicians there are boasting of the enormous exports of the United States, but the right-thinking people of that country are pointing out that these exports are entirely fictitious and wholly due to the war, that they have grown to abnormal proportions, and have brought amazing wealth to the people of the United States. But the wealth comes from a war in which they are taking no part. For us, this greatly increased wealth comes from a war in which we are taking a heroic, a noble, but at the same time, a sad part, and I, for one, would be very glad indeed to see the time come when these enormous exports would cease, and we would again have peace in Canada, peace in the Empire, and peace throughout the world.

I desire, with the indulgence of the House, to speak for a short time on a few matters which are contained in the speech from the Throne, as this is the only opportunity which one will have of referring to these questions which are general in character, but which at the same time are of considerable public interest. In his speech His Excellency makes this statement:

> Steps have been taken by my advisers for better organization of National Service, and attention has been given to more thorough utilization of our natural resources.

This brings to my mind a subject which I think ought to have been dealt with long since by this Government. I am told by experts that we have in Canada natural resources, which, if they had been taken hold of in a proper manner, would have furnished the raw material for practically everything which is required by Canada for war purposes. Instead of spending in other countries vast sums of money for raw material, we have plenty of raw material at hand, which might have been utilized. After two and a half years of war, we are told by the Government, what? That attention has been given to the more thorough utilization of our natural resources. Attention in what way? Have they appointed a commission to investigate? If they have, it will be about the 106th commission which this Government have appointed since they came into office. Perhaps my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), who seems to be taking a serious view of the observations which I have been making, will enlighten the House upon this subject, because it will be interesting to know in what respect this Government are paying attention to the natural resources of this country. What are they doing in the way of assisting in the development of our mining industry? What are they doing to encourage the utilization, within our own country, of the magnificent and valuable nickel deposits of Canada? What are they doing in the way of shipbuilding, of utilizing the vast deposits of iron for the purpose of building ships? In this, the third year of the war, the Government must confess that they have done absolutely nothing.

I trust my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will pardon me for calling his attention to some of his political activities, as, of course, it is difficult to refrain from doing so, because my hon. friend is very much in the limelight. Not long ago he went to the province of Quebec in order to attend a very interesting ceremony at the Vickers Maxim dock of launching a dredge or an ice-breaker—I forget which it was, and he spoke there of the great work which is being done in shipbuilding in Canada. My hon. friend, however, did not tell the assembled guests—perhaps he had not time to do it—that they would not be building any ships in the Vickers Maxim plant had it not been for the course which the late Government pursued when I was Minister of Public Works. It was at that time and under our administration that the Vickers Maxim plant was established, which has enabled them to do the creditable work to which my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries referred. My hon. friend also spoke of the splendid ships which were being built at the head of lake Superior by the Port Arthur Dock and Shipbuilding Company, which is not only building some splendid ships to sail on the Great Lakes, but which is now building some ships for the Norwegian Government. My hon. friend did not stop to think. If he had, perhaps he would have remembered that I turned the first sod of that dry dock and shipbuilding plant at Port Arthur when I was Minister of Public Works, and it has been doing magnificent work since. My hon. friend would have probably had brought to his mind that uneasy thought which would perhaps have caused him some unhappiness, that not long ago he told the members of this House and the people in the country that it would take twenty-five years or on to fifty years to establish a shipbuilding yard in Canada. If he had paid especial attention to the Port Arthur Dry Dock and Shipbuilding Company, he would have known that it only took the short period of two or three years to get that plant into working condition so that it could turn out the greatest steamers that ever floated on the Great Lakes. So I could go on with other cases. But I wish that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had been able, on that pleasant and interesting occasion, to tell the people that the Government had taken steps to establish shipbuilding plants in the Maritime Provinces. I well remember that in one of those eloquent speeches which my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows so well how to make speeches which thrill the hearts and evoke the admiration of his listeners, he told this House that he longed to see shipbuilding established in the Maritime Provinces; that he had the smell of the sea in his nostrils, and that he was simply aching to commence an enterprise of that character on behalf of the Government of this country.

He must not forget this; and if he ever does, I shall be sure to remind him of it, because I do not want him ever to forget it; I do not want this Government ever to forget it, and I do not want the people, who wish to know what a great penalty has been paid by the people of Canada because of the unholy alliance between the Nationalists and the Conservative party in 1911, ever to forget it. Let me remind my hon. friend that when he came into the office of Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the fall of 1911, he found on the files of his department an offer from one of the greatest shipbuilding firms in the United Kingdom, the firm of Cammell, Laird and Company, agreeing to establish a magnificent shipbuilding yard at the port of St. John, to build ten war vessels, namely, six cruisers and four destroyers. and to have them all completed before or in the year 1916, the year which is now past. He also found there on deposit the sum of $100,000 as a guarantee that this great shipbuilding company would perform its contract. What did my hon. friend do? During the election of 1911, the Nationalist party of Quebec had declared that we should have no Canadian navy, that being a part of their policy. They were not going to participate in the wars of the Empire; they were not going to allow Canadians to man the ships of Canada to sail upon the high seas, and to have their young men disembowelled upon the seas of China, or of Europe; they would pledge themselves to secure the repeal of the Naval Service Act, and there was to be no Canadian navy. When my hon. friend came into power, dearly as he would have liked to establish that shipbuilding plant at the port of St. John, dearly as he would have liked to enter into that contract with Cammell, Laird and Company, his hands and the hands of the other members of the Government were tied by that unholy alliance between the Liberal-Conservative party and the Nationalist party, which has been like a millstone around the necks of the people

of Canada from that day to this. The Government did not dare go on because they were bound not to go on, and they returned the deposit to Cammell, Laird and Company, and the contract was never entered into. And that magnificent inlet of the Bay of Fundy at the port of St. John, where this splendid shipbuilding yard would have been built, had the contract been let by my hon. friend, according to the tender, where to-day there would have been ships under construction, where there would have been from three to five thousand men employed, where there would have been great docks, that splendid sheet of water to-day is as quiet as a grave. Where there would have been the hum of industry, to-day there is nothing but the sound of the seagulls passing over the waves. All is dead, as dead as this Government will be, when the people of Canada have an opportunity at the next election of expressing their will.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Did you hear about Dorchester?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, I heard about Dorchester, and let me tell my hon. friend what I heard about Dorchester. My hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Blondin) stated that all that he did with regard to the money which Allison took was to tell the people that they were not concerned because it was England's money and not Canada's money which had been taken, and that all that he told them with regard to conscription was to point out to them that Mr. Cannon had said there would be conscription, but that the young men of Ste. Rose need not mind it because, if they did not want to serve their country, they had a remedy, they could easily cross the border and seek safety in the United States.

In addition to that, I heard another thing that Mr. Sevigny said. He claimed credit, even now, for having prevented the building of a Canadian navy. That is quite in accordance with the position which was taken by gentlemen like Mr. Blondin and Mr. Sevigny when a contribution of three battleships was suggested. They assured the people that that did not mean anything at all as compared with the proposal for the building of a Canadian navy. The building of ships would mean that Canadian boys would have to man them, but the giving of three dreadnoughts would simply mean that so much money, coming mostly out of the English-speaking people of Ontario, would be contributed. This, they said their friends would not mind very much, because the money would be all they would have to contribute and their young men would remain safely at home.

Something was said by one of the hon. gentlemen who spoke in this debate with regard to the great mistake Canada had made in not giving three dreadnoughts to the Empire. Looking at matters in a practical way, I appeal to every right thinking member of this House—which is, I think, appealing to every member, because while we sometimes differ I am satisfied that we all try to think aright—as to whether it would not have been a splendid thing for Canada to-day if we had even the ten ships which were to be constructed under the Naval Act of 1910. Opportunities have not been wanting in which they could have done great service to the Empire and have added to the glory of Canada. Only the other day a Hun raider appeared in the waters of the South Atlantic, and within a few days from 16 to 20 merchant vessels were sent to the bottom. If we had those ten vessels for the protection of our trade routes, as was designed by the Government which was led by the right hon. gentleman who now leads the Opposition, these vessels would be patrolling the north and south Atlantic looking for raiders and doing work which now has to be done by British ships. In this we would be following the splendid example which Australia has set in constructing a navy designed for the protection of her own coasts and available to the Empire in time of war. The war has now lasted more than two years, and we do not know how long it may continue. Even now it is not too late for my hon. friend on the treasury benches to take hold of the question of building a Canadian navy. It may not yet be too late to build vessels to form part of a Candian navy—cruisers, destroyers and submarines—which would be of enormous benefit to Canada and to the Empire.

In the speech from the Throne there is another paragraph of great interest. It is as follows:

> The life of the present Parliament will expire in October next, and under existing legislation a dissolution and election would be necessary in the early future. My advisers, however, are of opinion that the wishes of the Canadian people and the urgent requirements of the war would be best met by avoiding the distraction and confusion consequent upon a general election at so critical a time.

If it were possible to avoid a general election during the war, it would be desirable to do so, provided such a course

would be in accordance with the wishes of the people. When this question came up last year I used practically the same words. Many people throughout the country said to us last year: if you grant an extension, a precedent will be created; you may be asked to grant another, and it will be difficult for you to refuse. I think there was a good deal in the position taken by Mr. Lamarche, from the province of Quebec, who said that under the Constitution of Canada, Parliament has to sit for five years; that he was elected to serve the people for a term of five years and that he could not conscientiously vote himself a longer term as a member of Parliament. We have no guarantee that the war will end this year. It may run on to another year, and the question will naturally arise, as, indeed it has already arisen among the people, whether the members of Parliament would be justified in renewing their term of office from time to time for an indefinite period. That is the question to which the Government will have to direct its attention in submitting the matter to Parliament. Perhaps hon. gen-

10 p.m.

tlemen on the other side will take occasion to let us know whether there is any truth in the rumour that the Minister of Public Works will accompany the Prime Minister to England and that when the date of re-assembling comes there will be no meeting, but a dissolution of Parliament and an appeal to the people. If that decision has been arrived at the House and the country ought to be taken into the confidence of the Government at as early a date as possible. We ought to know whether we have to return for actual business, or simply to be told that His Excellency has dissolved Parliament and that we have to submit ourselves to the people.

Mr. ROGERS: We might as well set my hon. friend's mind at rest at once. He can depend upon being called upon early in the spring to attend business as usual.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am very glad to have that assurance from my hon. friend. He will observe that I am not nervous by reason of the rumour which I have heard. I believe in the words:

> Still achieving, still pursuing,
> Learn to labour and to wait.

An hon. MEMBER: Especially wait.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Whenever the elections come—and I am prepared to wait until they do come—I shall be ready to submit to any fate that may befall me.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

My right hon. friend the Prime Minister is going to England to represent Canada as a temporary member of the War Cabinet. I assume that he will have the right to vote at the meetings of this conference. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition took occasion early in the session to say that the Liberal members in the House would facilitate in every way the Prime Minister's attendance at that conference.

I am very glad, as one member of this House, that my right hon. friend made that statement, because, of course, it makes the path of the leader of the Government easier, and we shall all be prepared to make any sacrifice necessary in order to allow him so to attend. As one member of this House, I desire to say that when he goes to England he will have the sympathy and the support, I believe, of all the people of this country, irrespective of party, irrespective of their political differences, irrespective of the faults which we have to find with the Government in its administration in the past. We are all united in the one desire to serve the Empire in every possible way.

With regard to the conduct of the war, I am sure that he can carry to His Majesty the King and to the British Government a guarantee that the people of this country, irrespective of party, irrespective of religion or race, are united in a determination to make every sacrifice which is humanly possible in order to carry the war to success.

With regard to the terms of peace, of course we can say nothing. I notice that is one of the great subjects on which the overseas ministers are expected to deliberate. But let me say to my right hon. friend that the people of this country, while praying for peace, yet want a peace with glory for the Empire, and a peace which we can be sure will be lasting, and which will secure the realization of those ideals for which the Empire and our Allies are fighting. We trust that when it comes the joy bells will ring around the world acclaiming a victory for democracy, for civilization and for the highest Christianity.

Mr. A. BELLEMARE (Maskinongé) (translation): Mr. Speaker, before the closing of the debate on the Address, I wish to say a few words in explanation of my stand on the question of recruiting, and would ask the hon. members' kind attention for a few brief moments. Although the Government have as yet taken no definite steps towards adopting compulsory service, which to a few might seem desirable in the present

circumstances, there exists, nevertheless, a strong current of opinion in favour of compulsory enlistment or conscription. I do not question the honesty of purpose of the hon. members who favour conscription, but I deem it my duty to call the attention of the House to the serious consequences of such a policy.

But let us not be carried away by the enthusiasm of the moment and led into an over-disinterested patriotism. I am not opposed in principle to Canada taking her fair share in this titanic struggle, in view of the possibilities it implies for ourselves; but our participation must not be such as to put in jeopardy our own safety and interests.

To this day Canada has done its duty towards Great Britain, and we may well keep on helping the Empire, without, however going beyond the resources of the country or renouncing the principle of voluntary military service.

The thousands of our men on active service or under training in the British camps; our contribution to the supply of munitions by home production; the enormous sacrifices made by our people all go to show to what extent and with what patriotism Canada has answered the call of the Mother-Country.

As yet the sacrifices we have made have not overtaxed the resources of the country. But it is a debatable question whether by further action and by substituting compulsory for voluntary service a dangerous situation may be created, the risk of which should not be minimized, even with the best intentions in the world.

It is only a few weeks ago that the census of our resources was taken by the National Service Commission, and yet, as was stated yesterday by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), more than a thousand of our citizens have gone over to the United States.

My conclusion can therefore be no other than if we were to enforce conscription, a guard of 150,000 men would not be sufficient to prevent our people from crossing the imaginary line which separates our country from the neighbouring republic, and thus evading compulsory service. I therefore wish to state in this House that I am opposed to compulsory enlistment or any other coercive measure.

I go so far as to hold that if even Canada were in danger we would not need conscription, for all men of military age, of whatever race, would rush to the defence of the country.

We can most efficiently help the Allies by stimulating the manufacture of war munitions and increasing the output of our coal mines. Thus would we better contribute to the success of the Allies for whom those products are of prime necessity.

Moreover, Canada being essentially an agricultural country, not only is it most important that the present production of the land should be maintained, but that it should be increased as much as possible. In fact, our surplus production is, each year, one of the most important sources of provisioning for the allied countries where war paralysed agricultural works.

Every year, the available stocks of Europe are reduced, if we are to believe the following extracts of the report of the "International Institute of Agriculture of Rome", as published in Le Devoir of the 1st of November last. I am here quoting the most significant:

The International Institute of Agriculture, which has published the most voluminous report on the question since the beginning of the war, advocates the practice of the strictest economy of foodstuffs the world over on account of the unusual requirements of European armies. It states that all nations are facing a serious problem. The consumption of wheat for the year ending July 31, 1917, is estimated at 2,300,000,000 bushels at least, and the remaining stocks of that cereal would then amount to no more than 46,000,000 bushels. The report adds that it is only on account of last year's abundant crop, which left an overstock of 350,000,000 bushels of wheat, that there is enough left to fill the demand up to the end of July, 1917.

It is strange that a despatch of such importance should have gone unnoticed by the press—unless it was suppressed for fear of alarming the people; which would be very poor policy. Is it not better, on the contrary, that the people should know what to expect if the war lasts and if its efforts are directed to channels leading away from the road to success instead of leading to the haven of peace?

This menace of an universal famine was presaged in the very first weeks of the war, in 1914, by Lord Milner who is one of the best informed men of England on general economic conditions. On the 1st of September of that year he wrote a letter to the British press—which was little commented by our Canadian papers at the time—recommending an actual enlisting of the people for agricultural purposes, which he estimated to be as urgent as the enlistment of troops, and to sow in wheat 6,000,000 acres in the United Kingdom, instead of 2,000,000 acres only. He predicted also that should the Allies not take immediate measures to guard against this famine, they would be confronted by it, as well as the rest of the world, before the end of 1915.

France has realized that fact long months ago. Although that country grows her own supply and imports very little wheat from foreign parts in normal times, she was short by 100,000,000 bushels this last fall; and England has just found out that she is lacking 225,000,000 bushels. In spite of woman labour

in the belligerent countries, this year's crop has partially failed. Unfavourable weather conditions and the scarcity of farm hands have left unproductive in 1916 part of the wheat fields of the West which were under crop in 1915, with this result that in the United States and Canada and the whole of North America the production of wheat has been from 500 to 600 millions of bushels short of that of the year 1915.

But there are complications arising from the problem of transportation, and if the world produces an average crop next year and the Allies have to solve this problem, there can be nothing else than dire famine for Europe, and even for America. There will be a shortage of wheat. The 45,000,000 bushels in stock would hardly be sufficient for home consumption and for seeding purposes.

If I draw conclusions from the article I have just quoted and which seems to me well founded, the present Government should stimulate in every way the production of wheat, and not only in the Canadian West, but also in all the provinces of the Dominion. I gave a few lectures last summer in the county of Maskinongé, which I have the honour of representing in this House, and have advised the farmers to sow wheat. Some have followed this advice and are now quite satisfied, for you know that wheat is highly priced and flour is dear. I believe that by sending lecturers through all the provinces—even in our province of Quebec—we would help not only our own Canadian population, but also the Allies who are now fighting for the cause of civilization.

Motion of Mr. Gordon C. Wilson (Wentworth) for an Address to His Excellency, the Governor General agreed to.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN: In the absence of the Prime Minister I beg to move, seconded by the Hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane):

That the said Address be engrossed and presented to His Excellency the Governor General by such members of this House as are of the honourable the Privy Council.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Hazen it was ordered that this House do to-morrow resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

WAYS AND MEANS.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Hazen, it was ordered that this House do to-morrow resolve itself into a committee to consider of the ways and means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

[Mr. Bellemare.]

On motion of Hon. Mr. Hazen, the House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

Wednesday, January 31, 1917.

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

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister) presented the following report of the Special Committee appointed to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of the House during the present Session:

No. 1.

ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs

Barnard,
Bennett (Calgary),
Bennett (Simcoe),
Blondin,
Borden (Sir Robert),
Boys,
Bristol,
Bureau,
Carvell,
Charlton,
Crothers,
Demers,
Descarries,
Devlin,
Doherty,
Fripp,
German,
Kay,
Lafortune,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Lemieux,
Maclean (Halifax),
Marcile (Bagot),
Munson,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Patenaude,
Porter,
Rainville,
Robidoux,
Ross,
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Tremain, and
Wilson (Laval).—34.

No. 2.

ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

Messieurs

Achim,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Arthurs,
Barnard,
Barrette,
Béland,
Bellemare,
Bennett (Calgary),
Bennett (Simcoe),
Bickerdike,
Blain,
Boivin,
Boyce,
Boyer,
Boys,
Brabazon,
Bradbury,
Bristol,
Buchanan,
Bureau,
Carroll,
Cash,
Chabot,
Charlton,
Clark (Red Deer),
Clements,
Cochrane,
Lanctôt,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Lapointe (Montreal, St J.),
Lemieux,
L'Espérance,
Macdonald,
Macdonell,
Maclean (York, O.),
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McCraney,
McCrea,
McCurdy,
McKenzie,
McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
McLean (Sunbury),
McLeod,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marshall,
Middlebro,
Molloy,
Morphy,
Murphy,
Neely,
Nesbitt,

Cockshutt,
Copp,
Cruise,
Currie,
Davidson,
Delisle,
Descarries,
Devlin,
Donaldson,
Douglas,
Edwards,
Elliot,
Ethier,
Fisher,
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),
Fowler,
Fripp,
Gauthier (Gaspé)),
Gauvreau,
German,
Girard,
Gordon,
Graham,
Green,
Guilbault,
Guthrie,
Hartt,
Henderson,
Hepburn,
Jameson,
Kay,
Kemp,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lalor,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Oliver,
Paquet,
Pardee,
Porter,
Pugsley,
Robidoux,
Rochon,
Ross,
Schaffner,
Sharpe,
Smith,
Smyth,
Stanfield,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Thornton,
Tobin,
Tremain,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Wallace,
Weichel,
White (Renfrew),
White (Victoria, Alta),
Wilson (Laval),
Wilson (Wentworth, and
Wright.—119.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-five Members.

No. 3.

ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs

Ames (Sir Herbert),
Armstrong (York, O.),
Ball,
Blondin,
Boulay,
Bourassa,
Boyce,
Boyer,
Boys,
Broder,
Bureau,
Burnham,
Carrick,
Carvell,
Clarke (Wellington),
Davidson,
Devlin,
Ethier,
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),
Fripp,
Gauthier, (St. Hyacinthe),
Gauvreau,
Girard,
Glass,
Gordon,
Guthrie,
Hepburn,
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Jameson,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lalor,
Macdonell,
McLean (Sunbury),
McLeod,
McMillan,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin,
Mondou,
Morris,
Morrison,
Murphy,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Paul,
Perley (Sir George),
Porter,
Proulx,
Reid,
Robb,
Ross,
Scott,
Sharpe,
Shepherd,
Steele,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Thoburn,
Tobin,
Turriff,
Walker, and
White (Renfrew).—64.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

No. 4.

ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs

Achim,
Alguire,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Barrette,
Best,
Boulay,
Burrell,
Chabot,
Cromwell,
Doherty,
Fortier,
Hazen,
Knowles,
Kyte,
MacLean (York, O.),
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McCraney,
McCurdy,
Marcile (Bagot),
Michaud,
Morris,
Paquet,
Paul,
Roche,
Scott,
Seguin,
Stanfield,
Turgeon,
Verville, and
White (Sir Thomas).
—31.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Seven Members.

No. 5.

ON PRINTING:

Messieurs

Bickerdike,
Bowman,
Brabazon,
Brouillard,
Buchanan,
Burnham,
Cardin,
Chabot,
Clark (Bruce),
Clarke (Wellington),
Currie,
Douglas,
Elliot,
Graham,
Marshall,
Martin,
Middlebro,
Murphy,
Nicholson,
Roche,
Rochon,
Stevens,
Verville,
White (Victoria, Alta.), and
Wilson (Wentworth).—25.

No. 6.

ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs

Barnard,
Bennett (Calgary),
Bennett (Simcoe),
Blain,
Boyce,
Boys,
Carroll,
Carvell,
Chisholm,
Clarke (Essex),
Clarke (Wellington),
Clements,
Crothers,
Davidson,
Devlin,
Edwards,
Fisher,
Fripp,
German,
Green,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Kay,
Kemp,
Kyte,
Macdonald,
Macdonell,
Maclean (Halifax),
McCoig,
Marshall,
Martin,
Meighen,
Merner,
Michaud,
Middlebro,
Mondou,
Morphy,
Morrison,
Murphy,
Nicholson,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Pardee,
Proulx,
Pugsley,
Reid,
Robidoux,
Rogers,
Ross,
Scott,
Sévigny,
Sinclair,
Smyth,
Standfield,
Stewart (Lunenburg),
Tobin,
Tremain,
Truax,

McCraney,
McCrea,
McCurdy,
McKenzie,
White
(Sir Thomas), and
Wilcox.—63.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-one Members.

No. 7.

ON BANKING AND COMMERCE:

Messieurs

Ames (Sir Herbert).
Armstrong (Lambton),
Armstrong (York, O.),
Ball,
Barnard,
Bellemare,
Bennett (Calgary),
Best,
Bickerdike,
Boivin,
Boyce,
Bristol,
Broder,
Buchanan,
Burnham,
Cardin,
Carrick,
Carvell,
Charlton,
Clark (Bruce),
Clark (Red Deer),
Cockshutt,
Copp,
Currie,
Davidson,
Demers,
Edwards,
Fisher,
Forget
(Sir Rodolphe),
Fortier,
Foster (Sir George),
Fowler,
Gauthier
(St. Hyacinthe),
Glass,
Graham,
Guthrie,
Hanna,
Henderson,
Hughes
(Kings, P.E.I.),
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Jameson,
Kay,
Kemp,
Knowles,
Kyte,
Lemieux,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
Macdonell,
Maclean (Halifax),
Maclean (York, O.),
McCraney,
McCrea,
McCurdy,
McLean (Sunbury),
McLeod,
McMillan,
Marshall,
Meighen,
Middlebro,
Nesbitt,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Osler (Sir Edmund),
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Perley (Sir George),
Porter,
Power,
Pugsley,
Rainville,
Robb,
Roche,
Rochon,
Ross,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe,
Sinclair,
Steele,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Lunenburg),
Sutherland,
Thompson (Yukon),
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Thornton,
Tobin,
Turriff,
Verville,
Warnock,
Webster,
Weichel,
White
(Sir Thomas), and
Wilson
(Wentworth).—95.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-one Members.

No. 8.

ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs

Achim,
Alguire,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Armstrong (York, O.),
Arthurs,
Ball,
Best,
Boivin,
Bourassa,
McMillan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marshall,
Meighen,
Merner,
Molloy,
Morphy,
Morris,
Morrison,
Bowman,
Broder,
Brouillard,
Buchanan,
Burrell,
Cash,
Champagne,
Chisholm,
Clark (Red Deer),
Clarke (Wellington),
Cromwell,
Cruise,
Currie,
Delisle,
Donaldson,
Douglas,
Edwards,
Elliot,
Fortier,
Gauthier (Gaspé),
Gauvreau,
Girard,
Glass,
Gordon,
Graham,
Guilbault,
Hanna,
Hartt,
Henderson,
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Kay,
Lanctôt,
Lewis,
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McCraney,
McCrea,
McLean
(Queens, P.E.I.),
Munson,
Neely,
Oliver,
Pacaud,
Paquet,
Paul,
Proulx,
Robb,
Roche,
Ross,
Schaffner,
Scott,
Séguin,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe,
Sinclair,
Smith,
Steele,
Stewart (Lunenburg),
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Thoburn,
Thompson, (Yukon),
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Thornton,
Tremain,
Truax,
Turriff,
Walker,
Wallace,
Warnock,
Webster,
Weichel,
White (Renfrew),
Wilcox,
Wilson (Laval),
Wilson
(Wentworth), and
Wright.—94.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twelve Members.

No. 9.

ON MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Messieurs

Alguire,
Barnard,
Boulay,
Bradbury,
Cardin,
Chisholm,
Clarke (Essex),
Clements,
Copp,
Fowler,
Gauthier (Gaspé),
Hazen,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.)
Jameson,
Kyte,
Lafortune,
Lapointe
(Montreal, St. J.),
Loggie,
McCurdy,
McKenzie,
McLean
(Queens, P.E.I.),
Morrison,
Nicholson,
Pardee,
Power,
Robidoux,
Sévigny,
Shepherd,
Sinclair,
Stevens,
Stewart (Lunenburg),
Taylor,
Truax,
Turgeon,
Wallace, and
Wilcox.—36.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

No. 10.

ON MINES AND MINERALS.

Messieurs

Arthurs,
Blondin,
Carrick,
Carroll,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
McMillan,
Marcil (Bonaventure),

Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Devlin,
Douglas,
Green,
Guilbault,
Hartt,
Hepburn,
Lalor,
Lemieux,
Lewis,
Merner,
Mondou,
Nesbitt,
Osler (Sir Edmund),
Sexsmith,
Shepherd,
Smith,
Smyth,
Thompson (Yukon),
Turriff, and
Walker.—30

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

No. 11.

ON FORESTS, WATERWAYS AND WATER-POWERS.

Messieurs

Ames (Sir Herbert),
Barrette,
Béland,
Bellemare,
Blain,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Brabazon,
Champagne,
Charlton,
Cochrane,
Cromwell,
Cruise,
Davidson,
Donaldson,
Ethier,
Green,
Henderson,
Michaud,
Munson,
Osler (Sir Edmund),
Patenaude,
Perley (Sir George),
Rogers,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Thoburn,
Warnock,
Webster,
White (Victoria, Alta.)
Wilson (Laval), and
Wright.—31.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

No. 12.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Messieurs

Ames (Sir Herbert),
Burnham,
Descarries,
Devlin,
Foster (Sir George),
Hanna,
Lapointe (Montreal, St. J.),
Lemieux,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Perley (Sir George),
Rainville,
Schaffner, and
Taylor.—13.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Five Members.

No. 13.

ON THE LIBRARY.

Messieurs

Béland,
Borden (Sir Robert),
Boyer,
Broder,
Clark (Bruce),
Copp,
Crothers,
Doherty,
Foster (Sir George),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lemieux,
Lewis,
Meighen,
Pardee,
Pugsley, and
Sévigny.—16.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the Select Standing Committees of this House shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House, and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records, with the exception of the Committee on Debates and that on the Library of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

THE PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours that this House will unite with them in the formation of a joint committee of both Houses on the subject of the Printing of Parliament, and that the members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing, viz.: Messrs. Bickerdike, Bowman, Brabazon, Brouillard, Buchanan, Burnham, Cardin, Chabot, Clark (Bruce), Clarke (Wellington), Currie, Douglas, Elliot, Graham, Marshall, Martin, Middlebro, Murphy, Nicholson, Roche, Rochon, Stevens, Verville, White (Victoria, Alta.) and Wilson (Wentworth), will act as members on the part of this House on the said Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

THE LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to inform their Honours that this House has appointed Messrs. Béland, Borden (Sir Robert), Boyer, Broder, Clark (Bruce), Copp, Crothers, Doherty, Foster (Sir George), Laurier (Sir Wilfrid), Lemieux, Lewis, Meighen, Pardee, Pugsley and Sévigny, a committee to assist His Honour the Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament, so far as the interests of the House of Commons are concerned, and to act on behalf of the House of Commons as members of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the Library.

Motion agreed to.

THE PARLIAMENTARY RESTAURANT.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That Messrs. Fripp, Pardee, Ross and Stanfield, be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the Restaurant, as far as the interests of the Commons are concerned, and to act as members of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the Restaurant, and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours therewith.

Motion agreed to:

REPORT.

Report by the officer in charge of the Canadian War Records Office—Sir Robert Borden.

ESTIMATES FOR 1917-18.

A message from His Excellency the Governor General, transmitting Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1918, was presented by Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance), read by Mr. Speaker to the House and referred to the Committee of Supply.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

FREE TRANSPORTATION FOR PROVINCIAL LEGISLATORS.

Mr. GEORGE E. McCRANEY (Saskatoon) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 18, to amend the Railway Act. He said: The proposed amendment is intended to give to Cabinet Ministers of provincial governments the same rights of free transportation throughout Canada as senators and members of the House of Commons now have. It further gives to members of the Legislative Councils and Legislative Assemblies free transportation within the provinces which they represent.

The various railway companies now give them passes and this legislation would add no burden to them. It would, however, relieve members of provincial parliaments from any suggestion that in their dealings as legislators with the railway companies they might be influenced by the receipt of passes from the companies. The relationship would then be one founded on statute and not on the favour of the company. The proposed amendment is:—

1. Section 343 of the Railway Act, Chapter 37 of the Revised Statutes of Canada is amended by inserting after the words "House of Commons of Canada" in the third line thereof the words: "and to members of the Executive Councils of the Provinces of Canada, and within the provinces in which they reside, to members of the Legislative Councils and Legislative Assemblies of the Provinces of Canada."

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill No. 14, An Act respecting The Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited, and to authorize it to change its name to "United Grain Growers, Limited."—Mr. Bradbury.

Bill No. 15, An Act respecting the Saint John Board of Trade.—Mr. Pugsley.

Bill No. 16, An Act to confirm certain agreements made between The Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company and The Canadian Northern Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 17, An Act respecting The Western Dominion Railway Company.—Mr. Smyth.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CONSULTATION WITH DOMINIONS ON PEACE TERMS.

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Is the Government aware that the Entente Allies have agreed that, as one of the terms of peace with which the present European War will be concluded, Russia shall be given Constantinople and the Dardanelles?

2. Was the Government of Canada consulted regarding such agreement?

3. If so, did it approve thereof?

4. Has this Government been informed by the British Government that the Overseas Dominions would be consulted as to peace terms?

5. If so, when was the Government so informed?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1, 2 and 3. The Government has had no official communication from the Government of the United Kingdom with respect to the subject mentioned in this question.

4 and 5. The Government received on the 21st day of January, 1915, a despatch from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, as follows:—

> Will you inform your Prime Minister that it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to consult him most fully, and if possible personally, when the time to discuss possible terms of peace arrives.
>
> (Signed) HARCOURT.

From present reports it would appear that members of the British Government have, from time to time, made declarations in accordance with the intention thus expressed. Recently in despatches received during the months of December and January, copies of which have already been laid on the table of the House, the intention to consult the Overseas Dominions respecting the terms of peace has been more fully expressed and the intention to discuss the terms of peace at the approaching War Conference has been definitely announced .

STEAM TRAWLERS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has an order in council been passed permitting steam trawlers to operate outside a three-mile limit and inside a twelve-mile limit?

2. If so, what is the date of said order?

3. At whose request was this done?

4. How many steam trawlers operated in Canadian waters in 1916?

5. How many are on the Canadian registry?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes, during the portion of the year from January 18 to April 30, excepting in Chedabucto and St. Peter's bays, where such trawling is allowed from the 1st February to the 30th April. During these portions of the year trawling up to the three mile limit will not interfere with inshore fishermen, and will enable the landing of larger quantities of fish at the time when producers find it difficult to fill demands.

2. December 28, 1916.

3. On the recommendation of the Minister of the Naval Service following advice by his officers.
4. Two.
5. None, as such.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—TENDERS FOR ICE.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Were tenders asked for supplying ice to the Canadian Government Railway at Mulgrave this season?
2. If so, what was the name of each tenderer and the respective amounts of each tender?
3. To whom was the contract awarded?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.
2. Dan Johnston, Tracadie, N.S., $1.15 per ton, delivered and packed in icehouse. S. W. Hagerty, Mulgrave, N.S., 60 cents per ton, delivered on cars at Point Tupper, N.S., or $1.05 per ton, delivered and packed in icehouse.
3. S. W. Hagerty, $1.05 per ton, delivered and packed in icehouse.

THE FARMERS' BANK.

*Mr. LEMIEUX.

Is it the intention of the Government to reimburse the shareholders of the defunct Farmers' Bank?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is not the intention of the Government to introduce legislation for the purpose during the present session.

ROYAL NORTH WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Is the Royal North West Mounted Police force now engaged in enforcing law in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta to be withdrawn from the authority of the respective Provincial Governments?
2. If so, at what date is this withdrawal to take place?
3. Is the force to remain in the provinces?
4. In what duty is it to be employed?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I had expected to be able to lay on the table of the House to-day the orders in council which answer this question. I hope to have the answer to-morrow.

REMOVAL OF RAILS FROM CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Are the rails on the Canadian Northern Railway on the main line west of Edmonton to be taken up?
2. If so, at what time are they to be taken up?
3. What use is to be made of them?
4. What price is to be paid the railway company for them?
5. From what treasury will the funds come to make payment?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No.
2, 3, 4 and 5. Answered by No. 1.

RANCH LEASES IN ALBERTA.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Are any ranch leases in Alberta held by George Hoadley of Okotoks?
2. If so, what is their extent and where are they located?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.

MR. J. W. HYDE.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Was J. W. Hyde, late Indian agent on the Blood Indian Reserve at Macleod, removed from this position by Order in Council?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

OIL-BORING MACHINERY.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. What was the value of the oil-boring machinery, including casings, brought into Alberta through the Calgary port of customs in the years 1914, 1915 and 1916?
2. Who were the importers, and what was the amount of duty paid?

Mr. REID:

1. Dutiable oil boring machinery is not separately classified in the customs returns as compiled, and it would require a special compilation and considerable time to obtain this information.

The value of "well-drilling machinery and apparatus of a class or kind not made in Canada, for drilling for water, natural gas, or oil, and for prospecting for minerals, not including motive power" entered for consumption at the port of Calgary during the fiscal years ended 31st March, 1914, 1915 and 1916, respectively, was as follows: 1913-14, $4,415; 1914-15, $191,992; 1915-16, $39.

2. This well-drilling machinery was entered duty free. It is not usual to give the names of individual importers entering goods through the customs.

MEDICINE HAT MILITARY RESERVE.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Is the military reserve north of Medicine Hat being used for the purpose for which it was secured?
2. Has any request been made to have a portion of this reserve opened for homestead purposes?
3. If so, what action does the Government purpose taking?

Mr. KEMP:

1. This area, which was transferred from the Department of the Interior to the De-

partment of Militia and Defence as a permanent reserve for the use of the Department of Militia and Defence as a remount depot and training area, was leased to the National Live Stock Exchange, Ltd., for the purpose of training remounts.

2. Yes—but, in any case, as the reserve will be required for a training area, it will not be available for homestead purposes.

3. Answered by No. 2.

CHICAGO DRAINAGE CANAL.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Is the Government aware that the Conference Committee of the United States Senate struck out from the Rivers and Harbours Bill, a clause limiting the amount of water which can be diverted from Lake Michigan for the Illinois river improvement?

2. Has any report been made to show what detrimental effect this may have on the water level of the Great Lakes and rivers connecting them with the sea?

Mr. HAZEN:

Nos. 1 and 2. The Government is aware that a conference committee of both Houses of Congress of the United States eliminated from the Rivers and Harbours Bill for 1916 an amendment authorizing and approving a proposed expenditure of $5,000,000 by the legislature of the state of Illinois for the purpose of improving navigation of the Illinois river.

This amendment contained a provision to the effect that the amount of water to be diverted from lake Michigan through "this system of water ways" should at no time exceed 250,000 cubic feet per minute.

The elimination of the entire amendment left the matter as it was previous to the introduction of the Bill.

The permit issued by the United States Secretary for War on December 5, 1901, limits the amount of water to be diverted from lake Michigan through what is known as the Chicago drainage canal to 250,000 cubic feet per minute. That permit has not in the meantime been modified or changed.

SEED GRAIN INDEBTEDNESS.

Mr. McCRANEY:

1. What indebtedness was incurred to the Dominion Government by the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta respectively, for seed grain supplied to settlers on patented lands in these provinces in 1908?

2. What amount is still owing by each of these provinces in respect of these advances?

3. What was the amount of seed grain indebtedness by settlers on unpatented lands in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta respectively, for seed grain supplied in 1908, and what amounts are still owing in each province in respect of same?

4. What amount is now owing by settlers in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta respectively, for advances of seed grain prior to 1915?

5. What were the total advances for seed grain and fodder to settlers in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta respectively, in 1914, 1915 and 1916, and what amounts are still owing in each province in respect of same?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Province of Saskatchewan	$ 714,944 09
Province of Alberta	150,914 30
2. Province of Saskatchewan including interest	300,459 84
Province of Alberta, including interest	5,472 52
3. Province of Saskatchewan	326,511 96
Province of Alberta	75,109 80
3a. Amount still owing in provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta	4,443 83
4. Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta	233,536 46
5. Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1914	60,462 46
Province of Saskatchewan, 1915 and 1916	8,655,144 29
Province of Alberta, 1915 and 1916	3,542,223 38
Amount still owing in provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1914	54,716 16
Amount still owing in province of Saskatchewan, 1915 and 1916	5,498,480 16
Amount still owing in province of Alberta, 1915 and 1916	2,143,675 98

SHERBROOKE EXHIBITION GROUNDS.

Mr. McCREA:

1. Did the Government have the use of the Sherbrooke Exhibition Association grounds and buildings for a military training camp in the years 1915 and 1916?

2. If so, did they pay anything to the said Association for damages or repairs to grounds and buildings, and how much for each year?

3. Did the Government pay anything to any other person or persons for damages to property left or stores on said grounds or in said buildings?

4. If so, what is the name of the party or parties to whom such payments were made?

5. What amount was paid to each person?

6. What was, in detail, the kind or nature of goods so damaged?

Mr. KEMP:

1. Yes. From January, 1915, to August, 1915, and from October, 1915, to July, 1916.

2. Yes. $5,000 to August, 1915, and $1,050 to July, 1916. Repairs account damages.

3. No payments were made by the Government to any other person or persons for damages to property left or stored on the

said grounds or in the said buildings. If any such payments were made they were paid by the Eastern Townships Agricultural Association.

4. Answered by No. 3.
5. Answered by No. 3.
6. Answered by No. 3.

FRASERVILLE RECRUITING STATION.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Does the Department of Militia and Defence pay rent for a shop at Fraserville, which has been used for the purpose of a drill hall and armoury for recruits?
2. What amount has been spent either by the Department of Militia and Defence or the Public Works Department for the heating apparatus, lighting plant, water supply and furnishings of such buildings?
3. Who is the proprietor of said building?
4. What does the Government intend to do with this building now that there are no more recruits at Fraserville?

Mr. KEMP:

1. Yes.
2. $2,145.60 (from 19th May, 1914, to date.)
3. S. C. Riou.
4. This question is irrelevant, as it contains a statement of fact.

QUEBEC & SAGUENAY RAILWAY.

*Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Has the Government purchased the Quebec and Saguenay Railway?
2. If so, on what date and at what price?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. An agreement to purchase has been entered into, pursuant to the Statutes of Canada, 1916, Cap. 22 This agreement has already been laid upon the table of the House.
2. The agreement is dated July 25, 1916. The price is to be fixed by the Exchequer Court, in accordance with the terms of the above statute.

*Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Has the Government entered into a contract with the Quebec and Saguenay Railway Company for the completion of said railway?
2. If so, at what date, and upon what terms?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The Quebec and Saguenay railway is being completed by the companies under the conditions set out in the copy of the order in council.
2. Answered by No. 1.

ADVANCES FOR SEED GRAIN.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. What amount was advanced for seed grain and relief in the Dominion Lands Districts of Lethbridge and Medicine Hat in the years 1914 and 1915?
2. How much has been repaid in each of the years 1915, 1916, and up to January 15, 1917?
3. What was the total amount advanced in Alberta and Saskatchewan in 1914 and 1915?
4. What is the total amount so far returned?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. $2,190,045.93.
2. Amount repaid, 1915 .. .. $259,036 34
   Amount repaid, 1916 .. .. 655,912 65
   Amount repaid, 1917, (15th January) 59,170 82
   Total $974,119 81
3. $12,197,367.67.
4. $4,652,894.52.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—FREIGHT HANDLERS AT PICTOU, N.S.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. How many men were employed in the freight handling by the Railway Department at Pictou in conection with the winter service during the month of December, 1916?
2. How many men were employed for same purpose in the same service during the month of December, 1915, by the Marine Department?

Mr. PATENAUDE:

1. There were eighteen permanent employees and one hundred temporary labourers and longshoremen.
2. The handling of the freight under the Department of Marine and Fisheries, in December, 1915, was performed by contract, and the department has no record of the number of men employed.

MILITARY SUPPLIES.

Mr. MACDONALD:

Who were the contractors, in December, 1916, for furnishing supplies for the troops at Trenton and Pictou, respectively, in the county of Pictou?

Mr. KEMP: Trenton—Meats and lard, Harris Abattoir Co.; bread, Dominion Fish & Fruit Co.; bread, F. A. Mulligan (Hygienic Bakery); groceries, Jas. McArthur; jams and marmalade, T. Upton Co.; potatoes and vegetables, A. H. King; coal oil, Imperial Oil Co.; straw for men's bedding, J. B. Strickland.

Pictou—Fish and corned beef, Pope Bros.; groceries, John Munro; potatoes and vegetables, John Munro; bacon and lard, John Munro; jams and marmalade, Dominion Canners; coal oil, Imperial Oil Co.; bread, Jas. D. McDonald.

MR. A. DE WITT FOSTER.

Mr. KAY:

1. Is Mr. A. De Witt Foster, late member for Kings, Nova Scotia, employed by the Gov-

ernment or any department thereof, or is he in any way representing the Government?

2. If so, what is he doing, and what salary does he receive?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

PROHIBITION OF OLEOMARGARINE.

Mr. KAY:

1. Is it the intention of the Government, during the present session, to make any change in the law which prohibits the manufacture, importation and sale of oleomargarine?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. Any necessary announcement with respect to this matter will be made in due course.

PICTOU, N.S., MARINE AGENCY.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Has any appointment been made to fill the agency of Marine and Fisheries at Pictou, Nova Scotia, vacated by the death of W. H. Noonan?

2. If so, who is the appointee?

3. If not, will the vacancy be filled?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.

2. John R. Davies.

3. Answered by No. 2.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAY LEVEL CROSSING.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Is the Railway Department aware of the dangerous nature of the crossing on the Canadian Government Railway north of the Eastern Car Works at Trenton, Pictou county?

2. If so, is it the intention of the railway to construct a subway to remove the danger?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The elimination of the level crossing on the Pictou Harbour branch, north of the Eastern Car Works at Trenton, Pictou county, has been given consideration.

2. An item has been placed in this year's Estimates for the construction of a subway at this point.

WHARF AT MUCHABOOM.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Was any survey made for a proposed wharf at Muchaboom, Halifax County, in the calendar year 1916?

2. If so, by whom, and what was the cost of same?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.

2. Made by Messrs. Cox and Mosher of District Engineer Morrison's staff at a cost of $28.05.

[Mr. Kay.]

INDIAN LANDS; DIGBY, N.S.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Were any Indian lands in Digby County leased to one Mr. Torrie, during the past three years?

2. If so, where are such lands situated, what are the terms of the lease and the rentals stipulated therein?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

HALIFAX & EASTERN RAILWAY.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Were Messrs. Chisholm, McDonald and McGregor, contractors for the construction of cribwork at McCurdy's on the Halifax and Eastern Railway paid for such work?

2. If so, what was the total amount paid in connection therewith?

3. What was the date and amount of the last payment?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Messrs. Chisholm, McDonald and McGregor were not contractors for the Department of Railways and Canals, and therefore no amount has been paid them.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Answered by No. 1.

CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE DUTIES ON LIQUOR.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE:

1. What has been the net and gross revenue derived by the Customs Department from the importation of alcoholic liquors and beers of all kinds during each of the fiscal years ending March 31, 1914, March 31, 1915, and March 31, 1916?

2. What other revenues, if any, have been derived by the Customs Department from the same source during the above period?

3. What has been the net and gross revenue derived by the Inland Revenue Department from the manufacture or importation of alcoholic liquors or beers of all kinds during each of the above-mentioned fiscal years?

Mr. PATENAUDE:

1. Customs duties collected:

Fiscal year ended March 31, 1914	$10,157,647 87
" " " " 1915	8,889,734 65
" " " " 1916	7,776,472 19

2. Nil.

3.

Malt and Liquor.		Spirits.	
1914 ..	$166,466 07	1914 ..	$9,038,028 07
1915 ..	148,303 23	1915 ..	8,706,481 42
1916 ..	102,379 45	1916 ..	8,701,074 78

STONE FOR THE NEW PARLIAMENT BUILDING.

* Mr. MURPHY:

1. In the construction of the new Parliament Building will stone from the Tyndall Quarry in Manitoba be used?

2. If so, what quantity of the said stone is to be used, and what will be its cost per cubic yard or foot delivered at the works on Parliament Hill?

3. What quantity of the said stone has been delivered up to January 25, 1917?

Mr. ROGERS:

1 and 3. Whether stone from the Tyndall quarry in Manitoba is to be used in the reconstruction of the Parliament building is still under consideration by the Joint Committee on the reconstruction of the Parliament building.

2. In the event of it being decided to use this stone, 138,000 cubic feet will be required. This stone is quoted at $1.02 per cubic foot, f.o.b. Ottawa. The cartage from the Canadian Pacific Railway terminal to the stone shop on Sussex street is 30 cents per ton, giving an additional cost of 2·4 cents per cubic foot, or $1.04·4 per cubic foot at the stone shop.

* Mr. MURPHY:

1. In the construction of the new Parliament Building will stone from the Wallace Quarry in Nova Scotia be used?

2. If so, what quantity of the said stone is to be used, and what will be its cost per cubic yard or foot delivered at the works on Parliament Hill?

3. What quantity of the said stone has been delivered up to January 25, 1917?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.

2. Forty thousand cubic feet will be required, to be delivered in quarry blocks at the stone shop on Sussex street, for 75·4 cents per cubic foot.

3. Thirty-one thousand five hundred and fifty cubic feet.

* Mr. MURPHY:

1. Prior to November 11, 1916, how many cubic yards of rock had been excavated at the site of the new Parliament Building?

2. What was the total cost of excavating the said quantity of rock?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Nine thousand six hundred and fifty-one cubic yards.

2. Thirty-seven thousand three hundred and fifteen dollars and sixty-eight cents.

MONTREAL PUBLIC BUILDING.

* Mr. MURPHY:

1. Is the Government, or any department thereof, erecting a building in the rear of, and connected with, the post office sub-station occupying the premises formerly known as the Carslake Hotel on St. James street, in the City of Montreal?

2. If so, (a) who has the contract for such building, (b) and was the said contract awarded after public advertisement and tender?

3. If tenders were not advertised for, how was the contract awarded, and the prices fixed?

4. What is to be the total cost of the said building?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes, the Department of Public Works is erecting a shed and covered passageway to be used by the Post Office Department.

2. (a) E. T. Verbanise. (b) Yes, tenders were invited by public advertisement and the contract was awarded to the lowest.

3. Answered as above.

4. Contract price $7,490, and a unit price of $1.30 per cubic yard for excavation, and $8.50 for concrete foundations, if required.

MUNITIONS BOARD CLERKS.

Mr. McKENZIE:

1. Are the clerks employed in the Munitions branch of the Government permanent or temporary?

2. Are they paid on the average better salaries than the permanent clerks of the other departments of the Government Service?

3. Is the Government aware as to whether or not some of the women clerks receive over one hundred dollars per month and some of the men over two hundred dollars per month?

4. What is the highest salary paid (a) to a man; and (b) to a woman?

5. Have these clerks any special or technical knowledge entitling them to the higher salaries?

6. Are the clerks of the Munitions branch paid higher salaries than those who are permanent in other departments of the Government Service? If so, why?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The reference in this question is apparently to the Imperial Munitions Board, which is not a branch of the Canadian Government, and of which the administration is not under the control of the Canadian Government. The Government has no information as to the salaries paid to the clerks and other employees of the Imperial Munitions Board, and those salaries are determined altogether by the British Government through that Board. The Canadian Government has no information as to the special or technical knowledge possessed by the several clerks and employees of the Imperial Munitions Board.

SEED GRAIN—COLLECTION OF ADVANCES.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. What officials are engaged in the collection of the Government advances for seed grain and relief in Saskatchewan and Alberta?

2. Were the homestead inspectors used in every land district affected? If not, why not?

3. What are the salaries paid those persons apart from regular departmental officials engaged in this work?

4. What are the names of these persons?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Chief Inspector H. G. Cuttle, Inspector Thomas Bronsdon, a number of clerks out of the Land and Immigration offices and about half the homestead inspectors.

2. Yes. About half the homestead inspectors were used in connection with seed grain and relief collections. It was necessary to retain half of the homestead inspectors at their regular duties in order to keep up the most important homestead inspections.

3. One hundred dollars per month.

4. T. Brownlee, T. Carmichael, T. H. Cochrane, A. Hardy, J. B. Hawkes, J. D. Mitchell, A. Sipes and H. A. J. Scott.

STANLEY McCUTCHEON.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Was Stanley McCutcheon, preventive officer at Sonora, N. S., dismissed?
2. If so, why and when?
3. At whose request was he dismissed?
4. Was there an investigation?
5. If so, by whom?
6. Was a successor appointed?
7. If so, at whose instance?
8. What is the salary connected with the office?

Mr. REID:

1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. The employment of Mr. Stanley McCutcheon, acting preventive officer of customs at Sonora, N.S., was discontinued on the 20th November, 1916, in accordance with the terms of his letter of appointment dated 27th December, 1907.

6. Yes.

7. Minister of Customs.

8. $150 a year.

L. B. DODGE—HAY PURCHASES.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. What amount, if any, was paid to L. B. Dodge of Middleton, N.S., as salary and expenses, in the calendar year 1916, for the purchase of hay for the Government of Canada?
2. What quantity of hay was purchased by Mr. Dodge?

Mr. BURRELL: No hay was purchased by L. B. Dodge for the Government of Canada.

QUESTION TO STAND FOR SPEAKER'S RULING.

On the question by Mr. McKenzie:

1. Is the Minister of Justice aware, either officially or by common report, as to whether or not the Post Office Department, during the spring or summer of 1916, issued an order excluding from the mails a certain news sheet called Racing Form, published in the United States, containing advance information or tips on horse races to be run in Canada and the United States?
2. Is the minister aware, either officially or by common report, as to whether or not said news sheets are still being imported into Canada through the medium of the railway express companies?
3. Did the minister observe in the press, or was he informed that statements had been made by officials of the Justice Department to the effect that it was not the intention of said department to prohibit said express companies from bringing into Canada said news sheets?
4. Was the minister approached on the subject, either personally or by correspondence, either in favour of or against the importation of said news sheets by said express companies?
5. Is the minister aware of the provisions of Chapter 10 of the Acts of 1910 (Federal), section 3 and subsections f and h, which impose a penalty of $1,000 with a year's imprisonment upon persons dealing in news sheets of the type of said Racing Form?
6. If the above statute is not being enforced against said express companies, will the minister state the reason for such non-enforcement?
7. Is it the intention of the minister to permit the importation of said news sheets by said express companies?
8. Is the minister aware as to whether or not very large sums of money are wagered and lost every day and week by the young men and women of Canada, as the result of information given them through the medium of said sheet known as the Racing Form?
9. Is the Government aware of the following provision of the statutes, Chapter 10 of the Acts of 1910, section 3, sub-section f—"Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to one year's imprisonment and to a fine of $1,000 who: '(f) advertises, prints, publishes, exhibits, posts up, sells or supplies, or offers to sell or supply, any information intended to assist in, or intended for use in connection with book-making, pool selling or wagering upon any horse race or other race, fight, game or sport. (h) Wilfully and knowingly sends, transmits, delivers or receives any message by telegraph, telegram, mail or express, conveying information relating to book-making, pool selling, betting or wagering'"?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask that this question stand, to afford me an opportunity of consulting the authorities more fully. As at present advised, the question, to be in order, will have to be amended, if not entirely eliminated.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Buchanan.—For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other correspondence in connection with the suspension of F. D. Shaw, collector of customs at Lethbridge, Alberta.

Mr. Lemieux.—For a copy of all letters, telegrams and reports addressed to and received by the Minister of Trade and Commerce during 1916, to promote better trade relations between Canada and France.

Mr. Lemieux.—For a tabulated statement showing the number of divorces granted by the Parliament of Canada since 1867.

Mr. McCraney.—For a copy of all documents, letters, messages, correspondence, reports, and particularly an order in council dated 6th December, 1898, respecting the exemption from military service of the Doukhobors.

Mr. Graham.—For a copy of all correspondence between any member of the Government and Sir Thomas Tait referring to his appointment to, and resignation from, the National Service Board.

Mr. Graham.—For a copy of all correspondence between Mr. Murray, secretary of the Manufacturers' Association, and any member of the Government, or Sir Thomas Tait, as head of the National Service Board, concerning his suggested appointment as secretary of the National Service Board.

Mr. Macdonald.—For a copy of all letters, telegrams, papers and documents of any kind relative to the appointment of the assistant to Superintendent Hallisecy at Halifax, which was objected to, as alleged, by Mr. Stanfield, M.P.

Mr. Macdonald.—For a return showing a list of all persons employed for the first time during the year 1916 on the Oxford and New Glasgow division of the Canadian Government railways at Stellarton, New Glasgow and Pictou, as brakemen, telegraphers, and cleaners in roundhouse respectively, with the dates of their appointment.

Mr. Macdonald.—For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents regarding the change, in the year 1916, in the mail contract for the service between French River and McGrath Mountain, in the county of Pictou.

Mr. Macdonald.—For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the removal of Mr. H. D. McKenzie as mechanical foreman at Stellarton on the Canadian Government railways, and the appointment of his successor.

Mr. Verville.—For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and documents of all kinds exchanged between any person or persons and the Department of Labour or any other department of the Government relating to the labour trouble at Thetford Mines, P.Q., and also copies of all correspondence exchanged between the different departments of the Government respecting the same question.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a return showing the quantities of timber cut, and the sum paid therefor, to date, under the lease or sale of timber made by the Indian Department to Mr. Arthur Webber from lands situated near Ship Harbour Lake, Halifax county, together with the name or names of all surveyors of the timber cut from the said Indian lands under the above-mentioned sale or lease, and copies of all reports made in connection therewith by said surveyors.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all correspondence, vouchers, etc., in connection with the repairs to the Port Dufferin East Wharf, Halifax county, in 1915.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a return showing all expenditures made since March 31, 1916, by the Public Works Department in the several provinces of Canada, specifying the name of the work, the amount already spent thereon, and the estimated total expenditure in each case.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, memoranda, etc., by and with the Department of Railways in connection with the naming of stations on the Halifax and Eastern railway.

Mr A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all correspondence, vouchers, etc., in connection with the construction of a wharf at Ecum Secum West, Halifax county.

Mr. A K. Maclean.—For a copy of all correspondence, vouchers, etc., in connection with the repairs to Harrigan Cove Wharf, Halifax county, in 1914-15, under the foremanship of James McDonald.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all vouchers, correspondence, etc., in connection with the repairs to Beaver Harbour Wharf, Halifax county, within the last four years.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all correspondence, vouchers, etc., in connection with the construction of the Port Dufferin West Wharf, Halifax county, in 1913-14.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all correspondence, vouchers, etc., in connection with the construction of the Muchaboom Harbour Wharf, Halifax county, in 1913.

Mr. Cruise.—For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and other documents received by and issued from the Customs Department in connection with the duty charged on farm implements imported or to be imported by the Grain Growers Grain Company of Winnipeg, since June 1, 1915.

Mr. Macdonald.—For a copy of the report of Dr. Bruce on the hospital conditions for Canadian overseas soldiers, and of all evidence, if any, taken by him, along with copy of all correspondence, letters, cables and other documents in relation thereto, and also a copy of the proceedings of the Board presided over by Dr. Baptie in relation to the same subject, the evidence taken by the Board, and of all letters, cables and other documents in connection with the same.

Mr. Macdonald.—For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents relative to an agreement or arrangement with the Pictou Longshoremen's Union made by Canadian Government railways in the spring of 1916, in regard to the handling of freight and coal at Pictou, and in regard to the discontinuance of same, and as to the existing arrangements for handling freight and coal at the same place.

Mr. Macdonald.—For a copy of all letters, papers, telegrams and other documents relative to the application for, and the granting of, a Conciliation Board to the employees of the Acadia Coal Company in the spring of 1916, the proceedings of said Board, and all other papers in relation to the same.

Mr. Macdonald.—For a copy of all letters, papers, telegrams and other documents relative to the application for, and the refusal to grant, a Conciliation Board as petitioned for under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act by the employees of the Canadian Government Railway at Pictou, who were members of the Longshoremen's Union at Pictou during the year 1916.

Mr. Macdonald.—For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the removal of Mr. Spinney as trackmaster on the Short Line, so-called, of the Canadian Government railway, and to the appointment of Henry Gray as his successor.

Mr. Steele.—For a copy of all documents, letters, telegrams and other correspondence in the Department of the Interior relating to grazing leases numbers 2785, 2843, 3701, 3998, 4603, 5566, 6220 and 6221.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier.—For a copy of all correspondence respecting the appointment of a commission to investigate the financial and economic condition of Canadian railways, showing the names of the commissioners, the rate of their remuneration, along with the names of

the secretaries and engineers appointed by them, or by the commission, and the rate of their remuneration.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier.—For a copy of all correspondence exchanged between the Dominion Government and the Provincial Governments inviting them to a conference on the subject of making provisions for returned soldiers, including a copy of the proceedings of the conference which took place on the 10th of January at Ottawa on the same subject.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier.—For a copy of all correspondence exchanged with the Government of the province of Manitoba concerning a statute passed by the Legislature of Manitoba at its last stssion entitled, "An Act to amend the Jury Act"; together with copies of all orders in council respecting same.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier.—For a copy of all correspondence addressed by the Canadian Society of Civil Engineers, or any branch or any member thereof, to the Government or any member thereof, on the subject of the appointment of foreign engineers to the exclusion of Canadian engineers on Canadian works.

Mr. Sinclair.—For a copy of all orders in council and other documents on file in the Department of Marine and Fisheries relating to the requisitioning of Canadian ships by the Canadian Government.

Mr. McCraney.—For a copy of all documents, letters, messages, correspondence, etc., respecting the termination of the agreements between the Government of Canada and the Governments of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta in reference to the Royal Northwest Mounted Police.

Mr. Turriff.—For a copy of all letters and telegrams in the Post Office Department in reference to the removal of Pearson's post office, township of Casey, in the constituency of Nipissing, from where it was located to its present location.

Mr. Copp.—For a return showing the quantity of freight carried over the Grand Trunk Pacific railway between Lévis and Moncton since that portion of said railway has been operated by the Canadian Government Railways system.

Mr. Macdonald.—For a copy of all orders in council made respecting the direction, authority or control in England of the overseas forces of Canada, showing any changes that may have been made from time to time therein. Also, copies of any opinions or reports made by the Department of Justice as to the status of Canadian overseas troops in Great Britain in relation to their control or direction.

Mr. Macdonald.—For a copy of the order or orders in council providing for the appointment of a Minister of Militia in Great Britain and for the creation of a Militia Council there and for any appointments thereto or changes in said council.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. Pugsley.—1. What is the total value of the Oliver equipment, so-called, supplied to Canadian soldiers, who have crossed to England since the commencement of the present war?

2. Was such equipment discarded when or soon after the Canadian soldiers wearing the same arrived in England?

3. If so, what was done with the said equipment, and why was it discarded?

[Mr. Speaker.]

4. What equipment was supplied in its place?

5. Was such equipment so supplied in its place better than the Oliver equipment?

6. If so, in what respects?

Mr. Sinclair.—1. What were the names, home addresses and former occupations of all censors, decoders or other employees of the Government in the different cable stations in Nova Scotia during the calendar year 1916?

2. What is the name of the person who recommended each of the said censors, decoders or employees?

3. What salary was paid to each of the said persons for the calendar year 1916?

Mr. Graham.—1. How many men have been enlisted in Canada for overseas service?

2. How many of these have been subsequently discharged as unfit?

3. How many of these were discharged in Canada, and how many overseas?

Mr. Steele.—1. How many applicants for enlistment in the Canadian overseas forces have been rejected on account of being physically unfit?

2. How many have been discharged after enlistment for the same reason?

Mr. Carvell.—1. Were any changes made in the Ross Rifles Mark III, in England?

2. What changes were made, and when were they made?

3. Who gave the instructions for any changes made?

4. Were they carried out under the supervision of the Militia Department by duly qualified experts?

5. Were the rifles, as changed, duly proven according to War Office regulations, before they were given back to the Canadian troops?

Mr. Turriff.—1. What was the date of the last order given by the Government to the Ross Rifle Company?

2. How many rifles were ordered?

3. Was a recommendation of the British Army Council for the utilization of existing Canadian facilities in manufacturing the new and improved Lee-Enfield received by the Government?

4. What was the date of the recommendation, and when was it received?

5. Has the recommendation been acted upon?

Mr. Cruise.—1. What was the total number of Ross rifles made by order of the Government of Canada to date?

2. What was the cost per rifle?

3. How many of these rifles are in the hands of Canadian soldiers in France?

4. Are these rifles still being made?

5. If they are not being made to the Government order, at what date did the making cease?

6. What was the disposition made of the Ross rifles taken from the Canadian Forces in France when they were re-armed with Lee-Enfields?

7. Has the Government any information as to whether the Ross Rifle Company is now making Lee-Enfield rifles for the British Government?

8. Will the Government lay on the table the report of the Military Commission of inquiry regarding the Ross rifle, which sat in England in the year 1915?

Mr. C. A. Wilson.—1. Can the Government inform the House as to what was, on the 1st

December, 1916, the quantity of butter, cheese, eggs, fowl, turkeys in the cold storage buildings of the Dominion, particularly in the city of Montreal?

2. What was the value of these goods?

VOTES FOR WOMEN IN DOMINION ELECTIONS.

On the notice of motion:

That, whereas, in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, the provincial franchise has been granted to women by legislative enactment, and in British Columbia the electors have voted in favour of similar legislation:

Whereas it is provided in the Dominion Elections Act that persons entitled to vote for members of a Provincial Legislature shall also be entitled to vote for members of Parliament, but in respect to Alberta and Saskatchewan—alone of all the provinces of Canada—it is provided that only males shall be entitled to vote for members of the Federal Parliament, thus creating an anomalous situation as between the provinces, which should be removed;

Whereas during the present Empire struggle the women of Canada have shown a most intelligent and patriotic interest in, and an unselfish devotion to, the welfare of the state;

And whereas it seems but just and right that they should be given a voice in the direction of its affairs;

In the opinion of this House it is desirable that provision be made either to grant to women who are qualified to vote for members of a Provincial Legislature, the right also to vote for members of the Dominion Parliament, or to grant to women throughout the Dominion the right to vote for members of Parliament, subject to such provisions and limitations as may seem reasonable to Parliament.—Mr Pugsley.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In a short conversation which I had with my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers), who took a somewhat active part in a discussion on a similar resolution at the last session, it was suggested that this motion might stand for the present; but I would remind my right hon. friend the Prime Minister that when the matter was before the House at the last session, he intimated that possibly the Government might take some action upon the subject. I would just call his attention to the matter so that it might be remembered when the resolution comes up again.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I shall be very glad to bear that in mind.

Notice stands.

NATIONAL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Right hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Quebec East) moved:

For a copy of the order in council establishing the National Service Commission, giving the names of the members appointed and the rate of their remuneration.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think this information has already been laid upon the table of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Not the order in council. I have not seen the order in council at all.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I was under the impression that it had been laid upon the table of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In connection with this motion, I would like to call the attention of my right hon. friend to the fact that it has been stated in the press that the remuneration to the Director of the National Service has been fixed at $250 per month, in addition to travelling expenses. I also saw an intimation that the Director General, the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett) would not be paid any salary. I understand, however, that there is upon the commission Mr. Green, one of the members for British Columbia, and I think my right hon. friend will agree with me that it will be a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act for him to be paid a salary. I would also call attention to the fact that one of those appointed to the commission is Mr. Tilley, who is a representative of the city of St. John in the provincial legislature. The provincial statute expressly provides that for any member of the provincial legislature of New Brunswick to accept an appointment under the Dominion Government to which a salary is attached is a violation of the Act and renders his seat vacant. I do not know whether the attention of the right hon. gentleman has been called to this matter, but I thought it my duty to mention it. I have no objection to Mr. Tilley acting as a director, but, of course, he could not act as director and still continue to be a member of the legislature.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My attention has not been directed to the New Brunswick statute, nor am I informed as to the fact whether Mr. Tilley is being paid remuneration for his services or not. Mr. Bennett is receiving no remuneration; he accepted the appointment distinctly on the condition that he would accept nothing for his services. The same is true of Mr. Green, who is the other gentleman to whom the hon. member refers. I shall make inquiry about the New Brunswick statute.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The right hon. gentleman will find it in the Act relating to the members of the legislature.

REMOVAL OF RAILWAY MATERIAL TO FRANCE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

For a copy of all correspondence with the Imperial Government on the subject of sending to France rails and other railway material taken from existing Canadian railway lines, giving copies of orders in council and a statement of all action taken in regard to same.

He said: Some time ago a despatch appeared in the newspapers to the effect that the Canadian Government had been asked by the British authorities whether Canada could dispense with rails now in use, that they might be supplied for the construction of railway lines in France. I do not know whether there has been such correspondence, but in case there may have been, I move for it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There was, naturally, some correspondence on the subject; and the Canadian Government, after consultation with the several railway companies of the country and with the officers of the Intercolonial railway, were prepared to take certain action. This correspondence took place during my absence, therefore I am not wholly familiar with it; but I believe that in the end the extent of the requirements was considerably cut down, as compared with what was stated at first. I do not know that I have seen all this correspondence myself, and I cannot speak as to the nature of it all, but the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will understand that some of the information as to the necessity for the rails would possibly be of a character which would make it inexpedient to lay the correspondence on the table of the House. Should that be so, there would be no objection to submitting the secret correspondence to my right hon. friend.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not call for anything of a confidential nature. What I wish to know especially is the action taken by the Government in answer to the inquiries made.

Mr. OLIVER: Some weeks ago a very extraordinary announcement appeared in the public press—in the absence of the Prime Minister, as the right hon. gentleman (Sir Robert Borden) has just stated—to the effect that the rails upon certain railway lines in the Northwest would be taken up and sent to France. The newspapers stated very clearly that the Government was entering upon a definite policy, and that policy appeared to be the tearing up of rails on established railway lines in the western provinces, and particularly in northern Alberta. Of course, I do not assume that the Government has control of the press of the country to prevent such anouncements being made; but I wish to say to the Government that when such announcements are made so publicly and so definitely as in this case they have a most disturbing influence upon the public mind and lead to very important conclusions having a direct bearing upon the business of the localities affected. It was announced very definitely that the rails on the Canadian Northern west of Edmonton for a distance of over two hundred miles were to be taken up. At that time contracts were in process of being let for taking out railway ties in the wooded country through which this line, in part, runs. I am unable now to say whether these contracts were cancelled because of this announcement, but I am in a position to say that the question whether they should be cancelled or not was seriously considered because of that announcement, and a general disarrangeemnt of business was caused along the whole line. In the newspaper press there seemed to be a general consensus of opinion that there were too many railroads in the Northwest and particularly in northern Alberta, and that it would be entirely in the public interest to have these railways taken up. I have taken occasion several times to draw the attention of the House to the fact that in northern Alberta, so far from there being too many; there are railroads there the grade of which has been completed for several years, running through settled parts of the country, where the people are in desperate need of railway communication, and the excuse is made by the railway—this same Canadian Northern Railway Company—that they cannot get the rails to lay upon these lines, the money for the grading of which has been spent. It certainly strikes the people in our part of the country as entirely peculiar that, after the money has been voted, after guarantees have been given by the provincial Government in the one case and by the Dominion Government in the other in the full belief that these railroads were needed, and the railroads having been completed in the case of the Dominion guarantees and partially completed in the case of the provincial guarantees, the proposal should be sent broadcast through the country that the rails on the lines under Dominion guarantee should be taken up and the lines partially built under provincial

guarantee should remain without rails being placed upon them, on the general assumption that there are too many railroads in the Northwest at the present time and that the public money had been wasted in giving railroad accommodation to the people of that part of the country. I take this opportunity of pointing out to the Government how serious the business effect of such a report must necessarily be, and I can hardly think that the Government was doing right in permitting such a report to become current without promptly contradicting it if it had no foundation. In regard to the superabundance of railroads, there are people to-day in the constituency immediately to the east of that which I represent who have been living for years 100 and 120 miles from railway communication. I say that in such circumstances the idea that seems to prevail that there are too many railroads in that country is entirely mistaken.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways): The first request that came from the British Goyernment for rails was for about 1,000 miles, and it was thought then that we should do anything in our power in order to help the British Government during the war. The intention in taking up the rails in the western part of Canada was to take them from stretches where the Grand Trunk Pacific railway and the Canadian Northern railway parallel. It would certainly have been no hardship to take those up. When, owing to the difficulty of securing transportation overseas, the request was cut down to 300 miles, we decided to take the rails up at divisional
3 p.m. points of the Transcontinental railway, and that is what has been done.

Mr. GRAHAM: That would be sidings?

Mr. COCHRANE: At divisional points, the yards.

Motion agreed to.

HON. DR. BELAND, M.P.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL: My attention has been called to a newspaper cutting dealing with the case of the Hon. Dr. Béland, the hon. member for Beauce. I would like to know if there is anything new in his case. This newspaper points out that two Germans, one Baron von Polenz and another named Mundheim, have been liberated from internment camps in Canada. I would ask whether the release of these men would not have been a good opportunity for effecting an exchange in the case of Dr. Béland who, as we all know, has been a prisoner of war in Germany for about two years.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not familiar with the circumstances attending the alleged releases from the internment camps, but I do know that not only this Government, but the British Government have made every possible effort to secure the release or exchange of the Hon. Dr. Béland. In every instance I think I have made my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition acquainted with what has been done. I have sent to him, and also to the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), and to another gentleman who was a very intimate friend of Dr. Béland, the correspondence which from time to time has taken place. The difficulty with regard to this case, as well as to other cases, is that when very strong efforts are made to secure the liberation or the exchange of any person who is held by the German military authorities, that circumstance in itself seems to strengthen the determination of those authorities not to liberate or to exchange. I shall make inquiry of the Minister of Justice as to the matter referred to by my hon. friend.

Mr. MARCIL: Can the Prime Minister complete his answer by saying who has control of the release of men interned in Canadian camps?

SIR ROBERT BORDEN: The Minister of Justice. All the internment operations are under his direction by authority of an order in council passed for the purpose.

MONTREAL CUSTOMS COLLECTORSHIP.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MARCIL: I notice in the Montreal morning papers a statement that Mr. R. S. White, collector of customs in Montreal, a highly respected official, is about to retire from the service, and that he has been replaced by Mr. Bertram, the collector in Toronto. Is there any truth in the report?

Mr. REID: Mr. R. S. White, the collector of customs in Montreal, applied for superannuation. He is over the age limit for superannuation, and I have asked for an order in council granting his superannuation. In the meantime, until his successor is appointed, I have transferred Mr. Bertram, the collector at Toronto, to Montreal to take charge there, as Montreal is

the most important port in the Dominion, and Mr. Bertram is one of the most experienced officials in the service. It is because he has the experience that I have transferred him.

Mr. MARCIL: Then is this appointment only temporary?

Mr. REID: I have transferred Mr. Bertram temporarily, and have put in Mr. Bertram's place temporarily Mr. Blair, who is one of our best inspectors at Ottawa.

IMMIGRATION REGULATIONS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I am asked to draw the attention of the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche) to the fact that hardship is being experienced by people on account of the rule applied to the deportation of children coming into Canada from the United States. I have had two cases drawn to my attention within the last few days in which women with their children were turned back from McAdam junction, New Brunswick, and required to travel long distances back to the places from which they had come in the United States to obtain health certificates for their children. One was the case of the wife of a Canadian soldier who is at the front, who had been visiting her father in New York, and who was returning with her child to her home in New Brunswick. On her way back home she was refused entrance into Canada because she did not have the necessary health certificate for her child. She was subjected to the necessity of making a return trip to New York to obtain this certificate. It looks like a case of unnecessary hardship. One would think that there would be a health officer at McAdam junction, or at other points at which people are entering Canada, to make an examination, if an examination is necessary. I would like to know from the Minister of the Interior, or from the right hon. the Prime Minister, if it is absolutely necessary to have such a rigid rule as that applied to people coming with children into Canada.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I shall direct the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the inquiry of my hon. friend, and ask him to give the information.

DEPARTMENT OF MILITIA.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MARCIL: I would like to ask the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Kemp) a question with regard to his department. I have a letter from a retired militia officer who would like to know if it is the policy of the department to allow a man who is now permanently in the service to fill another position at the same time, or if officers of the department are required to retire from their former positions and give their whole time to the public service. Is there any rule in regard to a case of that kind?

Mr. KEMP: What is the case in point?

Mr. MARCIL: Of course, I understand that if an officer were overseas he would be required to give his whole time, but I would like to know if a man employed in the Department of Militia and Defence in Canada is required to give his whole time to the department; or will he have time to give to his former civilian duties as well as to his duties as an officer of the department?

Mr. KEMP: There are a great many branches of the service under the control of the Department of Militia and Defence, and there are instances in which a man can attend to his own profession and also perform service to the department or the country. Unless the hon. gentleman has more specific information, I am afraid I cannot give him a more definite answer.

Mr. MARCIL: I am merely speaking of the case of an officer of the militia who has been permanently appointed to the force.

Mr. KEMP: I do not know of any such case, but I can find out. Would not my hon. friend give me the case in point, not publicly if he does not desire to do so, but confidentially, in order that I may look into it?

Mr. MARCIL: I wanted to know if there was a rule preventing that.

Mr. KEMP. There is a rule against a man doing anything that is dishonest. If my hon. friend has in mind some irregularity in regard to this matter I would say to him that there is no intention to countenance anything of the sort.

Mr. MARCIL: I am not suggesting that there is anything wrong or irregular, but I want to know if a man is required to give the whole of his time to the department or if he can hold two positions and serve two masters, remaining in the employ of a corporation and still being on the staff of the department?

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

LIMITATION OF RACING MEETS.

Mr. OLIVER J. WILCOX (North Essex) moved the second reading of Bill No. 2, to amend the Criminal Code.

He said: The Bill, which I now propose to be read a second time, is intended to add a provision to sub-section 2 of section 235 of the Criminal Code, as enacted by chapter 19 of the statutes of 1912. This statute was passed in 1910 and assented to in 1912. The statute of 1910, or 1912, was intended to have dealt effectively with certain abuses that had developed throughout the country in connection with the extensive race meets held by various racing associations. The legislation as so passed has not proved effective. The racing men, or those who have been inclined to be speculative, have broken through this statute; if not by word, by action, they have declared it to be a scrap of paper. By digging up antediluvian charters and galvanizing them into life and by establishing different units in the same community, they are now having a greater number of days' racing in a locality than they had previous to the legislation that was passed in 1910 and which was calculated to limit the evils of the race course. The object I had in introducing this Bill was to make clear the intention of this Parliament and as the result of the full and careful investigation which I have made into the subject I do not expect that it will prove to be contentious in character. In view of the fact that there are in the country certain men interested in the question, some of whom are interested in suppressing the operation of race tracks entirely and some who do not like the idea of any limitation whatever, I desire to go fully into an explanation of what I regard as the actual situation and the evils incident thereto in connection with these associations.

The other day I read a very long article in the Toronto Globe by Mr. Raney, a very distinguished and honourable gentleman of the city of Toronto, written on behalf of the Social Reform Council of the Dominion of Canada. There is one statement that he made in connection with the legislation of 1910 with which I do not agree. He said that the reason why the Miller Bill, which sought to eliminate race track gambling throughout the Dominion, was not effective for the reason that Sir Allen Aylesworth, then Minister of Justice, opposed the Bill, and for the further reason that certain gentlemen high up in politics were interested in this institution, and men with strong financial means were backing them. It is my view that the Bill was considered on its merits. We all remember the late Mr. Miller, who introduced his Bill in the House in 1910. I think the House will agree that his presentation of the case was fraught with honour to himself, with discretion and skill. Mr. Miller was responsible for the appointment of a commission by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, then Prime Minister of Canada. I was present at the meetings that were held in Ottawa, which were attended by men from one end of the Dominion to the other, and men were even brought from the state of New York, at one time one of the greatest racing states in the Union. Mr. Hughes, a candidate in the recent Presidential election, succeeded in getting a law passed some time ago that made race track gambling a crime within the state of New York, and so important did he consider that legislation, that in his campaign literature reference was made to it as one of the outstanding accomplishments of his public life.

These men that I have spoken of, representing the Racing Associations, the Horse Breeder's Associations, the Thoroughbred Associations, and the Social Reform Council of Canada, gathered together and gave evidence, and upon their evidence Parliament came to the conclusion that certain legislation should be passed to deal effectively with the situation. I repeat, that in view of the full and complete investigation, lasting for days and weeks, that Parliament made of this question, both in the House and in committee. Mr. Raney is hardly justified in insinuating that the men who composed Parliament at that time were actuated by any other motive than the consideration of the case on its merits. The commission that my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, the Prime Minister, appointed at that time was composed of Mr. Miller, chairman, Mr. Blain, Mr. McColl, Mr. Martin, M.P. for Regina, now premier of Saskatchewan, Mr. Stratton, Mr. Sinclair, and Mr. Monk.

Racing in Canada was organized, as I understand from my study of the subject, in the year 1860. Queen Victoria set aside a certain sum of money to purchase what was known as the Queen's Cup. This trophy was given to encourage racing, with the idea of developing the breeding of thoroughbred horses in Canada. As I understand, previous to the year 1892, it was a

crime to make a bet on a race track; and when the Criminal Code was consolidated, there was added to it a provision calculated and intended to allow the registration of a bet or the selling of a pool on a race track. That legislation was subsequently tested in the courts, and the decision of the courts in connection with it is clearly set forth in these reports. Sir Allan Aylesworth, speaking to the House upon the debate on the Miller Bill, and the provision which was inserted in that Bill and which was supposed to deal effectively with this evil, as it had developed in the country, made this reference to it:

> We have all heard of the ancient conundrum "When is a dog's tail not a dog's tail?" With the answer: "When it is a waggin," It seems to me that this is something of the same sort: "When is a place not a place?" The definition is that the word "place" is to include any place, whether it is or is not a fixed place. Now to my mind, the word "place" necessarily implies and carries with it the idea of localization and of definite fixity. I cannot understand a place that is not a fixed place, and I cannot therefore think that the object which the framers of this Bill had in view, in endeavouring to get over the decision of the courts I have described, can be accomplished by any juggling with words or verbal trickery such as, it seems to me, with all respect to the draftsman of this Bill, the definition I have referred to, literally amounts to.

It appears that the provision that was added to the Criminal Code of 1902 has been questioned in the courts, and that the courts had ruled that if the bookmaker in the selling of a pool or in the registration of a bet stood still or under an umbrella, then he was committing a crime; but if he was moving from place to place in the booth, he was not committing a crime, so that it would be clear that previous to the legislation passed by this Parliament in 1910, the registration of a bet, or the selling of a pool was really on the verge of criminality. As I am a layman so far as legal matters are concerned, and as my opinion might not be considered as very authoritative if I attempted to give a definition of the statute with regard to this subject, I desire to quote the opinion of the Hon. S. H. Blake, K.C., of Toronto, who, I think, will be regarded as a reasonable authority upon the construction of any statute. Speaking on the peculiarities of the statute as it had been construed by the highest courts in the land, because the case had gone to the Court of Appeal and from there to the Supreme Court of Canada, and the highest judges in the country had placed their construction upon the insertion of the particular clause to which I have alluded heretofore in the Criminal Code in the year 1902, the Hon. S. H. Blake thus added his voice to the chorus of church denunciation of the Woodbine race track at the afternoon session of the diocesan synod meeting:

> It will be seen by reference to section 235, sub-section 2, of the Criminal Code that some provision was supposed to have been made for betting on and during the meet of a regularly organized and incorporated race track. This was taken advantage of until race track gambling became a public scandal, demoralizing in the extreme, until a case known as the Queen vs. Hanrahan, in which the Police Magistrate of Windsor convicted the defendant for keeping a common betting house. This case was taken to the Court of Appeal, where the conviction was unanimously sustained, the late Chief Justice Armour in his judgment, was very emphatic, holding as he did, that betting on any track, whether incorporated or otherwise, was an offence against the Criminal Code. The writer, acting in accordance with this judgment, brought the president of the Ontario Jockey Club into Court, where Colonel Denison convicted, giving a stated case, which was taken to the Court of Appeal, where the conviction was quashed, the court holding that as the president neither took part in the bookmaking nor profited thereby, a conviction could not be sustained against him. At the same time, one of the judges made a remark to the effect that the Crown should have proceeded against the bookmakers. At the next race track meet, evidence was secured and several bookmakers were brought into court, one of whom was selected as a test case. Colonel Denison again made a conviction, and this case was also taken to the Court of Appeal, where the conviction was sustained. It was then carried to the Supreme Court at Ottawa, and the judgment of the Court of Appeal was upheld, with one or two of the judges dissenting. This, however, did not put a stop to the gambling on the Woodbine race track, which was shown by a change of tactics in which the bookmakers stood on the lawn (and enclosures set apart for the bookmakers and their customers) and continued business as usual, the only difference being that they stood marking time instead of sitting.
>
> A case was brought into court and a conviction secured before Col. Denison, who, when passing sentence, stated that the attempted subterfuge in order to evade the law (in his judgment) intensified the offence. This case was also taken to the Court of Appeal and quashed on the grounds that standing up and moving about whilst the business of betting was carried on did not constitute an offence, not being a house, room, or place.

So it appears reasonably clear that, as I have said, previous to the legislation of 1910 on this subject the right to carry on race track betting or gambling had a very narrow margin indeed to stand on.

After full consideration of the subject, I believe that the majority in this House based their judgment upon three considerations, which considerations in turn were based upon the expert testimony given before the commission to which I have referred. The first consideration, I think, was this—that horse-racing was necessary to the development of the thoroughbred

horse, that it had the effect of developing his speed, stamina and character, and that, to the extent that thoroughbred blood was infused into the light horse of this country, to that extent the light horse of this country was improved. The second consideration, I think, was this—that a very large number of the best citizens of this Dominion held horse-racing as their real sport, and that Parliament should not go so far as to deprive them of the privilege of associating themselves to carry on a race track. The third point was this, that the evils which, it was admitted, had developed upon the race track were due to excessive race meets. The evidence of the detectives of New York, the evidence of the thoroughbred men of Canada—I mean the thoroughbred horse-breeders in Canada—and of all others interested, I think, supported that view. The evils that had developed in Victoria and Vancouver during the time of the Seattle exhibition were the consequences of the fact that there had been forty-two days' racing. To this was due the deplorable, demoralizing and degrading condition alluded to by Hon. Sydney Fisher, the late Minister of Agriculture, in his sworn testimony as published in the report of the commission, in which he stated that he would not like to find himself after dark with those who were connected with the racing on that occasion, in Victoria and Vancouver. I think this Parliament believed that the limitation of the days of racing would be the means of eliminating the very undesirable element which was complained of, and whose presence was regretted by everybody, including the racing men themselves, as the cause of the demoralization attending this sport throughout the Dominion. It was pointed out that during the first days of a race meet in any community, the class of citizens to which I have alluded, the class that hold horse-racing as their real sport, predominates upon the track; but that in a few days their desires in that connection are gratified. Then, if the racing is allowed to continue day after day, week after week, and month after month, it resolves itself into a gambling institution pure and simple. The legislation passed in 1910, and rightly passed, was intended to limit the evil by limiting the race meets to seven days twice a year. Well, that legislation did not hold. I think the racing men 'put one over' on Parliament, as they say. So I come to this House as a representative of a free constituency that has been outraged to ask that this evil may be remedied. Before the passing of the Act to which I have alluded, the Act of 1910, we had in the city of Windsor twenty days' racing in the spring, and nine in the fall. Public opinion was developing against it because this was regarded as excessive. The Miller Bill was passed and the number of days' racing limited to fourteen. From that day I never heard a single complaint from the people of the county of Essex regarding the operation of that one track and the fourteen days of racing. But certain speculators, mostly from the American side, to some of whom I shall probably refer at greater length before I close my remarks, have taken advantage of the situation. I am not going to find fault because of the law passed years ago under which certain charters were granted. There is no reason to find fault. Previous to 1900, when certain restrictive legislation was passed in the great racing states of New York and Michigan, we in Canada did not suffer from the abuses which have since arisen. It is not to be wondered at that our statute made it very easy for men to secure race track charters in Canada. But the limitations placed upon race track operations by the great states of New York and Michigan led to the whole institution being imported bodily into the province of Ontario and that is the cause of the difficulty to-day in Canadian racing. Years ago, as I understand—and again I want to say that I am not a lawyer——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: You ought to have been.

Mr. WILCOX: —any man could apply to the Secretary of State, and by letters patent, obtain a race track charter in Canada. That was previous to the legislation that was passed in 1910, which provided that in future no race track charters should be granted in that way, but only by special Act of this Parliament. I venture to assert that not a man who sat in this House at that time ever thought of the existence of these old charters. But that legislation had this effect; it at once placed a value upon those old charters, and in some cases they are asking to-day as high as $50,000 for one of them, because Parliament made it absolutely impossible for any new charters to be granted. Therefore, the owners of one of these charters could go to a good racing point like the city of Windsor, with 827,000 people across the line in Detroit eight hours or ten hours from Chicago, six hours from Buffalo, five hours from Toledo, and six or

seven hours from Cleveland, and dispose of such a charter at a great profit. Situated as we are in close relation to the cities I have mentioned, we can have races with 6,000, 8,000, 9,000 and 10,000 people every day, in the summer, and we do have as many people there as 20,000 on some occasions. It is that evil, that excess, that abuse which I am asking this Parliament to remedy under the provisions of the Bill which I have introduced.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Is racing forbidden by the laws of Michigan?

Mr. WILCOX: Yes.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Absolutely prohibited?

Mr. WILCOX: Yes. Racing is prevented by the laws of Michigan and New York. They do bet, but it is not within the law. Therefore the fact that the law makes it an offence to bet in Michigan, is a restraint upon those running races within the confines of their own state.

When I introduced this Bill in the House the other day, I was attacked through the press by a Mr. Francis Nelson, who is the sporting editor of the Toronto Globe. I think I have met Mr. Nelson once or twice, and from all I know of him he is a courteous, kind gentleman, but he has not been fair to me in the columns of his paper. I want to say to this House that he is a servant of the Racing Association, and that the insinuations and the aspersions which he has cast are not fair to me. I desire to allude to them this afternoon. I happened to make reference to the fact that the interests involved in this excess racing were permeated by American influences. Well, Sir, I do not think that it was an offence to say that. But in the columns of his paper, Mr. Nelson at once set up the argument that I did not complain about all these business men of Detroit who come over to the city of Windsor and invest their money in my constituency. No, we do not complain of that, and we have no criticism to offer of the great body politic of the United States, the great open-hearted, free, patriotic public of the United States. When I used the term American, I had reference to that particular class of people whom many of the states in the Union have seen fit to legislate out of existence in the confines of their own state; and I absolutely refuse to have my constituency made a refuge for the surplus of that class of the population of the United States.

[Mr. Wilcox.]

I want to make some reference to some of those gentlemen. There is a race track at Fort Erie. There are three race tracks at Windsor. There is a fourth application now filed with the Treasury Department at Toronto. A fifth one, I understand, is being organized. Three race tracks gave us last year forty-two days racing. Four will give us fifty-six days racing and five, if they are established, will give us seventy days. Will anybody say in this House, in view of the decision which Parliament came to in 1910, that I am not justified in coming to the members of this House and asking their support of this Bill which will establish clearly and distinctly what Parliament meant by its legislation of 1910? With further reference to that term "American influence" I want to make myself absolutely clear on that point, because in the city of Windsor and in the town of Walkerville and in the town of Ojibway, which will in the future be the great industrial centre of Ontario, we have prominent Americans and we welcome them; but let us see some of the men who are connected with this Racing Association—and I am fully alive to the fact that we have prominent Canadians connected with this association, men who are high in social circles and business circles and are the cream of society. I know it, and against them I have not a word to say. But I want to place my complaint clearly before the House this afternoon. And I do not desire to use my own words; I desire to quote from the official records and the sworn testimony given at commissions that have been held in Ottawa and in Washington.

4 p.m.

We have connected with the Fort Erie race track, Mr. Madigan, who is the president. I must quote some evidence in regard to that, because the statement might be disputed. On page 273 of the report of the special committee on Bill No. 6, relating to Race Track Gambling, I find that Mr. E. T. Malone was called and examined. Mr. Malone was the solicitor, and he came to Ottawa to give evidence. The following is his statement:

Mr. Malone.—I have a telegram from Mr. Madigan authorizing me to appear as solicitor for the association, also a telegram from Dr. Bruso, Buffalo, stating that Mr. Madigan is confined to his room with acute bronchitis and he has advised him to return south when he is able to travel. I am solicitor of the association which took out its charter under the Ontario Companies Act on the 27th day of April, 1906.

We were endeavouring to get some of the parties connected with these associations to Ottawa, in order to obtain some evidence as to their connection with American race tracks, and otherwise. With regard to the Windsor track, the following telegram appears in the report of the special committee on Bill No. 6, at page 290:

Mr. Raney.—Then I think there is a statement due from Mr. Counsell as to the books and statements that were asked for from the Windsor Association.

Mr Counsell.—The only statement I have to make is contained in the telegram that I received last night from Windsor, it is to the following effect:

Chief Wills sick, Magistrate Leggatt left last night, bookkeeper for Windsor Racing Association died recently, his successor ill with typhoid fever. Knows nothing regarding the books. Geo. M. Hendrie in the south, ordered there by his physician, present address unknown.

It would appear on the face of it to be a rather unhealthy organization. I wish to say in fairness that I recognize that the Windsor Driving Park Association has a large number of Canadians interested in it. I also recognize that the other tracks to which I have alluded have Canadians interested in them. But I do say that at the bottom, in and through them, they are connected with associations that operate south of the line, as far away as Mexico, and that in the summer they come to the southern part of Ontario. Who are some of these men? On page 9, I find that an application was made to the district attorney of Brooklyn, who had a very full and complete knowledge of the operations of race tracks in New York state, to give evidence, from which I shall give a few extracts with reference to the Windsor Racing Association, and to some of the men who were prominent in it, and also as to their operations in the United States. The district attorney of Brooklyn had this to say with reference to Samuel Wagner, familiarly known as Sam Wagner, a noted owner of gambling houses in Chicago and other cities in the United States, and one who was for several years the principal owner of the race track at Windsor:

When the prosecuting attorney for Wayne county, Michigan, started after the race track gamblers, the Highland Park Club, which had conducted racing at Highland Park, about seven miles north of Detroit, leased the Windsor track and the races at Windsor are now run under the control of the Highland Park Club. According to the records of the county clerk's office, Wayne county, the Highland Park Club was incorporated in 1897, under the laws of Michigan. George M. Hendrie, of Detroit, is the president and Walter O. Parmer, of Nashville, is the secretary.

With regard to Fort Erie, the district attorney's report has this reference:

The racing club is practically controlled by John H. Madigan, the Texan. Madigan has a reputation all over the country as a fighter of game-cocks, and is in the habit of wagering thousands of dollars upon the outcome of one of these contests. He is simply a gambler and on the race track is a plunger. Dan. J. Stuart, whose name appears in the annual returns of the association to the Ontario Government as a director of the association, was the man who staged the fight between Corbett and Fitzsimmons.

That is a sample. There was an investigation held at Washington, at which some very interesting evidence was given as to the operations of this institution. At Washington, on December 14, 1909, before a sub-committee of the Judiciary of the United States Senate on Bill 225, "To prevent the nullification of State anti-gambling laws by international or interstate transmission of race-gambling bets or racing odds," Mr. Henry Brolaski, an experienced racing man, gave evidence. He said:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee.—In answer to the inquiry of Senator Nelson, I will state in a moment what bookmaking is. I will preface my remarks by stating that I reside at Monrovia, Cal., 18 miles from Los Angeles. I am engaged in the real estate business, being associated with the "Home Builders" at 129 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Cal. Prior to entering that business, I was for twenty-one years a gambler, pool-room proprietor, bookmaker upon race tracks, and a handbook maker. I have booked in St. Louis, Chicago, Worth, Roby, Atlanta, Charleston, New Orleans, San Francisco, Oakland, Los Angeles, Latonia, Louisville and Benning."

Senator Nelson.—You might tell us a little more fully what a pool room is?

Mr. Brolaski.—A pool room is a place where 20 or 30 or more people congregate in an afternoon to bet on horse races run on race tracks at a distance, the news being sent from the tracks to the pool room by telegraph.

The pool room service is handled by an information bureau known as the Interstate News Company in the East, which leases wires from the Western Union Telegraph Company. Over these wires they send the names of the jockeys and scratches (meaning horses not to start this day), and then the betting and the official description of the race. The pool room allows from twenty to thirty minutes between races for their patrons to gamble.

It costs these pool rooms for this service $22 per day for each set of races that they may take. At present they are racing at Jacksonville and Tampa, Fla., Oakland, Cal., and Juarez, Mexico, 1¼ miles from the International boundary line.

Senator Burkett: Please tell the committee where the race tracks are.

I made the statement that they were affiliated with these tracks down there and

here is the sworn testimony of Senator Burkett:

The main one now is in Mexico. It is two kilos from the boundary line, about opposite El Paso, about a mile and a quarter away. Another, but in the United States, is at Tampa, Fla., and there is another at Jacksonville, Fla., now in operation. Another is in Oakland, Cal., running in defiance of law.

During the summer time they race at Windsor, Canada, opposite Detroit. That race track is about 3⅛ miles from the middle of the channel of the river dividing the United States from Canada. Another one in Canada is at Fort Erie, 4¼ miles from the International boundary line, near Buffalo.

Betting is being done in defiance of the law at Emeryville race track at Oakland, Cal.

Tracks running near the United States border line and sending prices to pool rooms in the United States are: One track at Juarez, Mexico, now running; one at Fort Erie, Canada; and one at Windsor, Canada. Those last are only run in summer.

I could quote ad nauseam on this subject but I do not intend to speak any longer. I think it is reasonable to ask Parliament for a Bill to limit race track operations and thus to carry out the intention of the legislation passed in 1910. I want to remind the House that I was a strong opponent of the Miller Bill. I was the second to speak in this House, following Mr. McColl, and I take the following extract from my speech delivered on April 6, 1910, Hansard Vol. 4, page 6453:

Evils, as they exist in all walks of life, can sometimes, by judicious legislation, be regulated, but not entirely suppressed, without great injustice, and this method is what is required in Canada, so far as protracted race meetings are concerned.

Reflecting men who know of what they speak express the view that the most direct and effective way to ultimate reform would be to materially shorten the meetings, as well, of course, as to cut out some other admittedly objectionable features.

Then on page 6459:

While I am entirely in sympathy with the moral reform association which has made its influence felt upon this question, I am inclined to the view that the legislation proposed goes just a little too far. There have been, in my opinion, excesses under the present law. I believe there is a certain amount of disorder which should be prevented, and I believe it would be possible to amend the law so that these abuses would be avoided, and at the same time certain very important interests in the country would not be injuriously affected, the ends of sport met, and a very great improvement brought out in the direction in which my hon. friend from South Grey seeks to legislate.

The position I took in 1910 is the position I take to-day. I ask for a limitation of these days to 14. I recognize that some may use the argument that this will create a monopoly. Does not a monopoly exist to-day in regard to these charters? There are only some 15 or 20 charters, as I understand it. No more can be granted without a special Act from this Parliament, and when Parliament steps in and grants charters to a certain number of associations and refuses to grant them to others a monopoly exists no matter how you may fix it. But the plan which Parliament should adopt in this matter is to place such legislation upon the statute-book as will prevent a duplication of tracks in any one place in order to prevent the abuses that were admitted to exist in Vancouver and which will exist in any other part of this country if thirty, forty, fifty or sixty days' racing is carried on. What does the license mean? Any institution that is licensed has a monopoly, and the proper way to deal with the question is to place a tax upon the racing association having regard to the benefits which the privilege is to the association. What is the operation of a racing association worth to them without a license? What is it worth with a license? The difference between what it is worth without a license and what it is worth with a license is the value of the license to the association, and I submit that a reasonable basis for the House to proceed upon with regard to this Bill is to pass it in order to prevent the duplication of tracks in any one locality and then to impose a tax on these associations equivalent to the full benefit that such a license is to the association after a reasonable profit is made by the association.

There are just one or two other points that I desire to allude to. The wording of the Bill is as follows:

Provided that where there is more than one race course in any city, town or county, or where there are two or more race courses less than fifty miles apart, the race meetings on all the race courses in such city, town or county, or on all the race courses within fifty miles of one another, shall not exceed in number or in duration the limit prescribed in the above provisions for one race course or race track.

The question might arise in the mind of some hon. gentleman: Who will apportion these days? I leave that to the provincial treasurer who issues the yearly licenses to these associations. I think it will be found not to be financially profitable to operate one of these tracks for less than fourteen days and the legislation will have the effect of causing the associations to negotiate one with the other, to dispose of their separate interests and to establish only one track where more than one exists.

There is just one other point, and that is with reference to the inevitable difficul-

ties of the Immigration Department in dealing with these institutions when they cross over the line. Complaint after complaint reaches the department that the associations refuse to employ Canadian labour and that if they had their own way they would not employ Canadian labour at all. They bring their own trained staff with them from the South, and naturally want to use them when they come to Canada. I just want to quote a few extracts from the official correspondence of the Immigration Department, to show the difficulties they have in this respect; and if there is one thing more than another that Mr. Scott, the Superintendent of Immigration, is entitled to credit for, it is for the strong position he has taken that Canadian labour must be recognized and Canadian returned soldiers given the preference. The first extract is from a report by Mr. James G. Mitchell, one of the best officers on the immigration staff, who was instructed to see that Canadian labour should be recognized by these racing associations. He says:

Ottawa, July 3, 1916.

Sir,

I met Mr. Lowden by appointment Monday, June 26th, and told him plainly that if all Canadians that were competent were not given positions, I would examine every alien working there, whether the races were going on or not. They then agreed to give all Canadians that were competent positions, even if they had to lay off Americans, and since the opening day there were twenty-seven Canadians given work.

Further on, he says:

I am informed that some of these American ticket sellers were expert and not above reproach. I am also informed that Canadians are not employed in the United States race tracks. There may be an odd one given a job for a purpose, also that in Kentucky a commission governs all racing, and this commission imposes a penalty of $500 on any association employing a non-resident of the State. The following estimate is approximately correct: In the money room there are three Canadians and 8 Americans; ticket sellers 17 Canadians and 15 Americans; cashiers 20 Canadians and 9 Americans. This is not complete. The checkers are as far as I can see, all Canadians. As they receive only $5.00 a day outsiders would not take this job.

And further on:

Among these Americans there are a few of them of German descent; two were removed, in one case a German-American by the name of Fink. They were quite willing to dispense with their services providing I told him that he was objectionable, but as the Jockey club had hired him, I did not consider it my duty to select those who should be laid off, while I gave them to understand that parties of German descent should go first. The Jockey Club wants to select men who are competent, and they would have to take their advices from Americans who are in charge of the pari-mutuel system, and no doubt they like to bring their whole staff right along from one track to another.

I shall now read a report made to Mr. Scott, Superintendent of Immigration, by Mr. James C. Mitchell, inspector of Agencies:

Sir,

With reference to the Fort Erie races, I beg to advise you that there were approximately eleven American ticket sellers and nineteen Canadian ticket sellers; nine American cashiers, and twenty-one Canadian cashiers; miscellaneous money counters, etc., nineteen Americans, and sixteen Canadians; clickers, which is a local man's job, there were two Americans, and twenty-nine Canadians employed at the recent race meet.

They have now started applying for admission to Canada, and Inspector Johns has admitted about twenty of them at Fort Erie on temporary admission. Many of them room in Buffalo, and only cross over at Fort Erie to work at the races. As these are not bona-fide residents of Buffalo, I do not think that the reciprocal arrangements in reference to border towns would include these men, as they come from Kentucky, Baltimore, New York, etc. In view of the fact that they are now applying for admission, the pari-mutuels are apparently making every endeavour to discriminate against Canadian operators, as in Fort Erie, three competent Canadians were given inferior positions. I feel that it is only right that the department should make every effort to exclude United States operators until our own citizens, who are available and competent, are first employed and not given inferior positions. I think the inspectors in charge at border points should be instructed to reject United States pari-mutuel operators under section 3, subsection (g), "persons likely to be a public charge."

In conversation with some of our inspectors at border points, I find that they are of the opinion that they must admit United States citizens of good health, provided they have the necessary twenty-five dollars, as race track followers are likely to become a public charge at any time.

To fully explain my contention that the Canadians are being unjustly discriminated against, I wish to draw your attention to the fact that at Fort Erie three competent Canadians were given inferior positions; also, they did not answer Canadian letters applying for positions. I would also point out that if I or some other officer of this department had not been sent to Hamilton, very few Canadians would have been employed.

When I interviewed Mr. Madigan, President of the Niagara Racing Association at Fort Erie, he explained to me that most of his patrons were citizens of Buffalo, and he had to put on some Americans to please the Buffalo Press. There were several German-Americans employed on the better positions while a Canadian returned soldier, by the name of Lawrence, who has worked on the pari-mutuel since its inception, was given an inferior position. There were several German-Americans to get a position on this track than a good Canadian; in fact, Mr. Martin's secretary told me that if they did not like the positions they were given they could quit. I think any track in Canada should not be dictated to by the

Buffalo press or the pari-mutuel operations in charge from the other side.

On July 18, 1916, Mr. W. D. Scott writes the following letter to Mr. G. Seebach, Inspector in charge of Immigration, Bridgeburg, Ont.:

Sir,—As you are probably aware, the department has met with considerable trouble in the matter of the employment on race tracks of Americans imported for the occasion to the detriment of Canadians.

Inspector J. C. Mitchell has been following up the case lately and finds that in many cases (particularly at Fort Erie) the management of the race track claim that as the patronage comes largely from Buffalo, they are obliged to employ American ticket sellers, cashiers and clickers; some of the help admitted is German-American and pro-German in sympathy.

I think the time has come that we should no longer be dictated to by the Buffalo press or the management of these race tracks, and you may, therefore, enforce the immigration regulations in the strictest possible way as regards race track employees. The character of the men and the nature of the employment is not of the best, and if everything else fails you may invoke section 3 s.s. (g), especially when you know that there are qualified Canadians available for the work.

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) W. D. Scott,
Superintendent of Immigration.

Immigration Branch,
Department of the Interior,
Canada.

Toronto, Ont., August 4, 1916.

Sir,—I beg to advise you that I am going to the Fort Erie race tracks to-night, as the pari-mutuel operators have not received any word of their appointment from the Niagara Racing Association. They are, apparently, doing as at last meet, not replying to applications, probably hoping that these men will not show up on the track to-morrow. They are all going to be there.

I met Mr. Madigan at the Windsor meet and told him that where men were qualified to work on other tracks they would have to be given the same positions at Fort Erie. He still persists in claiming his right to place them wherever he sees fit, no matter what positions they have held on other tracks. As you may know the class of man he is, I have pointed out to him how he had made a returned soldier work as a clicker at the last meet, who has held the position as cashier at practically all the other tracks. Since his return from the front he has been a cashier at the Woodbine, both Hamilton meets, and at Windsor. He told me that he did not care about soldiers. I think a man of this stamp does not deserve any consideration.

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) Jas. C. Mitchell,
Inspector of Employment Agencies.

W. D. Scott, Esq.,
Supt. of Immigration,
Ottawa, Ont.

If there is no objection, I have a few more letters that I would like to be permitted to file without reading:

[Mr. Wilcox.]

Immigration Branch,
Department of the Interior,
Canada.

Toronto, Ont., July 7, 1916.

Sir,—There is some dissatisfaction owing to three Canadians, Messrs. Lawrence, Quinn and Canning, having been put on as clickers, while I am satisfied that they are competent ticket sellers and cashiers, having worked on other tracks in Canada. Mr. Martin would not say these men were not competent ticket sellers and cashiers. His contention is that he has given all Canadians work, and he has the right to say what work he may put them at. It looks very much like discriminating against the Canadians, giving the Americans the positions at twelve dollars per day, and these three Canadians positions at five dollars per day, especially while some of these Americans are German-Americans. Mr. Lawrence is a returned soldier from the front, and quite naturally feels hurt.

Mr. Madigan says he is a Canadian. He told me that he prefers Canadians, but that so much of his patronage comes from across the river that he has to employ some Americans. I am quite satisfied that the management of this track is purely American, as their office is at Ellicott square, Buffalo, N.Y. As for Mr. Madigan claiming that he is a Canadian, it does not look very well when he will allow a German-American to be given preference over a Canadian soldier who has returned from the front.

I may state that the Canadians are very grateful to the department for the action they have taken in seeing that they were given positions on the Canadian race tracks. One of the Canadians was taken in to the office on Tuesday and accused of being the secretary who was responsible for bringing this matter to the attention of the department.

Mr. Martin complained yesterday that one of the Canadians was impertinent to one of his men, and as there is a good deal of feeling over this matter, I have decided to visit Fort Erie until the close of the races to see that no Canadian is unjustly treated.

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) Jas. C. Mitchell,
Inspector of Employment Agencies.

W. D. Scott, Esq.,
Supt. of Immigration,
Ottawa, Ont.

Immigration Branch,
Department of the Interior,
Canada.

Toronto, Ont., July 24, 1916.

Sir,—I am informed that Mr. Smith, an American, is a very large stockholder in the Hamilton track, and that Sam Spencer, who is known as the New York Jew on the race track, and who caused the trouble on the Dorval track, where the Canadians were refused work in the first place, is Smith's representative. He was around the Hamilton race track at the last meet. I made inquiries and they always claimed that he was not employed there, although he was in and out of the pari-mutual offices all the time and paid the men off the last day of the meet, and my impression is that he may have had something to do in offering some of the Canadians inferior jobs. Smith was in the Hamilton Jockey Club office to-day, and I was told by one of the operators, who was one of the outside officers, that Smith was going over the lists to-day.

I shall be in Hamilton on Wednesday at the opening of the meet, and will endeavour to see that these Canadians are not discriminated against, and, if necessary, I will examine the Americans as to their entry into Canada. I think the Hamilton Jockey Club has had fair warning.

I am enclosing herewith a copy of the notice sent out to the Americans.

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) Jas. C. Mitchell,

Inspector of Employment Agencies.

August 18, 1916.

Sir,—Mr. J. C. Mitchell, an officer of this department, is attending the Windsor Jockey Club meeting. Mr. Mitchell has been instructed to furnish the department with a full report in the matter of all aliens employed by your association, I shall be glad if you will kindly furnish this officer with a list showing the names and nationalities of all employees in your pari-mutual department. Mr. Mitchell will call upon you and obtain the above list.

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) W. D. Scott.

Superintendent of Immigration.

George M. Hendrie, Esq.,
Windsor Jockey Club,
Windsor, Ont.

Immigration Branch,
Department of the Interior,
Canada.

Windsor, Ont., August 16, 1916.

Sir,—I wish you would advise George M. Hendrie of the Windsor Jockey Club, as soon as possible, to supply me with a list of all the employees employed in the pari-mutual department in order that I may check the same up to see how many Americans are actually employed. The other racing associations have supplied me with this list and I do not see why any exception should be made in this case.

You might also advise me what action you desire taken in the Garland case, sending same in care of Immigration Office at Windsor.

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) Jas. C. Mitchell,

Inspector of Employment Agencies.

W. D. Scott, Esq.,
Superintendent of Immigration,
Ottawa, Ont.

Department of the Interior,
Canada.

Ottawa, August 29, 1916.

Sir,—There were approximately employed at the Windsor track at this meet sixty-three Americans and seventy-four Canadians in the better positions, made up as follows:

Cashiers—18 Americans, 34 Canadians.
In money room—12 Americans, 4 Canadians.
Ticket sellers—19 Americans, 18 Canadians.
Calculators—4 Americans, 2 Canadians.
In ticket room—4 Americans.
To change money—1 American, 3 Canadians.
Ticket checkers—2 Americans, 1 Canadian.
Messengers—2 Americans, 3 Canadians.
Blackboard man—American.
Field board man—Canadian.
Machinists to look after pari-mutuels—2 Canadians.
Telephone man—American.
Miscellaneous—3 Canadians.

Clickers—6 Americans, 31 Canadians. (There were Canadian clickers refused positions.)

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) Jas. C. Mitchell,

Inspector of Agencies.

W. D. Scott, Esq.,
Superintendent of Immigration,
Ottawa, Ont.

Department of the Interior,
Canada.

Ottawa, August 29, 1916.

Sir,—In reply to the letter of the Windsor Jockey Club in reference to myself, I may state that at the first meet this year I was promised the list of the employees on the pari-mutuels, but was refused at the last moment, only given the number of Americans and Canadians employed in the different departments.

On the first day of the second meet I spoke to Mr. George M. Hendrie, the president, in regard to the list, and the only satisfaction I got was he said he would see. I wrote the department and under date of August 18, Mr. Hendrie was notified to furnish me with the list. I did not receive this list until the 22nd, the second last day of the meet, and it only stated that the men were American or Canadian and did not give the permanent residence of the Americans. I had most of these men's permanent addresses and I checked the list over and secured from Mr. Elrod, who was in charge of the pari-mutuels, the number of the wicket that the different men were working at whose permanent address in the United States I did not have. I took every care not to disturb these few men when they were busy. I found a number of these had entered Canada without inspection, but it being the second last day of the meet I did not disturb them.

I might say that there were six American clickers employed at the last meet from different parts of the United States—one from Washington,—and that Canadians were refused. I was unaware of this state of affairs through Mr. Hendrie not complying with my request to furnish me with a list on the first day, and I only discovered on receipt of the list that these American clickers were on.

I must take strong objection to Mr. Hendrie's statement that the Canadians who are complaining are incompetent and undesirable, and it is very unbecoming in the President of the Windsor Jockey Club to insult the Canadian people in such a manner, as they are more than equal to some of the Americans he employs on his track.

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) Jas. C. Mitchell,

Inspector of Employment Agencies.

W. D. Scott, Esq.,
Superintendent of Immigration,
Ottawa.

In conclusion, I ask that the Bill be given the second reading and be permitted to go to committee for consideration.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings): Mr. Speaker, While, I am sure every member of the House has listened with interest, pleasure and profit to the historial review of racing given by my hon. friend (Mr. Wilcox), I am equally sure that on consideration of the Bill, it will be found that

it is unfortunately lacking in the machinery which would make it practical and usefully operative. Take the very case spoken of by my hon. friend in his own constituency where five race tracks are to be operated under recently resurrected charters. I think every member of the House feels that something should be done in regard to the matter; but all this Bill says is that only fourteen days should be given to racing in that constituency. Who is to decide which race track is to have the fourteen days racing? My hon. friend says that the provincial secretary in issuing the license for the year can do so. What right has this House to impose that duty upon the provincial secretary or what right has it to assume that he will undertake to perform that duty? If this Bill passes, will not these apparently somewhat unscrupulous racing men from the United States perhaps obtain an advantage in this country at the Woodbine Jockey Club or at the Blue Bonnets meet in Montreal, race tracks conducted in such a way that no one can take offence at the meets held there. If only fourteen days were allowed to Montreal or Toronto, one of the organizations on the other side might snap up the fourteen days and the Woodbine or the Blue Bonnets might have no opportunity of furnishing the pleasure which these race tracks furnish. I think, therefore, in view of the statements made by the hon. gentleman as to the serious injury that is being done to his constituecny, and in view of the lack of machinery in the Bill to carry out any of its provisions, it would be advisable that the Bill be read the second time, and, after the return of the Minister of Justice, it be referred to a committee of this House.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland): Mr. Speaker, to supplement what the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) has said, I think that not only would the amendment, if passed, destroy that class of what we might call legitimate racing at Montreal and Toronto, but hon. gentlemen will remember that this section states that if two race courses are in existence within fifty miles of each other, then fourteen days' racing must be divided among the two. It so happens that Toronto and Hamilton are within fifty miles of each other, and if this amendment should pass, Toronto and Hamilton could have only fourteen days between them. Who would decide as to who should have the fourteen days? The hon. member for Essex (Mr. Wilcox) says that he would leave it to the provincial treasurer; that the provincial government can deal with the matter at present. The whole trouble which has arisen is the very weak manner in which this law has been administered by the provincial government, which has allowed defunct charters to be revived for the purpose of establishing race tracks around Windsor, which charters should never have been revived, and which the provincial government should not have allowed to be revived, because it knew that those charters were being revived practically for the purpose of evading the law. The provincial government has at present the power to license race tracks, and no race track can operate in the province of Ontario or anywhere without a license from the provincial government. If there are more race tracks in operation in and around Windsor than the hon. member for North Essex thinks is good for the community, or than he thinks should exist there, then his remedy is to appeal to the provincial government to hereafter cease granting licenses to those various race tracks, and he will then have only one instead of four.

Mr. WILCOX: Those charters were submitted to three of the best lawyers in the province by Mr. McGarry, the provincial treasurer, and they advised that the associations having got the charters, after the tracks were built according to charter, the provincial government had no right to revoke the licenses.

Mr. GERMAN: Section 28 of the Provincial Company's Act says:

> That if a corporation incorporated by Letters Patent does not go into actual bona fide operation within two years after incorporation, or for two consecutive years does not use its corporate powers, such powers, except so far as is necessary for the winding up of that corporation, shall be ipso facto forfeited.

And a company whose powers are ipso facto forfeited has no more legal status in the province of Ontario than though it had never been incorporated, and the renewal of the charter is simply the incorporation of a new company.

What is known as the Miller Act, passed in 1910, provides:

> That all the penalties imposed by section 235 shall be operative, excepting as follows:

Speaking of betting and confining ourselves to that:

> Shall be legal on a race track, at a race meeting, held upon the race course of a racing association now incorporated;
>
> Or upon a race course located in or within three miles of a county town or city having a

population of not less than fifteen thousand people.

It seems to me that by no stretch of legal interpretation can it be held that four race tracks can, under law, exist within three miles of the corporate limits of the city of Windsor.

Mr. WILCOX: But they are there.

Mr. GERMAN: Then they are there only by grace of the Ontario government because the Ontario government is deriving the revenue. If that government wished to pay the expenses of the province from gambling revenues, they could start a Kentucky lottery; they could establish another Monte Carlo. But, I apprehend, the Government of Ontario does not choose to derive a revenue from race tracks, they simply wish to regulate the race tracks, and to see that no more race tracks are in operation than should be carried on for the general good of the public. Then, it is up to the Ontario government to regulate these race tracks and prevent the conditions in and about Windsor which now exist and which, I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Wilcox), are a disgrace to that section of the country as well as to the provincial government.

Mr. WILCOX: Would it not be as reasonable, and as logical, to insert a proviso into the Act to limit the number of race tracks in Canada, and to limit the number of days' racing in any county to fourteen, as it was in 1910, to limit the meets on a race track to two of seven days each in a year?

Mr. GERMAN: I should say, most emphatically, no. Companies, properly and legally incorporated, have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in establishing magnificent race tracks under the law as it stands, such as the Woodbine, the Hamilton, the Fort Erie, the Highland Park, the Blue Bonnets, and the Dorval tracks. Why destroy that property for the sake of the gambling element which, as my hon. friend has suggested, comes from the United States to establish what we might call outlaw tracks? I believe that seventy-five per cent of the people of Canada desire to see such tracks as those I have named, continue in existence. I think it would be better to cut out the illegitimate tracks that my hon. friend is proposing to regulate by this Bill, especially as it seems to me that his Bill will not attain the end he contemplates, while it will destroy the property already in existence.

Mr. WILCOX: I have no desire that my Bill should in the slightest degree——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Unless the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilcox) is exercising his right to conclude the debate, he cannot speak again.

Mr. WILCOX: I shall have another opportunity.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It would appear from what the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Wilcox) has said, that a result has come about which was not contemplated by Parliament when the Acts of 1910 and 1912 were passed. As I understand him, some racing interests have executed what might be termed a flank movement against the intention expressed by Parliament in those statutes. It seems to me that a remedy is desirable, and even necessary. On the other hand I share the doubt of the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) as to whether the Bill in its present form could be given practical effect. I regret that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) is prevented by illness from being in his place to-day, because he is much more familiar with the legislation and the conditions to which it relates than I am. It might, however, be worth while to point out that the Act of 1912 contains the following:

> And provided that no such association holds, and that on any one race track there be not held, in any one calendar year more than two race-meetings at which there are running races and that there is an interval of at least twenty days between meetings.

There are certain other provisions of that section to which I need not now call attention. My hon. friend from Essex proposes to amend that section by adding:

> Provided that where there is more than one race course in any city, town or county, or where there are two or more race courses less than fifty miles apart, the race meetings on all the race courses in such city, town or county, or on all the race courses within fifty miles of one another, shall not exceed in number or in duration the limit prescribed in the above provisions for one race course or race track.

The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) has pointed out that the conditions with regard to the race tracks at Toronto, Hamilton, and elsewhere, to which the Bill under consideration does not seem to be directed, would be interfered with by the amendment as proposed. The hon. member for East Hastings also points out that the Bill does not constitute any authority which shall determine in what proportion the time suggested by the Bill shall

be divided among the several race tracks, or what particular race tracks shall be permitted to carry on these operations. It seems to me that the Bill is susceptible to amendment which would remove any difficulty of that kind while carrying out the purpose the hon. member for North Essex has in view—and I am sure that the thanks of the House and of the country are due to that hon. gentleman for the very great industry and ability he has shown in making Parliament and the country acquainted with the conditions which require redress and which it is the purpose of this Bill to remedy. I am disposed, in the absence of the Minister of Justice, to accept the suggestion made by the hon. member for East Hastings, namely, that this Bill be read the second time, and that it shall then stand, awaiting the return of the Minister of Justice, that it may be referred to a special committee of the House to consider the conditions described by the hon. member for North Essex, and the necessity for a remedy and to suggest to the House the appropriate amendments.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw): Mr. Speaker, I was one of those who did not support the former Bill as presented by the late Mr. Miller, and I opposed it for reasons which seemed good to me at that time. My position now is that of supporting the principle of the Bill introduced by the hon. gentleman from North Essex (Mr. Wilcox), and my reason for doing so is that I think anything which tends to curtail and reduce the magnitude of this racing habit while the war is on, is something that deserves our commendation. I would go further, and be in favour of legislation which would do away with all these race meets while the war is raging. The sight which is presented to the country of 5,000 to 20,000 people, men and women, some of the women dressed mostly in men's clothes and the rest dressed like dolls, spending all the money they can succeed in wasting, shouting and hurrahing and waiting in breathless interest for the conclusion of a horse race, while the soldiers are making their race for life, taking perhaps a year to go a few metres or at most a kilometre or two, seems to me a spectacle such as is not to the credit of the country or such as the people of the country desire to see in any way encouraged. I am quite aware that there are large sums of money invested in a financial way in these institutions, and one has to be careful of the results which might be effected. If it were necessary, I would rather be a party to voting a reasonable Bill for a system of compensation to these people to keep ruin away from their doors, because that would be a thousand times cheaper to the nation in the end than to continue this menace of race meetings that we know now exists. Personally I do not live in a part of the country where they have these race meets; but that has nothing to do with the merits of the argument one way or the other, and I think the wishes of the people we represent would not be misinterpreted if the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice were to take into their very careful consideration the advisability of introducing legislation to suspend all such race meetings while the war is on. I think the moral effect upon the men whom we might wish to reach in the way of recruiting is bad. I think that the waste of all this money is not conducive to the best organization of our young nation at this juncture; and I support the principle of the Bill because it goes a small direction in the way of reducing what I think is an undesirable state of affairs. I should be glad if the Government could go even further, and suspend all such race meetings throughout Canada during the continuance of the war.

Mr. WILCOX: I very gladly accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Northrup), and I agree with the Prime Minister in regard to it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That on Wednesday, the 7th February, and subsequent Wednesdays to the end of the session, the House shall meet at three o'clock, p.m., and that the sittings on such days shall in every respect be under the same rules provided for other days:—That on and after Thursday, the 1st February, up to and including Thursday, the 15th February next, Government Notices of Motion and Government Orders shall have precedence on Mondays, Wednesdays and Thursdays over all business except Questions by Members and Notices of Motion for the production of papers; and that on Saturday, the 3rd day of February and on Saturday, the 10th day of February, the House shall meet at three o'clock in the afternoon and the order of procedure shall be the same as on Fridays.

He said: In the discussion of this matter between my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and myself, it was hoped that we would be able to conclude the work which I mentioned in the House as work that should be done before the adjournment, by the 7th instant, or at the outside the 8th

instant; but inasmuch as one could not be absolutely certain of that, and as I do not desire to have to bring down another motion, I have proposed as the date the 15th of February so as to guard against any contingency of that kind. With that explanation, I would move this motion in its amended form as above.

5 p.m.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The first part of this motion concerns the rule of the House which says that on Wednesdays the House shall meet at two o'clock and adjourn at six o'clock. The suggestion of my right hon. friend, as amended, now is that from this day until the end of the session, the usual rule of meeting at three o'clock shall prevail on Wednesdays. I agree to that. In these war times there are no entertainments, or there ought not to be; there are none on Wednesday evenings, and there is no reason at all why we should not have the same rule prevailing on Wednesdays as on other days. As to the remainder of the motion, it simply provides that on private members' days Government business shall have precedence over all business except questions and notices of motion. But it is understood that this rule will cease when the House meets again.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: By its terms it will cease then.

Motion agreed to.

PROPOSED ABOLITION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Mr. R. BICKERDIKE (Montreal, St. Lawrence) moved the second reading of Bill No. 3, to amend the Criminal Code and to abolish capital punishment.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Bill that I have introduced has a two-fold object, first, to prevent the possibility of recurrence of what has taken place at different times throughout the country, namely, the putting of innocent men to death; and secondly, to make it possible for juries to convict so that all murderers will be confined in prison. To-day, juries hesitate to convict unless the crime has been proven beyond a shadow of doubt, and, as a consequence, any number of murderers are to-day walking the streets of different cities in Canada who would be confined in penitentiaries if this amendment had been adopted at a previous session.

I think I am safe in saying that our whole system of punishment in Canada is on wrong lines. We punish largely for revenge. You say: it serves him right; hanging was too good for him. Punishment should be confined to improving the man, to making him a better man instead of shutting him up where he will become a worse man, or of sending his soul to eternity. A mother punishes her child, but she punishes it in love, for the purpose of making it a better child. She may close it up in a dark room, and she does so, not only for the benefit of the child, but for the benefit of other members of the family. But all the time that that child is shut up in the dark room the mother's heart is with it. In my opinion, that is the system of punishment that we should adopt in Canada. Sir, to hang a man because he deserves to be hanged is the poorest way of shirking our responsibility towards a lower soul who has come into this world for his fellow men to help him to develop into a higher and nobler life. If a man is capable of being made better, we have no right to send him out of the world until he has taken this step of development for which he was sent into the world, and which his higher fellowmen should help him to take.

Capital punishment is not based on Christianity, and any law that you have in this country, or any other country, that is not based on Christianity becomes a failure. Our law of capital punishment is based on vengeance. I have no doubt that a great many members of this House, and a great many people in this country claim that capital punishment is a deterrent. I think I will be able to prove, before the House adjourns, that capital punishment is not a deterrent. During the year 1916 there were fifty murders in this country. I think that that awful fact ought to satisfy any inquiring mind that there is no such thing as a deterrent, and that when a man commits a crime he is, at least at the moment, insane beyond a shadow of doubt. Forty of these cases went to trial for murder. In twenty the accused was found guilty. Some of the others pleaded guilty to manslaughter; some got clear; ten were executed; in nine cases the sentence was commuted, and one committed suicide. That is the record of our system in Canada: 50 murders, 40 men tried for murder, 20 found guilty of murder, 10 executed, nine commutations and one suicide. The suicide was, of course, in Ontario. I will not give the names of the men who were executed; it would not be fair to their families or relatives. But I will give the names of the judges. They were Justices New-

lands, Drysdale, C. J. Graham, Sir J. A. Boyd, Galt,—Justice Galt has two executions to his credit, and I think if he could have had his way, he would have had a third with the Minister of Public Works as a victim—Macaulay, Simmons, C. J. Harvey, Walsh, Prendergast, Falconbridge, Mulock, Macdonald, Haszard, Harris, Monet and Kelly. Unfortunately we had one case in the province of Quebec, only one; and that was such a brutal case that the public were all in favour of hanging the man. Otherwise he would have got off, because the people of the province of Quebec are determined not to send a man to eternity unless his guilt is established beyond a shadow of doubt, and I think they are right. I wish the Prime Minister, or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), who is leading the House, would just place his ear to the ground, and follow the dictates of his own conscience. If he did so, he would adopt my Bill as a Government measure. My hon. friend (Mr. Hazen) shakes his head, and like Pharoah of old, hardens his heart; and the Government, just to keep their hands in, strangles a few prodigals every year.

There are four great reforms marching hand in hand across this continent to-day, which no number of hidebound politicians, be they Grit or Tory, or Grit and Tory combined, will be able much longer to prevent becoming law by the consent of the citizens of Canada. They are, first, the right of the mothers in Canada to contribute towards making the laws of this country; second, the abolition of the bars; third, penitentiary and prison reform; fourth, the abolition of capital punishment. The first of these I feel safe in leaving in the hands of our most recent convert amongst our leading Canadian statesmen, the right hon. the leader of His Majesty's loyal Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who, having championed a good cause, fights for it, and fights to a finish. I regret very much that the hon. gentleman has not pronounced himself so strongly in favour of the other three reforms, but if I would be allowed to repeat an expression made use of by one who has gone to his rest, I would say that we should hope for the best, as the ship is heading in the right direction. The second—abolishing the bars—I will leave in the hands of the hon. the leader of the Opposition in the Ontario Legislature, whose battle cry is: 'Abolish the Bars.' The third I feel to be quite safe in the hands of the hon. representative of the county of Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), who has been making such a good fight for penitentiary and prison reform in Canada. The fourth—that of abolishing the death penalty in Canada—I intend to deal with to the best of my ability. It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to detain the House at any length, as I exhausted most of the arguments in my possession on this question on previous occasions in this House, when the question was being dealt with. I fail to understand how any man, claiming to be a Christian, and believing in an eternity of the soul, can be party to sending that soul into eternity.

Mr. BURNHAM: Is it not in eternity now?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: Who?

Mr. BURNHAM: The soul.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: If my hon. friend had remained where he should be at the present time serving in the country's defence he might have got his soul there too.

Mr. Speaker, I condemn any law that proposes to thrust souls into the fathomless abyss of the inscrutable beyond by the commission of a public crime. I have no doubt that the House will recall the fact that when this fight was started four years ago there were six of the states to the south of us which had abolished capital punishment; six more have now thrown off the yoke and to-day twelve states have abolished capital punishment. They are: Rhode Island, Wisconsin, Kansas, Minnesota, Maine, Michigan, Washington, Oregon, South Dakota, North Dakota, Tennessee, Arizona.

I was told that this was too big a fight for an old man like me to undertake. Well, it is true, it is a big fight, but it is a fight of democracy versus caste, humanity versus brutality, enlightenment versus superstition, construction versus destruction, Christianity versus heathenism, civilization versus blood, golden rule versus vengeance. Experience has shown that executions are followed by increased homicide. It is unwise economically. Lives are destroyed which would be economically valuable to the state. Capital punishment is unnecessary. It is not effective as a deterrent. Many murderers are not deterred by any punishment. Many criminals know that infliction of the death penalty is extremely unlikely.

The Minister of Justice, who, I am sorry, is not here at present, seems to be wedded to the scaffold. He claims that he has divine authority for hanging these poor men. I think the scaffold is a disgrace to any civilized country and in many respects, like

the tree of sorrows, it is watered only by the tears of the widows and orphans.

Allow me now to quote the words of one of the most eminent, most noble, and best statesmen that it was ever the good fortune of the great republic of France to produce. President Fallieres of the French Republic says:

> Among the unpleasant duties of the President of France is that of signing all death warrants issued in the republic.

This is well. He says, however, that there should be a slight change in the arrangement, to wit:

> The judge who sentences the man to die should also act as his executioner.

President Fallieres claims that if this were the case, it would do away with all legalized homicide. He further says:

> I will not ask any man to do that which I myself am unwilling to do. I will do no murder, even for the State.

Therefore President Fallieres, during his time, commuted all death penalties to life imprisonment, and where there was a reasonable doubt about the man's guilt, he pardoned him. He says:

> France must learn to take care of her criminals without killing them.

It is a poor use to make of a man to take his life. It is an acknowledgement of our inefficiency. Then, a life sentence should hold out to a man the promise that a number of years of good behaviour and useful work, will make him free. Penology must be made a science to the end that when we imprison a man we do it for his own good, with the intention of turning out a better man than we took in. Just as long as the state sets an example of killing its enemies, they must expect that individuals will occasionally kill theirs. Many years ago, when England had forty six offences punishable by death, there was very much more killing than now. Crime has decreased in England as well as elsewhere, as laws have become more humane. There is no such thing as a criminal class. When the state ceases to breed murder in the minds of her citizens, her citizens will then cease, not only the killing of each other, but also the desire to kill. Judicial murders are worse than those done in passion. They are so atrociously premeditated, so deliberately planned, that no excuse can be made or found for them beyond that of precedent or cowardice. The sentiments of the people in Canada are opposed to this legal killing business, and this is why so many murder trials turn themselves into a farce. When there is to be a hanging, every sheriff tries to get out of the job. In New York, when there is to be an electrocution, nobody wants to undertake it, and the deadly current is always turned on by a man at a distance from the scene, who salves his consience by pretending to think he is turning on the lights, and in many of the cases, the executioner is a convict, working under orders. President Fallieres' refusal to either act as an executioner, or to order or engage others to take human life, is a manifestation of the better spirit of the age. Now let enlightened Canada, by her Governor in Council, take the same stand. Our Governor General and our Prime Minister and members of the Cabinet are a negative party to these judicial killings. They know what is being done, and by lifting a finger can stop it just as President Fallieres did. Let them commute every death sentence to imprisonment for life, all without argument or question, and they will thereby express the spirit of the times, and show to the world that they believe in the future.

Man commits a murder and the state murders him. That is reciprocity with a vengeance. When I listen to a clergyman in the pulpit preaching Christianity on Sunday, and advocating the death penalty on Monday, I ask myself the old question: Was it he or his parents who sinned, that he should be born blind? The state claims Divine authority for this leprous out-cropping of the dark ages, but I claim that the state has no Divine authority for the death penalty. Those who clamour most for capital punishment deduce their severity from the Bible, and yet it is the Bible which declares that no man should be put to death.

Dr. Josiah Oldfield, of London, says:

> Can we ever forget that Cain was guilty of the worst of crimes, brutal, passionate, fratricide, and that by the laws of Canada, he would be hanged amid the execrations of our very righteous community, who would not raise a finger to get a reprieve in such a case, but would clamour for the hangman 'to do his duty' on the ground that 'such a monster ought not to live.'

Yet the infinite pity of God shielded Cain from the vengeance of pitiless men, and with a protective mark upon his forehead, he was sent out with an express command that no man should injure him; and no church dare to say that Cain, the first fratricide and the beginning of murderers, has not a seat now in the Heaven of the Blessed, and yet, to-day, if Cain were to come to civilized Canada, he would be hounded to the gallows as a monster not worthy of having spent upon him the pittance which

the cost of one extra prisoner would entail. Yet the Bible declared that Cain should not be hanged.

Mr. BURNHAM: Will the hon. member be good enough to read that chapter in the Bible where it says that Cain was sent out with a protective mark upon his forehead.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: My hon. friend will find that in Genesis. Being a good biblical scholar he will know where to put his hand on it. I would impress, too, the striking fact that were Moses to land upon our shores he would land as a criminal who had committed a murder which is punishable by hanging; and when I read the story of how Moses took the poor Egyptian and killed him, and surreptitiously buried his body, and covered the place over with sand so that his crime should be hidden, and then went home and went about his daily duties with serene face as if nothing had happened, I recall similar murders that have taken place in Canada, and I remember the popular outcry about the callous brutality of the crime, and the hard-hearted hypocrisy of the murderer, all quite true, and I can picture from the experience of similar cases that if Moses were to come to Canada to-day and were to repeat the crime which he perpetrated upon the Egyptian, the press and the public would combine to talk about "another brutal murder," and demand the expiation of the crime upon the scaffold. The Minister of Justice would never be satisfied until he had Moses hanged on the scaffold. I take these two striking cases because it is to the law of Moses that the modern pro-hanger appeals. To the Caesar of the Mosaic law does the pro-hanger appeal. By the Caesar of the Mosaic law shall the greatest of the world's prophetic law-givers be judged, and the majestic patriarch who had moulded for good the destinies of millions of people and the great races of men, would fall branded under the statute law of Canada as a common murderer not worth keeping alive.

Capital punishment is unjust to the criminal. He has no chance to reform. His soul is sent into eternity regardless of whether it is saved or not. It is unfair to his family; it disgraces them and robs them of any means of support. If you doubt it, ask any hon. member who has known of a family where the parent has been hanged, and knows how they have been hounded from one city to another. Capital punishment makes no allowances for varying degrees of guilt. It is irrevocable. It is wrong in principle. The State has no right to take life. Killing by a group of people is no more right than killing by one person. I claim that the law of Moses, "Thou shalt not kill," applies to the State as well as to the individual. The same arguments for capital punishment were formerly advanced for torture. Statistics show that murders have decreased in countries and in states that have abolished capital punishment. Life imprisonment is better. It is more effective as a deterrent. Conviction is more certain, and it is the certainty rather than the nature of punishment which deters. Its duration makes it a more severe punishment. It offers adequate protection to society. It prevents murderers from committing new crimes. It reforms the prisoners in order to determine the causes of crime. It makes the prisoner's life valuable to the state. He will support himself. He will provide for his family. His labour can be used in carrying on important public works.

I venture therefore to appeal, by the sacred mercy which spared Cain, and the infinite power which transformed Moses, to every one whose heart beats for the suffering and whose soul yearns over the agonized, to look with the eye of a sorrowing father upon every prodigal in the land, and not to rest until they are won from the misery of the brutal passions which bind them as slaves, into the glorious freedom of the sons of God. There is greater joy in heaven over one murderer who is converted than over ninety and nine murderers who are justly (?) hanged in their sins.

I wish to quote the words of a friend of mine, and of some other hon. gentlemen in this House. His Excellency, the Hon. Geo. W. P. Hunt, Governor of Arizona, says:

> The abolishment of capital punishment is an appeal to man's better nature, not his baser; to his reason, not his passion; to his thought, not his prejudice; to his hope for the future, and not his pitiful blindfold reverence for the customs of a dark and sanguinary past.
>
> Wholly practical and essentially scientific, the protest against legalized killing must naturally look to education for its victory. Aeons struggled for expression. The subject is yet so new to the great majority who have viewed the corpse-strewn course of criminology until its gruesome way is become an accustomed sight, that the mind of the public must be aroused, its thoughts developed, study urged, investigations encouraged; and to this end, as an educational treatise for which there exists an ample and important field.
>
> The blowing out of that God-lighted flame, the taking away coldly, deliberately, premeditatedly of a human life, either by an individual or by the chosen agents of a collection of individuals—the State—is an enormous respon-

sibility. Who views it lightly from the standpoint of the State is as great a menace to society as the criminal of disordered mind or distorted brain who employs it to achieve his evil ends.

I view it with the utmost solemnity, with a profound conviction of the terrible wrong it contemplates. Heroes are made of criminals. Respect for human life is lessened. The spirit of lawlessness is developed in the criminally inclined and in individuals of low mentality.

The evolutionary mutations of the centuries, from chaos almost to light, ever steadily advancing, educating, humanizing, building-up, reconstructing, will never halt, until at their feet shall stand the bright and shining goal whose motto gleams through the aurora of the Golden Rule. There will be no halt until the brutal and brutalizing process of expiation, which even now must hide in shame its visible symbols of ferocity, and in the deathly seclusion of high-walled keeps work its cruel way, shall be utterly destroyed, even as an awakening horror of this national crime has already forced its banishment from the public's horrored eyes.

I do not think that any man who has not witnessed an execution can vote intelligently on this question. In 1861, when I was a youth, I saw a young man hanged in Montreal, the executions in those days being public. I felt then that surely there was some better way for Canada to treat its criminals. When I saw that poor man strung up between heaven and earth and all his convulsions witnessed by some 20,000 people at the old Montreal jail, fighting and scrambling and some of them playing cards, I felt that as long as I lived I would do everything in my power to have capital punishment abolished in Canada. I know some hon. members think that I have a big task ahead of me; that I have so far not succeeded very well, and that I probably never shall; but when I am gone, I feel certain that the Lord will raise up some young men whose eloquence in this House will bring about the abolishment of capital punishment.

Legalized killing must go. It is the only form of crime denied the individual, but preserved in the processes of the state. It fails in its aim to serve society, but holds humanity in check. It writes God's law in earthly statute books, and becomes the chief offender. It destroys, but it cannot renew. It punishes, yes, if we think of the broken hearts of wives and mothers and innocent babes, but it does not punish where it seeks. It works an example, true, but an example of blood and revenge and murder, and as it sows so it reaps. It protects, aye, it protects the world from one man's hand, a hand that may be easily held, but it gives no shield against the malignity of a thousand passions by its crime unloosed. It deters, but it deters only love and good, and the growth of the brotherhood of man. Criminal tendencies are due largely to conditions for which the state, rather than the individual, is responsible?

The State would be justified in taking life in self-defence, but there is no other excuse for the State taking life and the State does not need to take life in self-defence. The death penalty is not in accord with the modern theory of penology. It does not reform the criminal. There is, regrettably, a disposition on the part of some of our most worthy citizens to bring passages of Scripture to the support of capital punishment. We have heard unto the point of weariness the quotation of the old Mosaic law of "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." We do not hear so frequently, however, of Christ's own allusion to the Mosaic law in the following words:

Ye have heard it said in olden times, "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth," but I say unto you, love your enemies and pray for them that despitefully use you.

If any one, however adept in placing construction on the English language, is able, in the light of these words, to attribute even tacit support of the death penalty to the Saviour of mankind, he will exceed all bounds of mental agility within my comprehension. Again, we hear from those who would quote the Bible in justification of legalized murder, the citing of that part of the sixth verse of the ninth chapter of Genesis which reads as follows:

Whosoever sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.

This has been very effectually answered by a statement with whose greatness every school child in America is familiar. I refer to Benjamin Franklin, who, in commenting upon the relation of the Old Testament to the death penalty, uttered the following words, alluding to the Scriptural passage quoted:

This has been supposed to imply that blood could only be expiated by blood. But I am disposed to believe with the best commentators on this text of Scripture, that it is rather a prediction than a law. The language of it is simply that such is the folly and depravity of man that in every age murder shall beget murder. Laws which inflict death for murder are, in my opinion, as un-Christian as those who justify or tolerate revenge; for the obligation of Christianity upon individuals to promote repentance, to forgive injuries, and to discharge the duties of universal benevolence is equally binding upon the state.

To attempt to discover, on grounds of morality, any distinction between murder and legalized execution is the sheerest quibbling. The only instances recorded in law as murder extenuated and in a degree justifiable, are an officer's act in killing one who is resisting arrest, the course of action of any one who slays in attempting to prevent the committing of some forcible or atrocious crime, and the deed of homicide committed either in the heat of passion, by accident, or in self-defence. In none of these conditions can the State find a justification for capital punishment since a deliberate execution is not extenuated by any of these circumstances. Nothing tends to make the heart of an honest man or an honest woman bleed more than realizing that some innocent people are being hanged. Although I have here a dozen cases where innocent men have been hanged, and although I have no doubt there are hundreds of such cases, I will not detain the House by bringing them up this evening.

Capital punishment does not protect society; it is based on revenge, and is dangerous to society. It brutalizes human nature. Legal executions increase the number of murders. If I take a pistol and fire it at the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the bullet strikes his watch and does not kill him, as far as I am concerned, my crime is just as bad as if the bullet did kill him. If I do not kill him, the chances are that I shall be imprisoned and not executed. If I do kill him, the chances are that I shall be executed. I claim that the crime is committed when the shot is fired. If I do not succeed in killing the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that is not my fault; I am equally guilty as if I had killed him, but I shall not be hanged for it. Surely the hon. members of this House will see the distinction.

Judge Robert McMurdy of Chicago says that the death penalty is a cruel invention of caste. Ignorance lazily follows the beaten path; wisdom chooses the way. Readers of history cannot fail to perceive that the death penalty is disappearing step by step. We are told that deaths through religious persecution alone averaged thousands a year for a period of six hundred years. Hume quotes Harrison as authority for the statement that in the reign of Henry VIII seventy-two thousand persons were executed for theft and robbery; and in the "Golden age" of Elizabeth between three and four hundred a year. This reckless slaughter is no longer possible; and with less sanguinary laws have come a number of other changes which indicate an advancing civilization. Trial by jury has been instituted; hanging in chains has been done away with; quartering and breaking on the wheel and burning at the stake have passed into tradition; the death penalty for political crimes has been abandoned generally; it has substantially disappeared for infanticide; the execution of a woman is rare; public hangings have been almost wholly abolished; two degrees of murder have been established by law, one of which in nearly all countries is not capital; in some forums the determination of the punishment to be inflicted is left to the jury. In these particulars we have gradually approached, and in others we are rapidly nearing, the abolition of the death penalty. This form of punishment is discriminatory. Because of the severity it is almost never inflicted upon a person of wealth or influence. In general we hang only such as belong to the abjectly miserable portion of humanity. The long and the short of the matter is that the death penalty is too severe to be inflicted upon the rich or the strong. It is one of the cruel inventions of caste,—it is a class penalty, just as some of the laws governing it have been class laws. One of these men from the United States to whom I have referred said, "Why abolish capital punishment? Why not adopt our system of execution?" And he went on to explain how neatly it was done. I said that I did not see there was much improvement. In the early days, in New York, they burned criminals at the stake until they were dead, now they burn them in the chair until they are dead. There is not much difference to the poor criminal. Is it cowardice? Most people justify the deliberate taking of a life by the state for the wilful taking of a life by a man on the ground that life is sacred and that he who takes it must expect the most severe of all punishments. But if life is sacred enough to be protected from destruction by personal violence, is it not so sacred that we should make it certain that it will not be taken through conspiracy, public prejudice or judicial mistake? Why not go a step further and say that life is so sacred that Canada should not take it at all? Among the Quakers, who live by this rule, there are no murders. The contemplation of an execution with the horrors that accompany it degrades and brutalizes. The death penalty renders human life less sacred by inducing the desire for suicide on the part of the criminal, so that every prisoner under sentence of death is guard-

ed, lest he destroy himself and thus set before the community another evidence of disregard for life. Cowardice has had much to do with retaining this form of punishment. In cases of murder we do not inflict the extreme penalty for the crime itself, but for the result. If one discharges a load of buckshot into the breast of another with the distinct intention of murdering him, and it happens that the man survives, the punishment is limited to imprisonment. If the man dies, the penalty may be death. Morally, the crime is committed when the gun is discharged, and to be consistent the sacredness of human life and all the other arguments used to sustain and justify capital punishment demand that the offender be executed. Yet such is not the law. We refuse to abolish this penalty for crime which results in death because we fear that our lives may be less secure. In other countries this fear has come to the surface when it was proposed to abolish the punishment, although the abolition, in every instance, proved the fear to be unfounded.

A penalty so severe as not to be enforceable has a basic objection; it produces unrest to have a constant miscarriage of justice. A wealthy malefactor, an influential murderer cannot go free in a community where paupers and friendless foreigners and prodigals are hanged, without the people acquiring a contempt for the laws, such as they felt in England during the period of fifteen years when 555 verdicts were rendered for stealing from dwellings thirty-nine shillings, at a time when it was a capital offence to steal forty shillings. When the amount was changed to five pounds the juries raised their verdicts to four pounds, nineteen shillings.

Capital punishment is generally defended upon religious grounds. The passage upon which those who favour the death penalty rely is that part of the sixth verse of the ninth chapter of Genesis, which reads: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." These are the words of the Old Testament. If we are to derive our authority for capital punishment from that part of the Good Book, we may likewise there find our authority for slavery, since we are told that "of the heathen that are round about" us we shall make bondmen. And by these words slavery was defended not very long ago. We are told in Exodus that "He that curseth his father, or his mother, shall surely be put to death," and that if an ox known by its owner to be vicious escapes from its stall and kills a human being, the ox and "his owner also shall be put to death". To be consistent, then, those who undertake to sustain capital punishment by the sentence from Genesis must uphold hanging for cursing a parent, or even for negligence in the care of a vicious ox; and for thirty-three transgressions, including witchcraft, all of which are designated as capital in the Mosaic law. The doctrine of "life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth," given us by the Old Testament, is expressly repudiated in the New. We are told that vengeance is the Lord's; we are commanded after the most solemn fashion not to kill and if we adhere to the original Hebrew, expressly enjoined not to kill man.

Aside from the fact that no sufficient warrant is to be found in the Scriptures for the infliction of death as a punishment, it would seem clear that the State has the right to deprive a man of his civil rights only. It may lawfully withdraw its protection and its privileges from an offender, but the right of a human being to live is derived from the Creator, and the State cannot justly take it away. Constantine prohibited branding the faces of criminals because he believed it to be a violation of the law of nature to mar the majesty of the human face. And nature's first law is life. No one has the right to take his own life, and therefore no one has the right to consent that others shall take it. It follows that if others acquire such a right it must be wholly on the specious ground of self-defence, or "expediency", as it is generally called. A matter of logic. All logical minds agree on this fundamental proposition: If the death penalty does not deter, or if communities are safe without it, we have no right to retain it; for, under either of these conditions, it cannot be justified on the ground of self-defence or expediency. Let us proceed to learn from the facts that both these conditions obtain.

So far as the penalty is aimed at criminals it would seem to be useless. Such deterrents do not reach to the subnormal. In general this class of people do not prize life highly. Moreover, criminals who are homicides, as a class, are not to be frightened. They are the bravest of their kind. Many of them in committing murder have had the courage to risk their own lives. While the constant recollection that the state has fixed the extreme punishment for murder may induce a habit of mind averse to committing the crime, it is by no means certain

that the same result would not be produced, and to the same degree, if the punishment were deprivation of liberty. And this mental state is disrupted, and every other restraint swept aside, by strong passions which continue to dominate until the crime is consummated. But even such a habit of mind is foreign to the majority of criminals, who are struggling against heredity, environment, poverty and drink. Most of our homicides are committed in a more or less drunken state, when the aggressor has dulled himself to considerations of fear. In the few cases of sudden impulse there is no time for weighing consequences. Even if a man with murder in his heart were to stop and consider the likelihood of punishment he would naturally believe that he would be one of the 56 who escape the gallows and not the one in every 57 homicides, in the United States for instance, who is hanged. In view of the uncertainties of a jury trial he would feel that he probably would be acquitted, and at all events would not be condemned to death. In New York city, during a period of three years, 141 persons were convicted of murder, but of these only two were executed. The old criminal knows these figures in a general way, and if he calculates his chances at all he believes that even if he should be caught and convicted he will be one of the 139 and not one of the two. As long as there is the element of chance or uncertainty about threatened death, it loses its terrors. Otherwise, we would have few volunteer soldiers and very few in our extra-hazardous employments.

The deterrent effect of hanging has always been overestimated. It was the experience of England for generations that men by the thousand would risk the gallows to forge a five pound note or to steal property of insignificant value. And it was not the fear of extreme punishment, but the invention of the steamship, that broke up piracy. When hangings were public, it was not uncommon for ten or fifteen thousand people to witness them, and in some instances the crowd numbered more than twenty thousand; but it was found that, so far from the sight operating as a deterrent, these occasions were the scene of ribald jests, profanity, fights and brawls, in some cases leading to another murder before the crowd dispersed. And during the executions of pickpockets, thieves of that class have been caught plying their trade in the assembled crowd. Experience has led us to execute in private.

[Mr. Bickerdike.]

We are just beginning to learn that murderers are controlled in some degree by a morbid desire to imitate, and that murders are committed in cycles bearing no relation to the degree of punishment. In France, one of the Ministers of Justice became satisfied that crime would not decrease as long as so few prisoners sentenced to the guillotine were put to death. Upon this assumption, during a period of twelve months every condemned prisoner but one was beheaded by "the knife of the law"; and the next year murders increased nearly fifty per cent. Montesquieu tells us that it is certainty and not severity which deters—that excessive severity hinders the execution of laws; and Beccaria that it is not the intensity but the continuance of punishment that produces the greatest effect on the mind—principles fully established by the history of the criminal law of England. We need to keep in mind the celebrated petition against punishing with death the crime of forgery, presented to Parliament in 1830 by a thousand bankers located in 214 cities and towns, reciting that the petitioners "find by experience that the infliction of death, or even the possibility of the infliction of death, prevents the prosecution, conviction and punishment of the criminal, and thus endangers the property which it is intended to protect." After the execution of Fauntleroy, the lawyers of England sent up a similar petition in which they predicted that if the Crown were to cease punishing forgery by death, the crime would become less frequent. And when hanging for that offence was abolished the crime became very rare. So with the rest of the 160 crimes which Blackstone tells us were formerly punishable in his country by instant death. And so with murder. The experiments of abolishing this penalty for the crime has been tried without bad results in all parts of the globe, in a great number of instances, at different periods and under diverse conditions. Where the abandonment of the penalty has been immediately followed by an increase in the number of homicides, investigation has shown that the offenders at the time the crimes were committed had not learned that the change had taken place. It is admitted, also, that the restoration of capital punishment where it has once been abolished has not decreased the number of murders.

It may be added that substantially all the arguments now advanced for the retention of the death penalty for homicide were urged with vehemence in the endeavour to pre-

vent its abolition for offenses against the laws protecting property, and coupled with these arguments were solemn predictions of dire calamity in the event of a change. We learn from experience that when executions are most numerous, convictions are most difficult, and on the other hand, when executions are least frequent convictions are most readily obtained, so that it is quite impossible to combine certainty of punishment with the penalty of death. For some persons, the penalty of death has a certain fascination arising out of vainglory, a characteristic weakness of criminals. Many of them would readily choose the scaffold, with its suggestion of heroism and martyrdom, rather than the penitentiary which has no other meaning than disgrace. During cycles of corruption in other lands, capital punishment has been a menace to liberty, especially with respect to that indefinite crime we call by the name of treason—still a crime in the United States and Canada. Sir, had the venerated signers of the Declaration of Independence been men of less heroic character, and had they been deterred by this penalty, one of the best pages of history would never have been written.

Life is as secure without the infliction of such a penalty. In the ancient world nations existed for hundreds of years in perfect safety without the death penalty. In modern days, eight of the civilized countries have abolished capital punishment and are living in security without it; in some of them, it has been abolished for half a century; in others, again, it is never inflicted; while in still others it has been abrogated for long stretches of time. But it is said by sanguinary supporters of the penalty that its retention is necessary to hold in check the criminal classes in the great urban centres. The answer is that many large communities have lived in security without executions—Bombay, Amsterdam, Brussels, Warsaw, Moscow, Odessa, Naples, Milan, Rome, Marseilles, Lyons, Lisbon. It is objected that these cities are not of the first magnitude. The answer is: St. Petersburg, Paris. It is urged that these are not in America, where murder is most frequent. The answer is: Milwaukee, Detroit, Providence. In any given instance it will not do to brush all argument aside with the comment, sometimes heard: "Served him right. Hanging was too good for him." Such sentiments proclaim the savage. Revenge is the lowest of our characteristics. This standard has been abandoned even by the most violent and drastic penologists. Punishment by the state, we are taught, has but three objects: to restore to the injured, to reform the criminal, to prevent a repetition of the crime—(the idea of expediency, or example to others, is secondary). In murder it is impossible to restore to the injured. The death penalty prevents the reformation of the criminal, but it does effectively stop repetition by the same man. If, however, repetition can be prevented by imprisonment, hanging is without an apology. The modern prison is amply sufficient, whatever may have been true in former days. If we can restrain the homicidal madman, we ought to be able to control the ordinary murderer.

Mr. Speaker from the time of Calvary to the present day innocent men have been put to death. We are told by Mittermaier of guiltless persons executed in Italy, France and Germany. He speaks of a condemned man, afterwards proved innocent, concerning whose case Baron Martin, the trial judge said: "The evidence was about the clearest and most direct that, after a long course of experience in the administration of criminal justice, I have ever known." Chief Baron Kelly says that from 1802 to 1840 he traced twenty-two men who were wrongly convicted of murder in England, seven of whom were hanged. Mackintosh says that in the same country, taking a long period of time, one innocent man is hanged in every three years. It may be safely asserted that the thousands who were put to death—at the stake and otherwise—for witchcraft were not guilty of the crime with which they were charged. Again there is no way of ascertaining to a certainty the guilt of any one charged with murder. Felonious intent is the essence of crime. The jury must determine, then, in each instance, the state of mind of the accused. In many cases this is a difficult task, and in not a few the verdict is a mere guess. A confession of guilt, if voluntary, would seem to be a strong evidence; but by way of illustrating a general rule, it will be remembered that a number of men confessed to the murder of Nathan in New York City, all of whom were innocent. In some cases of acknowledged murder the supposed victim has turned out to be still alive, and in at least one instance interrupted the trial. Whatever may be the testimony of a witness, it cannot be certain to a demonstration, in some cases, that he is not committing perjury or is not mistaken.

Even in those cases where the murder is proved to the satisfaction of the most exact mind, there is no way of determining whether the culprit was sane when he committed the act. If insanity is present, the very nature of the disease often leads the offender to conceal its symptoms. If a man of normal mind should commit murder and be convicted, it cannot be known absolutely whether at the time of his hanging he is mentally sound. Yet our nature revolts at the thought of hanging a man who is insane, and the law does not permit his execution. To the hanging of women there is a special objection. More than one instance is related of an unborn child being destroyed at the same time with the mother. Such a result may be avoided, but the objection illustrates what all these facts accentuate, the difficulties that surround the infliction of this penalty. Throughout history man has been endeavouring to devise some decent method of putting a brother to death in cold blood. Hanging has been preferred to other methods because it does not literally shed blood; but a bungling hangman or a faulty rope may make it most revolting. Electrocution is but the forerunner of abolition. What nature has rendered so difficult, man should accept as forbidden.

With regard to the deterrent effect, let any one cast his mind back to the days of the Declaration of Independence. One of the greatest chapters in history would never have been written if the men who signed the Declaration of Independence had been in fear of the rope; but they signed the Declaration of Independence knowing that the rope was hanging over them. We hang men because they are rebels. We hanged Riel, a man whom I knew very well. He was no more guilty than George Washington was; they were both rebels—one succeeded and became the father of his country, the other failed and was hanged.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to the rule.

Thursday, February 1, 1917.

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

REPORTS.

Report of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1916.—Hon. Mr. Blondin.

Public Accounts for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1916.—Sir Thomas White.

[Mr. Bickerdike.]

ELECTION OF MR. RAINVILLE AS DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): It has become necessary to appoint a chairman of committees of the whole House, and I need not say that the appointment is an important one, involving the duty of presiding over committees of the whole House, and also of presiding over the House itself in the absence of the Speaker. I have very much pleasure in proposing to the House that Mr. Joseph H. Rainville, member of this House for the electoral district of Chambly-Vercheres, be appointed chairman of committees. Mr. Rainville, who has had experience for the past six years as a member of this House, has, I think, manifested a thorough acquaintance with the rules of the House, having been called on from time to time to discharge temporarily the duties of chairman of committees. He has also the qualities which will enable him to discharge his duties in a manner satisfactory in every way, possessing, as he does, the promptness of decision, impartiality, courtesy and tact that are essential to the position which he will be called upon to fill if my proposal should meet with the acceptance of the House. I therefore beg to move, Mr. Speaker:

That Mr. Joseph H. Rainville, member for the electoral district of Chambly-Vercheres, be appointed Chairman of the Committees of the Whole House.

Motion agreed to.

GERMAN SUBMARINE WARFARE.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, a telegram has been received from His Excellency the British Ambassador at Washington, which it is proper that I should communicate to the House:—

TELEGRAM FROM BRITISH AMBASSADOR AT WASHINGTON.

Washington, January 31, 1917.

Urgent.

German Ambassador has just informed Secretary of State that all pledges as to restriction of submarine warfare have been withdrawn from February 1st.

(Sgd.) Spring Rice.

CONFISCATION OF COAL BY RAILWAYS

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: A question was asked in the House a few days ago in regard to the commandeering of coal by the Dominion Atlantic Railway. In answer to the hon. gentleman who sought information upon the subject, I stated that it would be taken up by the Board of Railway Commis-

sioners, and I am to-day in receipt of a letter, dated yesterday, which is as follows:

January 31, 1917.

Dear Sir Robert Borden,—As the question of commandeering of coal by the Dominion Atlantic railway came to me through you, for your information, I beg to advise that the company makes the following explanations as to the situation.

Your telegram yesterday re coal for Nova Scotia Underwear Company. This coal was taken at Truro. Action made necessary in order to keep traffic moving. On night of 23rd Dominion Atlantic took three cars, one consigned to the Underwear Company and two to F. W. Dimock, local coal dealer, Windsor, who was under contract to supply Underwear Company with one car a week. Railway Company returned one of these cars to Dimock on the 25th and one on the 24th and three will be replaced to-day under arrangement with local coal dealer Wolfville and Mr. Ballantyne, Manager Underwear Company with whom company have been in constant touch. Am advised coal was not taken without first making sure that Underwear Company would be in no way inconvenienced. On account of very heavy demand for munition plants, etc., mines have been unable to meet requirements. Effective February first Railway Company is making heavy reductions its passenger trains in order to save coal and enable it to move overseas traffic. It is purchasing coal from whatever source possible at prohibitive prices in order to keep situation in hand.

The coal shortage is, of course, severe, and our troubles many. On the one hand, trains have to move; but, on the other, factories have to be kept going.

Yours faithfully,
H. L. Drayton,
Chief Commissioner.

The Right Honourable the Premier,
Ottawa, Ont.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

ROYAL NORTHWEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Is the Royal Northwest Mounted Police force now engaged in enforcing law in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta to be withdrawn from the authority of the respective Provincial Governments.
2. If so, at what date is this withdrawal to take place?
3. Is the force to remain in the provinces?
4. In what duty is it to be employed?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I beg to lay on the table of the House the orders in council which are alluded to in this question, and which, I think, will give a full answer to the inquiry made by the hon. gentleman.

REMOVAL OF RAILWAY MATERIAL TO FRANCE.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. What trackage of railway is Canada sending to the Allies?
2. What is the tonnage?
3. Are ties included?
4. From what lines and at what points is this trackage taken?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Three hundred miles.
2. Approximately 45,000 gross tons, including fastenings, turnouts, etc.
3. No.
4. From yards at divisional points on the National Transcontinental railway.

PATENT MEDICINES.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

Will the Minister of Inland Revenue introduce, during this session, a Bill respecting the classification of patent medicines, especially as to abortive drugs and medicines or their equivalent?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Any necessary announcement in regard to this subject will be made in due course.

MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Who secured the mail contract between Trois Pistoles and St. Jean de Dieu, Temiscouata?
2. What is the price paid to the present contractor?
3. How many persons tendered for this contract?
4. What were the names of tenderers?
5. What was the amount of their respective tenders?

Mr. BLONDIN:

1. Florian Rioux.
2. Four hundred and fifteen dollars per annum.
3. Seven.

4 and 5. Cyrille Rioux, $349; Zephirin Marquis, $373; Florian Rioux, $415; Vallier Lavoie, $500; Thomas Dauteine, $525; Louis de G. Rioux, $550; Leon Rosseau, $590. The contract was awarded to Cyrille Rioux, the lowest tenderer, who refused it. After Zephirin Marquis had notified the department that he would not be able to perform the service if his tender was accepted, the contract was given to the next lowest tenderer, Florian Rioux.

EXCHEQUER COURT CASES.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Does the Honourable the Minister of Justice allow the Government Solicitor, in the Exchequer Court cases, in the district of Kamouraska, to take a counsel with him for the hearing of the evidence and to defend the Government?
2. Is it the usual practice of the Department of Justice to appoint two attorneys when very simple cases can be pleaded by only one, at this period when the war expenses are already so heavy?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. There is no such office as that of 'Government Solicitor' in the district of Kamouraska or elsewhere. The considerations governing the employment of counsel in Kamouraska are the same as in other parts of Canada. Out of nine cases in the district of Kamouraska since 1911 counsel were employed in only two, and these were cases involving considerable amounts and depending upon doubtful questions of law.

2. No. Counsel are employed only where by reason of the nature of the case it is considered advisable by the Department of Justice to retain counsel.

SEPARATION ALLOWANCE.

Mr. MACDONALD:

What class of persons are entitled to receive separation allowance whose relatives are in Overseas service?

Mr. KEMP:

Under present regulations the classes of persons who are entitled to Separation Allowance as dependents of Officers and men enlisting for overseas service are set out in orders in council:

P. C. 2266, September 4, 1914; P. C. 2553, October 10, 1914; P. C. 2613, November 6, 1915; P. C. 1997, August 23, 1916; P. C. 2246, October 20, 1916; P. C. 2615, October 28, 1916; which have been laid on the table of the House of Commons. The regulations are modelled after the British regulations governing payment of Separation Allowance.

HOME GUARD DUTY.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. What is the reason that men enlisting for Home Guard duty are not being dealt with, as regards pay and allowances, in the same manner as men originally in the Canadian Expeditionary Force and subsequently transferred to Home service?

2. Why were the special rates authorized for the Canadian Expeditionary Force not extended to Home Service?

3. Have representations been made to the Government to have all guards placed on the same basis?

Mr. KEMP:

1. (a) The only men who have enlisted for Home Guard service are men who are serving in the Active Militia. They receive exactly the same pay as members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, but they do not receive separation allowance.

(b) Men who originally enlisted in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and were subsequently transferred to Home Service, were those who after they enlisted for overseas service became either temporarily or otherwise medically unfit for overseas service. These men are used on guard duty or on detail work of various kinds necessary in the district. When they become medically fit for overseas service, they proceed overseas. They are subject to the same regulations as the overseas forces.

2. Separation allowance was not extended to members of active militia units, as these men are used for guard duty in Canada only, and the members of these militia units are largely employed in the locality in which their homes are situated. The members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force who are being employed on guard duty in Canada volunteered their services unreservedly for the defense of the Empire, and in so doing were prepared not only to endure hardships and hazards, but to sacrifice their lives if necessary. They are therefore in most cases removed from their families by great distances, and the wives and mothers of these men, who have given their husbands and sons for the common cause, have suffered the sorrows necessitated by such removal. It is therefore considered that they are entitled to separation allowance.

3. Yes, representations have been made to the Government to have all guards placed on the same basis.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—LEVEL CROSSING.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Is the Railway Department aware of the dangerous nature of the crossing on the Canadian Government Railway north of the Eastern Car Works at Trenton, Pictou County?

2. If so, is it the intention of the railway to construct a subway to remove the danger?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The elimination of the level crossing on the Pictou Harbour Branch, north of the Eastern Car Works at Trenton, Pictou County, has been given consideration.

2. An item has been placed in this year's estimates for the construction of a subway at this point.

THE RACING FORM.

Mr. McKENZIE:

1. Is the Minister of Justice aware as to whether or not the Post Office Department excluded from the mails The Racing Form, published in the United States?

2. Is the Government aware as to whether or not the said publication is finding its way into Canada through the agency of the express companies?

3. Is it the intention of the Minister of Justice to take such steps as may be necessary to

prevent the coming into Canada of the said publication through the agency of the express companies?

Mr. DOHERTY: With regard to this question, as it stood on the Order Paper up to to-day it was not in the same form as that in which it stands to-day. The answer was prepared to the question as it stood but as it reads to-day it asks whether the Government had information about certain matters. To answer the question as it stands to-day, I should have to get more information and I therefore have to ask that the question be allowed to stand.

Mr. McKENZIE: The question was reconstructed at the suggestion of Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I might explain that the question, as it originally stood, was, in my judgment, objectionable in part; and after a conference with the hon. member for Cape Breton (North) the question was revised so as to read as it now appears on the Order Paper.

Mr. McKENZIE: The answer that would be given to the former question would be quite acceptable to me if the Minister is prepared to give it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question stands.

Mr. DOHERTY: I should like to point out that first of all the question read "Has the Minister of Justice" certain information. This question asks "Has the Govern ment" certain information, and before I can answer that I must make inquiry of every department, to see whether they have information on the subject.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Minister of Justice is the Government.

Mr. DOHERTY: It ought to be that way.

BRICK FOR NEW PARLIAMENT BUILDING.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. In the construction of the new Parliament Building is it the intention to use brick supplied by the Ontario National Brick Company, Limited?
2. If so, what quantity of the said brick will be supplied and at what price will it be delivered at the works?
3. Up to January 25, 1917, what was the total quantity of the said bricks delivered at the works?

Mr. ROGERS: 1, 2 and 3. A contract has been awarded for 5,000,000 common brick, which is one-half the total estimated quantity required. This contract is not with the Ontario National Brick Company, Limited, but they will have an opportunity of tendering on the balance, when the same is required.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. In the construction of the new Parliament Building is it the intention to use brick supplied by the National Brick Company of Laprairie, Limited?
2. If so, what quantity of the said brick will be supplied, and at what price will it be delivered at the works?
3. Up to January 25, 1917, what was the total quantity of the said bricks delivered at the works?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.

2. A contract has been executed with the National Brick Company of Laprairie, Limited, under date of September 6, 1916, for the supply of 5,000,000 common brick at $10.50 per thousand, delivered at the site.

3. 4,449,000.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—SAFETY-FIRST INSPECTORS.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. How many safety-first inspectors are there on the Canadian Government railways?
2. What are their names and salaries, respectively?
3. Is there a safety-first engineer employed?
4. If so, who is he, and what is his salary?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Three. They also perform duties of first-aid instructors.

2. W. H. Tout, P. P. Begin, and H. Mitchinson. Salaries, $83.33 per month.

3. Yes.

4. J. E. Long; $225 per month.

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY MEAT SUPPLIES.

Mr. COPP:

1. Who has the contract for supplying meat for the Dorchester Penitentiary?
2. What is being paid per pound for the different kinds of meat supplied under said contract?
3. When does present contract expire?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. The Harris Abattoir Company.

2. Beef, $9.60 per 100 lb.; mutton, $10.60 per 100 lb.

3. March 31, 1917.

ENLISTMENT OF NOEL GAZELLE.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. Has the Government been made aware that a minor of fifteen years of age, named Noel Gazelle known as Razel (Number 324853), has joined the Canadian troops, without the consent of his parents?
2. Under the King's Regulations, is such an enlistment valid?

3. Did the parents of this boy demand his release?
4. If so, has such request been granted by the Department of Militia? If not, why?
5. To what nationality does soldier Gazelle belong?
6. Where is he at the present time?
7. Is it the practice of the Government to enlist minors of fifteen years of age without the consent of their parents?
8. If so, what are the reasons for so doing?

Mr. KEMP:

1. Private Noel Gazelle enlisted in the 57th Overseas Battery on March 8, 1916. On October 14, 1916, a letter was received from Lt.-Col. Armand Lavergne, M.P.P., stating that this soldier enlisted without the consent of his parents, and was only sixteen years of age, and requested that he be returned from England. Lt.-Col. Lavergne was informed that, owing to the statement of age taken under oath at attestation, this soldier was over eighteen years of age, and no further action could be taken. No application was received from this soldier's parents for his discharge until he had been in the forces for over seven months, and was, at the time of application, in England and under Imperial authority.

2. Under King's Regulations, such an enlistment is valid.

3. Not until seven months after enlistment.

4. Request not granted for reasons stated in No. 1.

5. Gazelle was born at Levis, Quebec. His father claims to be a Syrian.

6. Private Gazelle is at present in England or at the front.

7. The Government does not enlist minors under eighteen years of age without the consent of their parents. Age sworn to on attestation is legally binding.

8. Answered by No. 7.

DISMISSALS FROM THE MILITIA.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. Did the Department of Militia bring any deserters before the Court of Sessions at Quebec last summer?
2. If so, how many of such cases brought before the court were dismissed?
3. Did the Judge recommend that costs for some of the dismissed cases be paid by the Crown?
4. Has the Government declined to pay said costs?
5. If so, for what reasons?

Mr. KEMP:

1. Yes.

2. Eight acquittals during whole of 1916.

3. Yes, in four cases.

4. Yes.

5. On the ground that the prosecution was on behalf of the Crown, and no costs are collectable against the Crown as a matter of right. The Crown may, in its discretion, pay costs. It was not considered advisable in these cases that costs should be paid.

ARTHUR STEELE.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Was Arthur Steele, of Boylston, preventive officer of the Department of Customs, dismissed?
2. If so, why, and on what date?
3. Was there an investigation?
4. If so, by whom, what was the charge, and who laid the complaint?
5. What was the salary of said officer?
6. Who was appointed as his successor, on whose recommendation, and at what salary?

Mr. REID:

1, 2, 3 and 4. His services were dispensed with by order in council of 24th July, 1915, owing to the fact that the Customs business transacted at Boylston did not appear to warrant the employment of an officer at that place.

5. Salary $150 a year.

6. There has not been any one appointed as his successor.

WAR SUPPLIES—HAY.

Mr. PROULX:

1. How many tons of hay has the Department of Militia or the War Purchasing Commission purchased during the month of December last, to be delivered at the sheds of the wharf or harbour of Montreal?
2. What was the price paid per ton?
3. How many tons were purchased since the first of January, 1917, and what was the price paid per ton?

Mr. BURRELL: 1, 2 and 3. The hay referred to was not purchased by either the Department of Militia or the War Purchasing Commission, but by the Department of Agriculture acting for the British War Office. It is undesirable in the public interest to give information on such matters at the present time.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Buchanan.—For a copy of all communications, reports and documents concerning the alleged treatment of Thos. Kelly, a prisoner in the Stony Mountain Penitentiary.

Mr. Sinclair.—For a copy of all letters, petitions and other documents in the possession of the Department of Customs relating to the dismissal of Arthur Steele of Boylston, N.S., a preventive officer of said department.

Mr. Sinclair.—For a copy of all correspondence in the possession of the Department of Public Works bearing date after September, 1911, relating to the expenditure of money voted last session for harbour improvements at Tracadie, in the County of Antigonish, including copies of all letters relating to the

same written by Mr. G. A. R. Rollings to the said Minister of Public Works or to any other member of the Government.

Mr. Sinclair.—For a copy of all correspondence in the possession of the Department of Public Works bearing date after September, 1911, relating to the extension of a breakwater at Breen's Point, in the County of Antigonish.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN.

Mr. Turriff.—1. What are the names and present rank of all appointees as chief recruiting officers or as district or special recruiting officers, not local or regimental, made since the beginning of the war?

2. What were the dates of their respective appointments?

3. What were the ages and vocations of respective appointees?

4. What is the name of military organization, if any, in which appointees had previously served?

5. What was the rank of appointees while serving in any military organization?

6. Have the services of any of these appointees been dispensed with?

7. If so, what were their names, and on what dates were they retired?

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

STATEMENT BY HON. P. E. BLONDIN.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. P. E. BLONDIN (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, I saw yesterday for the first time, in the Ottawa Evening Journal of Friday last, January 26, a report of the Canadian Press, which I will read:

Montreal, Jan. 26.—Hon. P. E. Blondin, through his lieutenant, Felix Durocher, has issued a reply to an affidavit, which purported to give a report of his remarks at St. Rose during a Dorchester county by-election speech on Wednesday night. The affidavit credited Mr. Blondin with contending that the Allison scandal was of no importance to St. Rose because it is English money that was stolen, while those who desired to escape conscription could do so by crossing the United States border. Mr. Blondin's explanation follows:

The statement which has been sworn to by certain Liberals with regard to my utterances are a distortion of my words. I never by any means intended to convey the meaning which they have attached to my speech. Mr. Cannon had been stating in his speeches that the Conservative party had been grafting from the Canadian treasury in connection with munition contracts.

In my speech at St. Rose I explained that it was not true that the Allison scandal had to do with Canadian money pointing out that the money paid for the shells was the money of the British Government. I did not imply that Allison had done a worthy act, but simply corrected Mr. Cannon's mis-statement. In regard to the conscription matter I told the people of St. Rose that I did not believe conscription would be necessary because so many Canadians were eager to go and fight for the cause of liberty and humanity. I added that if any of them were afraid of conscription, if conscription should be passed and they did not want to go to the war, they had a remedy left. They could go across the United States line which is near St. Rose and escape military service.

First of all, as for Mr. Desrochers, I beg to state that he did not act as my secretary or lieutenant, and that during the whole election I had no connection with him whatever. I never spoke to him concerning the matter referred to in the report which I have just read. I never authorized him to make any statement for me, and I never was informed by him or anybody else of the statement reported to have been made by him on my behalf. I have inquired from Mr. Desrochers about the correctness of the statement, and he denies, and authorizes me to deny in this House, the last part of that report, namely, that part which relates to conscription.

As to the statement itself, to wit, that I advised people to cross the boundary, which I am informed, was freely commented on by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), and the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp), I must say that there is not a single particle of truth in that report. The facts concerning the matter are very plain. I was replying to a speech in which my opponent had strongly endeavoured to show that conscription was coming by means of the National Service cards, which, he said, meant nothing but conscription, and that very soon coercion would be used by the Borden English-Protestant Government against the Catholic French-Canadians, and that very soon armed soldiers would come and force their husbands and sons to go to war.

These are the very notes that are still fresh on the paper on which I wrote them when preparing my answer.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Can you swear to that?

Mr. BLONDIN: I can swear to it. I can bring into this House the affidavits of a hundred and fifty men worthy of confidence, which, I am afraid, will make the whole Liberal party blush.

My answer to these arguments was that the National Service cards did not mean anything of the kind and were only an appeal to the patriotism and good-will of every citizen whose duty it was to sign them; that if conscription had to come it would come openly; that this Government could not promise or declare that conscription would never come, as it would be coward-

ice on the part of the Government to make such a declaration or promise; that it might have to come; but that for the present there was no question of conscription, and the Government did not by the National Service cards intend any coercion of the people, and that the best proof of this was that the stretch of 4,000 miles of frontier had been left unguarded and open. And this I said in order to show the stupidity of the contentions of my opponent. I may add, Mr. Speaker, that any other construction of my words is purely and simply gross misrepresentation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I would ask the hon. gentleman to supplement his explanation by giving us the name of the Liberal gentleman who spoke as he did.

Mr. BLONDIN: In Ste. Rose, Mr. D'Anjou, who presented himself as a lawyer from Rimouski, and I can give some of the other names.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Who is Mr. Desrochers?

Mr. BLONDIN: He is a lawyer of Montreal.

GRAIN CONGESTION IN THE WEST.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. McCOIG: I draw the attention of the Government to an article that appeared in one of to-day's papers. It is headed "Congestion of Grain in West becomes serious," and reads:

> Saskatoon, Jan. 30.—Grain congestion in the West has reached a serious condition, in the opinion of J. R. Wilson, superintendent of the Dominion Government elevator here, who declares that unquestionably there is far more grain in the country than anyone had any idea of at harvest time.
>
> With the embargos against inward shipments to Port Arthur, Fort William, Saskatoon and Moosejaw, it is little use for either farmers or interior elevators to receive cars for there is no place to route them to.

My reason for calling this matter to the attention of the Government is that during the past year there has been a great shortage of feed throughout the province of Ontario, and in many cases hundreds of cattle and hogs have been taken to market before being brought to a fit condition for selling. To-day, there are no doubt hundreds of cattle and hogs that should be retained for feeding purposes that, on account of the shortage of feed, are being slaughtered, and this will greatly affect the meat situation next year. If the Government can remove the embargo and allow grain to be brought into Ontario, their action will be greatly appreciated by men who are anxious to comply with the Government's request for the greatest possible production in the coming year.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The despatch which the hon. gentleman has read contains information most of which I apprehend to be the facts. Part of it is not disagreeable information, as it tells us that the Northwest, on the ultimate revision of its output, shows a much larger yield of grain than we had heretofore thought would have been turned out. That, as far as it goes, is useful and very agreeable information. As regards the car congestion, there is probably not a foot of ground on the North American continent where congestion is not very strong and very pressing, and causing a variety of hardships. The railways have to impose embargos when it is necessary, and I am quite certain they do not put on any embargos when it is not absolutely necessary. If my hon. friend can point out any way by which the car shortage can be diminished in its pressure upon the industries and upon the traffic of the country, we would be very glad to have his suggestions. The railroad companies are doing everything they possibly can. and the Board of Railway Commissioners is using the powers at its command in order to ameliorate the situation as far as possible. But the situation is a pressing one, and we shall simply have to bear what we cannot get rid of by any reasonable means.

Mr. OLIVER: Is there not a Common Carriers' Act that requires the railway companies to take goods for shipment to destination according to the order of the owner?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend the Minister of Railways can answer that better than I can.

Mr. COCHRANE: I do not know whether the Act covers that or not, but I know that both the railway companies and the Board of Railway Commissioners are doing everything in their power to get the freight delivered.

WAR PURCHASING COMMISSON.

INQUIRY AS TO PURCHASES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. CARVELL: Just before the close of the last session an order was passed by this House calling for a return of all purchases made by the War Purchasing Commission.

A few day ago I inquired of the clerk of records and I found that, so far as he knew, this return had not been brought down. I made no remarks about it, as I assumed that we should have the auditor general's report in our hands and that it would cover at least a portion of the information required. Now, we have received the information from the Minister of Finance that that portion of the auditor general's report covering the transactions of the War Purchasing Commission will not be available until after the adjournment. I would like to know if the Minister of Militia cannot have that return brought down before we adjourn next week?

Mr. KEMP: A few days ago there was laid upon the table of the House a report of the War Purchasing Commission in four large volumes. Was my hon. friend aware of that?

Mr. CARVELL: That is not a compliance with the order of the House which required a statement of the purchases. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia, who was then Acting Minister of Militia, will remember that we discussed the matter on a number of occasions, and that finally the House ordered that the report be given. I think that, an order of the House having been passed, we are entitled to the information.

Mr. KEMP: It is certainly correct for the hon. gentleman to say that any order of this House must be honoured. The idea, however, was that, as the report which was being published would contain such a tremendous amount of detail, there would be sufficient information in it to answer my hon. friend's purpose. Moreover, the auditor general's report would be forthcoming, and between the two reports all the information would be given that would be desirable. The report which my hon. friend asked for was one of tremendous detail, and the department was so busy that it seemed almost impossible to get the work out. In view of the report of the War Purchasing Commission and the report of the auditor general giving practically all the information asked for in the order of the House, I hope my hon. friend will be willing not to insist upon the labour being expended that will be necessary to get out the return for which he has asked.

Mr. CARVELL: I suppose I have no right to discuss the matter at this stage, and I do not intend to do so. I ought, however, be allowed to say that I think the minister has not treated the House exactly as he should, in view of the somewhat extended conversation we had about the matter during the months of April and May last.

Mr. KEMP: I may add that I was acting-Minister at the time—for about two months, I think. After that I was not in control of the Department of Militia and Defence, and consequently was unable to follow the matter up in the way my hon. friend thinks it should have been followed up.

WESTERN COAL MINING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. BUCHANAN: In the papers this morning there is a despatch from Lethbridge concerning the situation with regard to the coal supply. The fear is expressed that unless the trouble between the miners and the operators is immediately settled there will be considerable suffering, because many communities are practically without coal. The Minister of Labour has gone to the West in an effort to bring about a settlement; has the Government had any report from him as to the progress of the negotiations?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Telegrams received yesterday and the day before indicate that the men in some of the mines have returned to work. I think the men at the Blairmore mine had not returned to work, but were in session discussing the situation at that particular mine, according to the last report which I have received. I am not aware that we have had any direct report from the Minister of Labour. The reports to which I refer are those which have come to the officials of the Department of Labour from representatives of that department in the districts to which my hon. friend has referred.

HON. DR. BELAND, M.P.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MARCIL: The Prime Minister was kind enough to answer a question yesterday with regard to Dr. Beland. He told me that he would inquire still further about the allegation made by Quebec papers that certain Germans had been liberated from the internment camps, and that the matter would be referred to the Minister of Justice—especially the case of one Baron von Polence and one Muntine. I would like the right hon. gentleman to tell us if an exchange is generally made when these men are liberated from Canadian camps.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: With respect to this inquiry I took the same course as was taken with regard to the inquiry of the hon. member for South Renfrew; (Mr. Graham) I addressed a letter this morning to the Minister of Justice directing his attention to the remarks of my hon. friend and asking him to give the information as soon as possible.

Mr. GRAHAM: This letter-writing is a fatal gift.

RECRUITING IN QUEBEC.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MARCIL: May I ask the Minister of Militia to answer a question that I asked him yesterday as to whether the raising of a French-Canadian brigade in the province of Quebec has been authorized?

Mr. KEMP: The department ha not authorized the raising of a brigade. The information which my hon. friend asks for is being inquired into.

$100,000,000 LOAN FOR PUBLIC SERVICE.

On motion of Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance), the House went into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Rainville in the Chair:

That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to raise by way of loan, in addition to the sums now remaining unborrowed and negotiable of the loans authorized by Parliament by any Act heretofore passed, such sum or sums of money, not to exceed in the whole the sum of one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000), as may be required for paying maturing loans and obligations of Canada, carrying on of public works authorized by Parliament and meeting expenditures for general purposes authorized by Parliament.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Mr. Chairman, His Excellency the Governor General has been made acquainted with the substance of this resolution, and has been pleased to commend it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is this the time to make known the consent of His Excellency the Governor General—when the resolution is in Committee. That information should be given when the Speaker is in the Chair.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend is correct. I had intended to make the statement, but the Speaker declared the motion carried before I got upon my feet. I hope that under the circumstances my hon. friend's sense of propriety will not be too greatly shocked. I appreciate fully the importance of the point that my hon. friend has made, but it was through inadvertence that I omitted to make the statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I assure my hon. friend that I did not mention the matter simply for the sake of raising a point of order. He must be aware that informing the Committee of the House has no greater effect than giving the information before an ordinary standing committee. It is desirable that the rule should be adhered to; perhaps my hon. friend might give the information to the House after the Committee rises, so that the matter may appear regularly in the minutes.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am not sure that the statement was not made last night by the Prime Minister. The proper time to give this information is when the motion is made that the House do resolve itself into committee on the day following for the purpose of considering the resolution. My hon. friend will pardon me if I have to correct even him. But I shall be glad to observe propriety in regard to a matter which is of great importance.

The object of this resolution is to replenish the borrowing powers of the Dominion upon general purpose account. It will be necessary for us during the coming year to raise very considerable sums by way of borrowing. Some of that money will be raised in Canada, and possibly some in the United States.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Why not all in Canada?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I will deal with that just in a moment. We have not in mind an immediate loan either in Canada or in the United States, but it will not be long before we shall have to consider the question of a further loan. My right hon. friend has very properly raised the question, why not borrow all the requirements in Canada? It is possible that we may be able to do so. That will depend entirely upon financial conditions prevailing in Canada, and the state of exchange between Canada and the United States, for example, let us assume that exchange as between Canada and the United States is unfavourable to Canada. We are at the present time buying very large amounts of raw material and other commodities from the United States. These enter into our domestic manufactures, and our manufactures

for export. If it should transpire that on account of our large purchases from the United States for that purpose and for other purposes the balance of trade should prove unfavourable to Canada and be not offset otherwise, then if we borrowed in the United States market our exchange would be affected advantageously.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Would reciprocity facilitate exchanges?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My right hon. friend and I have discussed reciprocity before. It is a subject which I should like to discuss with him, but the present does not seem to be an opportune time. However, once or twice since war broke out, exchanges have been unfavourable to Canada. At the present time they are rather favourable to Canada, and on the whole they have been extraordinarily well maintained. If, during the year, the exchanges should prove unfavourable, it would be our proper policy to borrow in the United States.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If my hon. friend borrows from the United States will he use the usual channel, through the Bank of Montreal?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I shall make no pronouncement upon that at the present time because I do not know what I shall do. I think it quite unwise to make any announcement in advance as to what one's course is to be. The object will be to get the best result. The Bank of Montreal has acted as financial agent for the Dominion Government most acceptably for many years. As to what I shall do if I am obliged to borrow in the United States, what course I shall adopt, that is a matter that will have to be determined in the light of prevailing conditions.

There is another contingency under which we might borrow in the United States: that is to say, if the financial condition in Canada was such that it would be a proper course for us to adopt. What I mean is that at the present time Canada has a very large agricultural and industrial production. Prices of commodities and products of all kinds are exceedingly high. That means that there are large demands upon our banking institutions in carrying the large volume of our production and consequently a situation might exist in which the Dominion Government might desire to raise $75,000,000 or $100,000,000, and in which it would not be in the public interest, having regard to financial stability in Canada, to raise that loan in Canada. It would then be more advantageous to seek the American market. Generally speaking, I should like to make all our loans in Canada. Canada will have a very large debt after the war is over, and it would make very much for national strength and financial stability if the greater amount of Canada's debt should be held by the Canadian people, because the position then would be that Canada, in her collective capacity, in her national capacity, would owe her debt to her own people. That would be a strong situation. It is very desirable we should aim at that, but the amounts which we may have to raise in order to finance our own interests on this side of the Atlantic, and to assist the United Kingdom in making purchases of munitions and supplies in Canada, are so large that I am not clear as to whether the Canadian market will be able to take the entire amount, and that is where judgment will be required as between the Canadian and the American market. I assure my hon. friend that I would much rather borrow in Canada than in the United States, for the reasons I have given.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I suppose it is inevitable that the Government must borrow during the current year in Canada or the United States, and, as the minister has stated, in all probability the loans will be of such an amount that he will be obliged for one reason or another to go to the United States.

In connection with loans made since the beginning of the war, on one occasion at least, I expressed in Parliament the regret that the loans had not been of the character of national loans to the extent which I had hoped for. That is, the minister, in selling his securities on the domestic market, did not make as broad an appeal to the people of Canada as I think he should have made. Primarily, of course, the object was attained; he secured the amount of money he, at the moment, desired for Canada. At the present time I notice the minister is encouraging a saving campaign in Canada with a view to increasing our banking reserves and savings so that they will be available for the commerce of the country and the purposes of the Government. The suggestion I would make is this, that the Minister of Finance will have an excellent opportunity of inculcating the value of national saving by asking the people of Canada to invest in the securities offered by the Government in the

event of their desiring to make a domestic loan. The subscriptions to previous domestic loans and since the beginning of the war have been very satisfactory indeed, and very creditable to Canada. However, I think an investigation of the subscriptions made will show that the money so invested came largely from a class of people who are accustomed to invest in Government and municipal securities and other high grade securities. I suppose that in many instances the subscriptions came from banks and insurance companies who were making a substitution of securities. I have no doubt that the life insurance companies of Canada held very large amounts of United States securities, and that on the occasion of our domestic loans they replace them with our own war issue securities. Of course, that is not objectionable. The suggestion I would like to make, if the minister contemplates an early appeal to the public for subscriptions for another loan, is that he create some organization which will enable him to get to the people generally in support of that loan. I am sure that every member of Parliament, and every agency in this country is at the service of the minister if he desires to make the campaign as widespread as possible. It is not necessary for me to say to Parliament, or to the Minister of Finance, that it is very much in the interest of Canada at the present time, and for the future, that we engage in the strictest private and national economy, and that we educate our people to save and invest in our Government securities. I think that if the minister, in placing his contemplated loan before the public, were to endeavour to create some organization to carry out the proposal, it would be in the interests of the country and of the Government as well. I would ask the minister if any portion of the loans already authorized have not been exhausted.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We have a balance, I think, on general purpose borrowing account of about $25,000,000 or $30,000,000. My hon. friend will observe that this borrowing is not for war purposes. I think I explained to my hon. friend last year, and it can do no harm to explain to the House now, that if we are obliged to borrow in the United States, it will facilitate our borrowing to do so on general purposes account rather than on war account. That is the reason why this $100,000,000

4 p.m. Borrowing Bill is to be introduced separately from the general War Appropriations Bill, to be introduced by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Would my hon. friend explain the reason why he borrows on general purposes account rather than on war purposes account? What is the difference?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There are two reasons. Objection might possibly be raised —I hardly think it probable—in the United States to an issue for war purposes. But apart from that, in a neutral market, bonds issued on general purposes account will sell more widely than bonds issued on war account. That would seem to indicate that a part of the community may not be disposed to subscribe for bond issues on war account but might be quite ready to subscribe for bonds issued on general purposes account.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would ask the minister a question—perhaps he might answer it at this stage—for the general information of Parliament. I think we have advanced to the British Government the sum of $150,000,000 on account of munition contracts. That is in excess of the credit afforded by the Canadian chartered banks. I would like to know what the arrangements are between the Department of Finance and the British Government. Are British Treasury notes deposited with the Canadian Government for such financing, or has the minister had an open account up to the present?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Has my hon. friend concluded his remarks as to a better organization?

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Well, possibly my hon. friend will permit me to take up that question first. I entirely agree with my hon. friend as to the desirability of having a widespread subscription for the war loans of the Dominion. It is good from a financial standpoint, and it is good from a patriotic standpoint. But I would submit to my hon. friend that that is precisely what we have been doing. The two loans which we have placed before the Canadian people, one for $50,000,000 in November, 1915, and the other for $100,000,000 in September of last year, were both doubly subscribed. I gave a very great deal of personal attention to both of these loans, four or five weeks of hard work in each case. Patriotism creates a favourable atmosphere, but loans will not float themselves without

attention. The utmost care was taken to fix a price which was strictly in accord with market conditions, and which would likely insure the success of the loan. Until this war, no issues of any magnitude had been made in the Dominion, and it takes a very considerable time to educate the great body of the public to subscribe for public loans. There is a certain class in the financial community, as my hon. friend said, and a portion of the investing public, who subscribe freely to bonds and other securities. What we have sought to do is to enlist the interest of the small subscriber, and I think we have been very successful. We allowed in each case two weeks as the period during which subscriptions might be made. We advertised the loans in every paper, daily and weekly, morning and evening, religious and secular, Grit and Tory, in the Dominion of Canada; so that the advertising was of a very extensive character. In addition to that, we enlisted the editorial co-operation of the press, and the press responded, as it always has since the outbreak of the war, and did a great deal indeed to bring the loans to the favourable attention of the Canadian people. In addition to that, as my hon. friend knows, the brokers did magnificent work in connection with both loans, some of them spending almost as much money for advertising as they made in commissions. Besides, they sent their travellers throughout the country, and generally did everything possible to promote the success of the two issues. In addition, we have an instrument that I myself did not know could be made so powerful to accomplish the object we have in view, namely, some 3,500 branch banks. It is a wonderful system for the purpose of getting in subscriptions. The success of our loans was due in considerable measure to the fact that we have had the branch banks, the brokers and the press working for us in introducing the securities to the attention of the public.

In connection with the first loan, I think there were some 25,000 subscribers, and in the case of the last loan, some 30,000 subscribers. The lowest denomination was placed as low as $100, and there was a very large number of subscriptions for those $100 bonds. In making allotment, we cut down the larger subscriptions, because the loans were over-subscribed, alloting in full up to $25,000 only. It is a matter of great gratification to me that in connection with the important subject of allotment in regard to the last loan I heard absolutely no complaint whatsoever. It seemed to be entirely satisfactory to the community when we allotted fully up to $25,000 and beyond that cut down very substantially the higher subscriptions.

Since the last loan, in order to promote national savings, which I regard as of great importance at the present time both from the economic and patriotic standpoint, we created a short-term issue of three-year war savings certificates. It has been very gratifying to me to find that these certificates have met with a very considerable degree of public appreciation. We are, so to speak, pushing their sale. We are enlisting the co-operation of the press, the clergy, boards of trade and public bodies throughout the country. We are sending out literature to manufacturers and to labour organizations, and are communicating directly with the operatives themselves. In the last week or ten days, since the certificates have been out, something like 5,000 applications have been received, aggregating some $400,000. Of course, we do not expect to obtain very large sums in terms of Dominion finance; they are large sums but not relatively to our requirements, but it is of the greatest importance that the individual citizen should save his money by investing in these certificates. The matter has also, as my hon. friend knows, a patriotic aspect.

My hon. friend asked another question, when he rose the second time—about the British Government. When the war broke out the exchange was very much in favour of Great Britain as against this continent, and the result was that Canada borrowed her war expenditure in Great Britain up to about the spring of 1915. If we had not done that I think we should have lost considerable gold, because the exchanges were greatly against America. We borrowed at first therefore from the Imperial Treasury. As our situation improved we were able to take care of our own expenditure here. In 1915 the exchange was reversed and became unfavourable to Great Britain. It is very unfavourable now to Great Britain, although not nearly so unfavourable to Great Britain as to other European belligerents. The exchange situation to-day is such that Great Britain can only purchase on this side of the Atlantic if she is able to borrow on this side of the Atlantic. That is really an understatement of the fact, because she must not only borrow in order to buy here and in order to pay for her purchases on this side of the Atlantic,

but she must also borrow for the purpose of sustaining sterling exchange and holding it at the figure of $4.76, which is about the gold export point. That is also of great importance, although this being a technical matter, its importance is not realized by the general public. Our position very much improved by reason of our great production in 1915, by reason of the large prices obtained for produce of all kinds and by reason of our great production of munitions. Canada has been able, out of her own revenue, and by her own borrowing in Canada, to help Great Britain in making her purchases in Canada. That, of course, is of great advantage to Great Britain and also of great advantage to Canada. Generally speaking, the policy which has been adopted is this: We made an arrangement to borrow from Great Britain for our expenditures in Great Britain and on the Continent, that is to say, we do not buy exchange on Great Britain to pay for the maintenance of our troops there or on the Continent, we borrow the amount necessary from the Imperial Government and they borrow from us here part of the amount that they require to pay for their munitions. That runs about $25,000,000 a month in this country. One way of dealing with the accounts would be to offset one against the other. But Great Britain has been obliged to borrow heavily in New York and she had been obliged to lodge collateral in New York as security for her borrowings. I think it is unfortunate that she has been so obliged, but it is the fact, and it is an object to her to find securities of a high quality which she can deposit as collateral. I went to New York a year ago last fall at the request of the Imperial Treasury to meet Lord Reading and the representatives of the Treasury. I thought that they would be obliged to give collateral later on and I made the proposition at that time that as we owed them, let us say, $100,000,000, and as they required collateral in New York, we should fund our debt of $100,000,000 to them by issuing them our securities for the same period and at the same rate as they had issued theirs in the London market, and that they should use that collateral to borrow against in New York, where our credit is about as high as that of any country in the world. Later that plan turned out to be of great advantage both to Great Britain and to us, as it gave them more than $100,000,000—I will give the figures in a few minutes—of high-class collateral which they put up with other securities against their $250,000,000 loan.

[Sir W. T. White.]

While it gave them collateral to the extent of $100,000,000 or more, it gave us also an advantage in that we funded our floating debt to Great Britain.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Did that simply refer to advances on account?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Advances on account. But it liquidated the open account in respect to these advances. The result is that we funded our debt—I have not the period of the issue precisely in my mind. It was not only an advantage to Canada to make an issue to pay off her indebtedness, but that issue was made without any expense to Canada and at precisely the same rate of interest as Great Britain had borrowed on the London market on the Imperial credit. We had the further advantage of the exchange situation, which for some time had been favourable to us, and in determining the amount of our indebtedness which should be cancelled over there by the issue of these securities we had regard to the exchange situation which existed between Great Britain and Canada at the time the advances were made. That, I may say, was at the suggestion of the Imperial Treasury, and it was altogether a good arrangement for both them and us. Altogether, we issued, or are about to issue, to the Imperial Treasury about $122,000,000, and to that extent liquidated our indebtedness for advances made by Great Britain to us in Great Britain.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is this Government the guarantor of the credit afforded by the banks to the British Government?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No; I will speak of that in a moment. The Dominion Government has made advances to the Imperial Munitions Board at Ottawa of $116,000,000 to date, and we have agreed to advance them a further sum of $34,000,000, for which I have the money provided. That makes a total of $150,000,000 which the Government of Canada will have advanced to the Imperial Government for the purpose of buying munitions and supplies in Canada. We owe the Imperial Government in London about $97,000,000. So there is at present a balance owing us by the Imperial Government of about $18,000,000.

Mr. NESBITT: Is that $97,000,000 over and above the $122,000,000 just mentioned?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes. With regard to that $97,000,000, we could either issue our securities, which they could pledge in New York in connection with further loans there,

or we could set it off against this larger sum which they will owe us.

My hon. friend has asked me about the banks. The Dominion Government, as I have stated, has loaned or arranged to loan $150,000,000. We made arrangements with the banks to loan $100,000,000 direct to the Imperial Government. The Dominion Government is not guarantor of those loans, as it was not regarded as necessary that the Imperial credit should be fortified by the Dominion credit.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I did not mean that the guarantee was necessary, but that the banks might have desired it.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No. The first $75,000,000 loan was against the security of British treasury bills, and then there was a further loan of $24,000,000, making a total of $100,000,000. The last $50,000,000 which the Dominion Government advanced to the Imperial Government was borrowed by us from the banks. In that case it was loaned direct to us.

Mr. NESBITT: That last $50,000,000 borrowed from the banks was in connection with the $100,000,000 war loan recently issued?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No. We borrowed the amount from the banks and loaned it to the Imperial Government.

Mr. CARVELL: Can the minister give us any idea of what the debt of the country will be at the end of the present fiscal year? I should like to know what we shall owe in Canada, and what in London.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I thought some hon. gentlemen might desire that information, and I have had a memorandum prepared.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: To what date does this memorandum go?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: From 1914 to the end of last month. This memorandum shows in round figures that the net national debt to March 31, 1914, was $335,000,000—that is, up to the end of the last fiscal period before the war broke out. The amount of the national debt to March 31, 1915, was $449,000,000; to March 31, 1915, $615,000,000; and to January 31, 1917, $745,000,000.

Mr. CARVELL: Does that include our liabilities to the British Government for munitions and other war supplies? I do not want to press this question if for any reason the minister might think it inadvisable to answer.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: What I have given is a correct statement of the national debt to January 31, 1917, namely, $745,000,000; that represents the debt so far as ascertained. My hon. friend is aware that Great Britain supplies our troops on the continent with such equipment as they may require at the front, such as rations, munitions, and other supplies.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Has this liability been liquidated up to date?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The liability has not been ascertained up to date. Since the last session of Parliament an arrangement has been come to, whereby the British Government will be paid six shillings per day per man for rations, clothing and equipment of every kind whatsoever, munitions, small arms, artillery, etc., supplied to the Canadian forces at the front. In our view, that charge is quite fair and reasonable.

Mr. CARVELL: That includes rations and clothing?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Everything.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: When was the last settlement made on that basis?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The adjustment has not yet been made. I am speaking from memory. But I can get the information for my hon. friend, if desired.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Would there be any substantial amount due on that account?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It might be a matter of $50,000,000 or $60,000,000. At all events the arrangement is so fair that the amount in terms of war finance is not large.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It looks very reasonable.

Mr. CARVELL: Am I to conclude from the statement the minister has just given, that the total debt of Canada up to January 31 will be, roughly speaking, $800,000,000.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think that is a fairly accurate estimate.

Mr. NESBITT: I understood the minister to say that the $745,000,000 does not include the open accounts between the two Governments; that is, the British Government owe us $150,000,000, we will say, and we owe them $97,000,000.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is the net debt. I think about $800,000,000 represents the situation.

Mr. NESBITT: That includes the $50,000,000 the minister just spoke of as being due under the new system of adjustment? But the net debt does not include the adjustment of the open accounts?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I cannot say definitely as to that, but my opinion is this. They owe us more than we owe them on open account, and I think—I am not positive—that the principle of set-off has been applied, and that $745,000,000 represents the net debt.

Mr. NESBITT: That is, you have charged them with your open account and credited them with their open account?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes.

Mr. NESBITT: In view of our large revenue, I was rather surprised to hear the minister say that this proposed loan was for ordinary account. Does he not anticipate that the revenue will be large enough to pay the expenditures on current account? I should also like to know why the minister thinks that the last war loan would not have been subscribed on a straight five per cent basis, after paying one-quarter per cent commission to the brokers. The loan was issued at 97½. I have often wondered if it would not have been subscribed and more than subscribed on a straight five per cent and at par.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think not. My hon. friend knows that when an issue of securities is made, regard must be had to the price of other securities of a like character. When we used to make loans in London, if our securities were standing, let us say, at par, and we desired to sell £5,000,000 of a new loan, we would never attempt to put it out at par, we would put it out at, say 98. The reason is that the stock exchange quotation is for small lots, and if you want to sell £5,000,000 or £6,000,000, you have to make, so to speak, a wholesale price. What used to happen in cases like that was this: Suppose that the loan was a popular one and was taken up, then it would go to a premium, which was a very desirable thing in connection with the loan, because everybody felt happy over his investment. In all our financing, both here and in the United States, we have been affected in the price which we have been able to obtain by the price at which Great Britain has had to sell her securities in the American market. Just recently, the British Government was obliged to pay in the New York market a six per cent rate on two-year or three-year notes, which carried the option to the holder of subscribing for five and a half per cent United Kingdom bonds maturing in twenty years.

Mr. NESBITT: Yes, I understood that.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: A year ago last fall the Imperial Government put out in the United States a five per cent five-year loan at 98, the underwriters taking a considerable portion of it at 96. That loan went down to 95, to 94, to 93. When Canada comes on the market with her securities, she is to a certain extent in competition with those Imperial securities and in competition with that market price. Canada's credit today is better on this continent than Great Britain's credit. We can sell our securities on a lower interest basis than Great Britain can sell her securities in the United States. Of course, Great Britain has offered no securities in Canada. Answering my hon. friend's question specifically: At the time that we made the loan last fall of $100,000,000, our fifteen year securities, payable in New York, were slightly under par; that is to say, that was the quotation for a market lot.

Mr. NESBITT: About 99½.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The five per cent fifteen-year securities which we had issued the previous March were about 99½. Now, if I had attempted to sell $100,000,000 to the public at par, of course, I could not have done it. You have to put your securities out at a lower rate than the stock exchange quotation, because you are selling wholesale, and it is of supreme importance that your loan should go to a premium. If your loan goes to a discount, you are not so welcome the next time you come along. There is such a thing as a prudent generosity in connection with loans, especially to your own people, and it is much better to put out a loan at 97½ and have it run up a point or a point and a half by reason of over-subscription, than to have it go to a discount a point or a point and a half, because that injures your credit. We have been very successful in regard to our loans, every loan put out in the United States by the Dominion of Canada having gone to a substantial premium. The last loan put out stands just about the issue price, but it did run up to 99 or a little over. The best proof of our financing is the market quotations for our loans after they were issued and subsequently our credit has been im-

proved by our loans, because every time we have made a loan, it has been open to any subscriber to take a small profit if he has so desired. That has been by reason of the heavy over-subscription and the popular demand for the loans.

Mr. NESBITT: I thoroughly understood what the hon minister told us before, that it is necessary to issue a loan at a price a little lower than the market price. I quite appreciate that in connection with loans issued in the United States or Great Britain. This, however, was a loan to the people, and we are not told how much of that loan was taken up by the people and how much by the loan companies and the banks. The loan companies and the banks, of course, would want to get the security at a price at which they could resell it at a profit; but the ordinary man or woman who bought $1,000 or $2,000, was, so far as my knowledge goes, perfectly satisfied with the five per cent Government loan as he was getting only three per cent from the banks. But the price at which the loan could be sold afterwards would depend entirely on how much of the $100,000,000 was taken up by the loan companies and the banks and how much was taken up by the private investors. That was why I asked the question; it was not because I did not know that it was necessary for the minister to issue loans in the way described by him.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In the case of a loan as large as $100,000,000, you have to rely on all classes of the community to contribute. The small investors could not subscribe nearly as much as the larger investors. It would take ten thousand $1,000 subscriptions to make $10,000,000. You get subscriptions from the small investor; you get subscriptions from the business man who can subscribe for $25,000 or $30,000; you get them from capitalists who will take $100,000 or $200,000 or even more; you get them from the life insurance companies who will subscribe for large amounts, according to the state of their finances, and you get subscriptions from other companies. The banks took none of the last issue, because my arrangement with them was that the public was to have the first call. My hon. friend has it in mind that if the public would take the loan on a five per cent basis, it should be put out on that basis. That is not quite sound, for this reason, that notwithstanding you are putting out a loan for patriotic purposes, such as the prosecution of the war, it is always wise to observe the financial or business conditions. The patriotic aspect of it creates a certain atmosphere which is favourable, but your loan must conform with market conditions or, even if immediately successful, it will go to a discount later on. In other words, it must conform with the prevailing financial conditions applicable to that class of security; otherwise, investors will subscribe for it under patriotic impulse, hold it for a little while, and then sell it out and buy something more attractive. I am quite clear that your loan must be such as, in the estimation of the investing public, makes it a desirable investment at the time when it is put out.

Mr. NESBITT: In regard to the three per cent certificates which have been issued, what rate do they pay and are they transferable to future loans?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The three-year war saving certificates are sold at the rate of $86 for $100 denominations, $43 for $50 denominations, and $21.50 for $25 denominations. The rate of interest is slightly over 5 per cent.

Mr. NESBITT: They do not bear interest, but are payable at par?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is correct.

Mr. A. K. MACDONALD: Are they in debenture form?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: They are really like debenture stock. They are made out in the name of the party who buys them. He may surrender or transfer them according to the terms of the issue, but he cannot by losing his certificate be deprived of his property in it. One reason why we made them payable to the party purchasing is because most people of slender means have no safety-deposit boxes in which to place their securities.

Mr. BLAIN: Did I correctly understand the minister to say that in 1914, the national debt was $335,000,000 and that at the close of the present fiscal year it would be about $800,000,000?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: On January 31, 1917.

Mr. BLAIN: What proportion of that increase is due to the war expenditure?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I cannot answer that off-hand, but it will be gratifying to my hon. friend to know that during the present fiscal year our revenues have been such as will enable us to pay all our ordin-

ary and all our capital expenditure, and, I think, probaby $60,000,000 or $70,000,000 on account of the principal of our war expenditure. The first year after the war broke out there was a deficit on account of capital and ordinary account amounting to some $40,000,000 or $50,000,000. That was because our revenues were at once affected by the dislocation of business occasioned by the outbreak of war. Since that time our revenues have been such as to enable us to carry on our ordinary and capital expenditure and to pay a considerable amount on account of the principal of our war indebtedness.

Mr. MACDONALD: What was the cost of the flotation of the last loan?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I should say about three-quarters of one per cent, or less.

Mr. MACDONALD: What would be the total amount?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: About $750,000.

Mr. MACDONALD: I noticed in the Financial Times a discussion of what was said to be a warning by the minister to the investing public of Canada against investing in English securities. A quotation was made from the Toronto News, which spoke in the very strongest terms of the moral obliquity of the man who would venture to do that. The Financial Times rather questioned the right of the Finance Minister to take such a strong stand. Is it a fact that the Finance Minister has intimated, either directly or indirectly, that he does not think it wise for Canadians to take up any of the English loan?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have no hesitation in saying that the Canadian investing public should reserve their funds for Dominion loans. In Great Britain no issues are allowed outside of Government issues except with the consent of the Treasury. Great Britain borrows money in the United States, where there is a plethora of money.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Rolling in gold, they say.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Great Britain uses that money to make purchases in the United States. If the Canadian public buy British securities issued in New York, Canadian money is being used for the purpose of making purchases in the United States. That in itself would not be objectionable if it were not for its possible effect upon our exchanges. International balances, as my hon. friend knows, are settled in gold and if the Canadian public invested largely in British or French loans made in New York for the purpose of buying goods in the United States, exchange would soon become unfavourable to Canada. Apart from that, when the Dominion Government would make its next war loan in Canada the money which would otherwise have been available to take up those issues would have been spent in the United States. What I have said is subject to this qualification: A considerable portion of the loans which we float in Canada find their way to the United States. If we put out a loan of $100,000,000 in Canada, $15,000,000, $20,000,000, or $25,000,000 of it may be sold in the United States by those who took it. That, of course, would be a set-off against $15,000,000, $20,000,000 or $25,000,000 that might be expended by Canadian people in purchasing securities in New York. As long as exchange is not seriously affected and as long as the loan fund in Canada is not depleted so that our loans are unlikely to be subscribed, no harm will be done. But on account of the large sums that we require for our own war expenditures and to finance Great Britain in her purchase of munitions in Canada, it is exceedingly desirable that the Canadian people should conserve their resources for the purpose of buying our war loans. That is not discriminating against Great Britain. The authorities in Great Britain would be the first to suggest that the Canadian people should not purchase those loans in the United States, because there is abundance of money there to take up those loans, and Great Britain is not in any way disadvantaged. I do not hesitate to say that I view those purchases as inadvisable. Answer might be made to me: If a Canadian buys a security in the American market and is able to sell it later at a profit, is that not a gain? It is a gain to the individual, and, in a sense, to the nation. But there is an overriding consideration, and that is that the money has been diverted from the issues which the Dominion Government may offer to the Canadian public. Although the individual may make a profit, the national power to finance itself is weakened.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister has talked all around the point. I merely wanted to know whether or not the hon. gentleman intimated to the investing public in Canada that they should not invest in the British War Loan?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not recollect precisely what I said, but I did give an

intimation that I thought it exceedingly desirable that the Canadian investing public should conserve their funds for Dominion war loans and should not buy loans of any government issued in New York, because there is abundance of money in New York to take up those securities. In that I am in entire accord with the Imperial Government. No possible question arises as to the Imperial Treasury. They do not ask the Canadian people to buy loans which they are issuing in New York for the purpose of purchasing munitions in America, because they know perfectly well that we require to make our own war loans here and to supply money to pay for the munitions which they order here. If a situation arose in which the people of Canada were buying securities so extensively in the United States as to seriously affect the exchanges, or seriously affect our prospects of floating our loans in Canada, I should have no hesitation in saying that the Dominion Government should put a tax upon any securities so purchased. I must decline to commit myself as to whether we shall take that course or not; it depends on events.

Mr. DEVLIN: The minister said that our buoyant revenues would fully meet our ordinary expenditure and pay for the interest on some $40,000,000 of war loans. Can the minister inform us now what part of the revenue is formed by the war taxes imposed? That is, the business profits war tax and the stamps and so on?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I cannot give it accurately. For this the first year the result of the business profits war tax will, I think, exceed $10,000,000. Next year the amount will be much larger, because profits for the past year have been very much greater than they were for 1915. The special tax upon the banks realizes about $1,000,000. As to what the stamp and other taxes realize, I am not prepared to say, because I did not know that this question would arise. Those matters are usually dealt with in the Budget.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does the minister intend to exercise any control over stock exchange operations in order to control our financial strength for domestic loans?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: All these questions have had a good deal of thought on my part. I need not say that they are very difficult questions to deal with. We have a boundary line of 3,600 miles between us and the United States. There are numerous financial transactions across that line every day. In my own opinion, the best way to deal with the situation is to watch the exchanges. If our Canadian exchange is maintained, then their purchases over here of our securities and commodities are equalling our purchases over there. If the exchange began to run against us, we might have to take drastic measures with regard to the purchase of securities on the other side. But the exchange at present is quite satisfactory.

Mr. GRAHAM: Has the minister ever taken into consideration the question of the succession duty taxation imposed by the provinces? So far as Ontario is concerned, loans to the Ontario Government or securities sold by the Ontario Government are exempt from succession duty tax. If the provinces could see their way clear to applying the same thing to Dominion domestic loans, I think it would help the flotation of the war loans materially. A great many people buy provincial loans, having that object in view, knowing that whatever they have invested in these securities will not be liable to the succession duties which are fairly large. I know it would probably interfere to a considerable extent with the revenues of the provinces, but this is a time when we are all bending every energy to meet the war conditions, and the expenditure in connection with the war.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: When our first loan was being floated I took up the question privately with the prime ministers of the several provinces, and they were not unanimous as to the advisability of this course. This was not through any lack of desire on their part to be patriotic and to do everything they could to facilitate the prosecution of the war; their objection was rather on this ground, that a province which has to depend for its revenues upon taxation should not make securities free of taxation to a greater extent than is absolutely necessary, because people will take advantage of such a condition and purchase those securities for the express purpose of evading the tax. If you had enough securities of one kind free of succession duty to absorb a considerable demand the province would be deprived of a large amount of its taxes. In England they are careful not to create a large class of securities that would be free of income tax.

Mr. CARVELL: I think there is a great deal in what the Finance Minister has said.

I would be very sorry, indeed, to see this Government embark on any scheme which would in any way relieve any portion of the community from its due share of taxation. I think the time has come in Canada when every person and every class of person should be taught that they must pay their share of taxation. I know that along the lines mentioned by the Minister of Finance a number of fairly large loans were issued by the province of New Brunswick in the last year and a half which were made tax-exempt in New Brunswick. The result was that there was an unprecedented rush for those bonds, and while they were on the market I think very few of the war bonds were absorbed. Those provincial bonds were all taken up six or eight months ago, and when the last loan was issued there was a very much more hearty response through the province of New Brunswick than in the previous case. I would suggest to the Finance Minister that he might take some steps to prevent, if possible, the floating of any other loans in Canada excepting war loans. I realize the difficulties.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What could he do?

Mr. CARVELL: I realize that there are difficulties; I simply want to know whether he could not go into the matter and see if something could not be done. It might be done by a super-tax, or a tax of some kind. From the statement given to us to-day, it seems to me that before this war is over we are going to require all the money we can possibly raise in Canada to enable us to do our share.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The minister told us to-day that the public debt of Canada is $745,000,000 at this moment, and that at the end of the fiscal year it will be $800,000,000; and then we will start with this loan of $100,000,000 which we are authorizing. Is it premature to ask my hon. friend how much more he will have to borrow during the next fiscal year, $1917-18? Perhaps he cannot give us the answer to-day.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think I can tell my hon. friend approximately. We may need from $200,000,000 to $250,000,000 for our own war expenditures on this side, and we should borrow considerable sums in addition to that for the purpose of establishing the credits here out of which Great Britain can pay for the munitions which she is ordering here.

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. ROBB: To come back to the question of investment, if I understood the minister, the Government control the issues of new debentures or stocks that are issued to the public. It occurred to me that it might be a good thing for the Government to at least control some of the mining issues that have been offered and are still being offered to the Canadian public. I have never known a time when more literature came to a man's office, offering attractive prices for mines in a neighbouring province. We know that periodically there runs across this continent a mining boom, and there seems to be one on now. I think it is time for the Government to step in and stop these operators, who, I believe, are
5 p.m. largely people in the United States, gathering up Canadian money and selling what is really a hole in the ground. I think it would be well for the minister to look into that and, if possible, control that sort of investment in our country. There is another feature in connection with this, though perhaps it does not affect the Department of the Minister of Finance. These people are loading down the Canadian mails with circular letters that are carried for one cent a letter, whereas the people of Canada are paying three cents a letter to do legitimate business. I think it is time for the Government to step in and control this sort of work.

Mr. GRAHAM: Can the minister state the rate?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is not advisable to state it, and there is no loan immediately in prospect. As things are, unless conditions radically change, it would be a five per cent security; but of course I cannot state at what price it would be issued. The price is never fixed until the time of issue. That is a matter for consideration, and, if it is sold in the United States, a matter for negotiation.

Mr. GRAHAM: The reason I ask that in conversation not long since with a party who was speaking of making some investment, it was pointed out to me that the short-term British loan, I think, is paying about six per cent.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Nobody knows it better than I do.

Mr. GRAHAM: It puts the minister in a difficult position in competition with the British loan if it is issued at six per cent and we issue at only five per cent.

Mr. MARCIL: Can the minister tell us what the cost of the war has been up to date; and whether we have reached the maximum of expenditure for the coming year?

Mr. GRAHAM: I may say that the loan to which I referred is a short-term loan.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I explained when my hon. friend was out, that we are always in competition with the securities that are issued in the United States; but our credit is really higher on this continent than the credit of Great Britain, and consequently we are able to sell our securities on a lower interest basis than she is.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The minister has never been asked for collateral.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We have never been asked for collateral, and I do not think that we shall be. Nevertheless, my hon. friend (Mr. Graham) is right. We are affected in our issues by the price at which Great Britain issues her securities.

My hon. friend (Mr. Marcil) has asked about the war expenditure. The war expenditure to January 31, 1917, in Canada and Great Britain is about $450,000,000. Then there is the adjusted situation on the Continent; I cannot say how much that will be at the present time.

Mr. MARCIL: Can the minister give us the probable expenditure for another twelve months?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I should not like to make an estimate.

Mr. MACDONALD: Are there any securities falling due this year on which this loan will be dependent?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There are two short-date loans, aggregating $50,000,000, due in April and May. We have a $25,000,000 loan maturing in New York on August 1, and then we are clear, I think, until past the end of the year. I may say that in our financing we are keeping free of short-date obligations as much as possible.

Mr. MARCIL: In inviting subscriptions for these loans, has the minister considered the advisability of using the post offices? There are many places where there are no branch banks, and if these notes were offered in small denominations at the various post offices throughout the country some money might be raised. It might be in small sums, but still it would be of value at a time like this.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: They are on sale at post office savings branches.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have not seen the report of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but I would ask whether these loan subscriptions have come from the post office savings banks, or whether they have come out of the current business of the country?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: They have come from both sources. I do not think the post office saving deposits have been seriously affected.

Resolution reported.

Sir THOMAS WHITE moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 19 founded on the resolution.

He said: Mr. Speaker, to meet the point of order raised by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), I desire to say, now that you are in the Chair, that the assent of His Excellency the Governor General has been obtained to this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—INTERIM VOTE.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We will not go into any particular Estimates, but we will give you what you want; we will give you a quarter of the total amount in these Estimates.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: They are just the same as the usual Estimates.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Yes.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We have usually put through the vote for Civil Government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have no objection to your putting through the Estimates that you want to put through, but you know there is a rule that on Thursday and Friday the Speaker leaves the Chair without any motion, and the House can only take up such Supply as is to be taken into consideration. If we were to pass all the Estimates to-day, when we begin after the adjournment we could not take up any of the Estimates upon any day, and therefore we cannot consent to that. But if it is understood that the rule will not apply, then we will pass the Estimates.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think that can easily be understood on both sides of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: All right; go on.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is very little that challenges criticism in the Civil Government Estimates.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No, but I want it to be understood that when we meet on Friday again it will not be said that these Estimates have been passed, but that we will proceed as if the Estimates had not been passed at all.

On the motion of Sir THOMAS WHITE, it was resolved:

That a sum not exceeding one-quarter of the amount set forth in the Main Estimates be granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the year ending 31st March, 1918.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Yes, we agree to that.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: All right; let it go on that basis.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: With reference to Item 321 of the Estimates, I beg to move that the words "Canadian Associated Press" be struck out and "Canadian Press, Limited" be substituted. This is for a subsidy for a national wire to the West. The press is very much interested in it.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is different from the Associated Press?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does that vote include capital as well as ordinary expenditure?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is one-quarter of the Estimates which have been brought down.

Resolution reported and read the first time.

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

WAR LOAN—$500,000,000.

House in Committee to consider the following proposed Resolutions.—Mr. Rainville in the chair.

1. That it is expedient to provide that a sum not exceeding five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000) be granted to His Majesty towards defraying any expenses that may be incurred by or under the authority of the Governor in Council during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1918, for:—

(a) The defence and security of Canada;

(b) The conduct of naval or military operations in and beyond Canada;

(c) Promoting the continuance of trade, industry and business communications, whether by means of insurance or indemnity against war risk or otherwise;

(d) The carrying out of any measures deemed necessary or advisable by the Governor in Council in consequence of the existence of a state of war; and

(e) Payments made for the said purposes during the fiscal year ending the thirty-first day of March, nineteen hundred and seventeen in excess of the amounts authorized by The War Appropriation Act, 1916.

2. That the Governor in Council be empowered to raise by way of loan, temporary or otherwise, such sums of money as are required for the purpose of making any payment authorized by any Act founded on these Resolutions.

3. That the principal raised by way of loan under this Act and the interest thereon shall be chargeable on the Consolidated Revenue Fund.—Sir Robert Borden.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, in connection with this vote I need hardly observe that the expenditure for war purposes has grown to a figure which none of us could have anticipated when war first broke out. The figure which has been placed in the vote now under consideration is $500,000,000. It is hoped, however, that a very large amount out of that sum may be available for the purpose of assisting the British Government in financing payments for munitions produced in this country. The necessity for that was dwelt upon by myself and also by the Minister of Finance in a previous debate.

It is, however, desirable that the committee should be made acquainted with the expenditure, as submitted to me by the Department of Finance, which has been made for war purposes since the beginning of the war, and it might perhaps be convenient that I should give this information in the tabulated form in which it has been submitted to me. The statement shows the amounts that have been expended by each department of the Government in the several fiscal years, 1914-1915, 1915-1916 and 1916-1917, up to the 20th day of January:—

EXPENDITURE ON ACCOUNT OF WAR.

	1914-15.	1915-16.	1916-17. (To Jan. 20.)
Militia and Defence	$53,176,613.55	$160,433,416.42	$209,213,488.96
Justice	254,945.85	1,287,693.31	1,004,151.92
Dominion Police	132,763.89	201,508.04	124,447.69
Public Works	12,865.45	94,344.04	106,709.46
External Affairs	4,214.14	11,211.06	5,580.94
Naval Service	3,096,125.35	3,274,019.94	5,775,709.71
Post Office	110,097.80	349,672.00	270,000.00
Railways and Canals	178,845.20	313,740.73	212,500.89
Indian Affairs	81.72	5,688.83	174.98
Governor General's Secretary's Office	4,330.93	9,108.81	609.94
Secretary of State	16,192.63	21,667.98	22,516.39
Privy Council	13,637.91	17,346.91	13,924.76
Inland Revenue	.....	6,723.40	522.50
Trade and Commerce	3,003,005.06	14,795.40	15,225.97
War Purchasing Commission	.....	29,413.39	25,876.10
Finance	149,630.09	73,671.16	53,254.00
Audit Office	.....	4,439.17	14,096.72
Labour	.....	1,071.19	1,274.94
Agriculture	.....	5,077.79	9,000.00
Marine	.....	1,529.77	.....
Legislation (Library)	.....	270.00	.....
Interior	.....	41,346.13	.....
Royal Northwest Mounted Police	597,126.44	.....	.....
Shell Commission	.....	.....	9,282.49
Canadian Munition Resources Commission	.....	.....	7,238.44
National Service Commission	.....	.....	16,235.88
	$60,750,476.01	$166,197,755.47	$216,901,822.68

The appropriation is based, of course, upon the contingency of the war continuing throughout the whole of the coming fiscal year. Further details as to the anticipated expenditure of the various departments are as follows:—

Militia and Defence	$196,171,000	
Ministry of Overseas Military Forces	219,000,000	$415,171,000
Naval Service		17,500,000
Interior		75,000
Railways and Canals		300,000
Finance		60,000
Public Works		133,000
Labour		15,000
Agriculture		20,000
State		48,720
		$433,322,720

The provision which is being made for the Department of Militia and Defence, the principal spending department of the Government for war purposes, is for the following purposes, calculated on the basis of 400,000 troops actually under arms continually:

Separation allowances, rations and subsistence, clothing and necessaries equipment and general stores, ammunition, small arms, machine guns, forage remounts, medical services, ocean and railway transport engineer services, civil employees, printing, stationery, telegrams, cables, sundries, including recruiting expenses, pay of censors, customs dues, funeral expenses, fuel, etc.

Mr. NESBITT: Are the amounts carried out opposite the items?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, that is a general statement of the purposes of the expenditure. The following is a more definite statement with regard to those matters:

War Estimates 1917-18.

1.	Pay of 400,000 troops		$182,500,000
2.	Separation allowance to dependents		36,000,000
3.	Rations and subsistence		51,000,000
4.	Clothing and necessaries		48,000,000
5.	Equipment and general stores, including harness and saddlery, vehicles of all kinds, tents, blankets, accoutrements and all equipment except Ross rifle, machine guns, small arm ammunition and clothing		42,261,000
6.	Ammunition — Dominion and Lindsay Arsenals	$ 3,000,000	
	Gun ammunition in France	11,000,000	
	Small arm ammunition in France	2,750,000	16,750,000
7.	Small arms, Machine guns, etc.—Ross rifles and bayonets (80,000)	$ 2,660,000	
	Renewals of small arms and machine guns in France	5,500,000	8,160,000
8.	Forage		2,500,000
9.	Remounts		2,000,000
10.	Medical services		4,000,000
11.	Ocean transport		5,000,000
12.	Railway transport		3,000,000
13.	Engineer service, housing troops, etc.—		
	Canada	$ 1,000,000	
	England	250,000	
	France	2,750,000	4,000,000

14. Civil employees. . . . . .$	2,000,000
15. Printing, stationery, telegrams, cables, etc..	3,000,000
16. Sundries.—including recruiting expenses, pay of censors, custom dues, funeral expenses, fuel, etc..	5,000,000
Total estimate for 1917-18..$	415,171,000

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That, of course, would not be in addition to the arrangement made with the British Government for six shillings per man per diem.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My understanding is that it is included in that arrangement. Would my hon. friend like me to read what that arrangement is? It might be useful.

Mr. MACLEAN: I would be pleased if my right hon. friend would read it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That arrangement came about in this way. In connection with the organization of a huge army of two and a half million men at the front, it is absolutely impossible to have separate arrangements in respect of commissariat and ordnance stores and a variety of such matters; there can be only one organization for the purpose. Further than that, when articles are issued from the general stores which are maintained by Great Britain in France near the front or upon the lines of communication and at the bases near the coast, it is absolutely impossible to keep a detailed account of what is provided for the troops of the Overseas Dominions. Therefore, it was realized summer before last, when I was in Great Britain, that it would be necessary to make an arbitrary estimate, and I believe that the subject had been previously brought up in a formal way by New Zealand. A great deal of discussion took place between those representing the Overseas Dominions and the War Office as to what would be a fair basis, and I am bound to say that I think that the arrangement made is a very fair one, and, indeed, I think it may be regarded as a generous one on the part of the United Kingdom.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does the arrangement of six shillings per man per day apply to the troops in England as well as to the troops in France?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, it applies to those in France. It applies not only to the Canadian troops, but to the Australian and the New Zealand troops.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: And not to those in England?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, I do not understand it refers to those in England.

Mr. MACLEAN: We gathered from the Minister of Finance this afternoon that it applied to the troops in England.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I read the memorandum some time ago, and I am not sure that my recollection is absolutely correct, but I think it relates to the maintenance of the troops at the front, because in England we provide our own commissariat to a considerable extent. This is the memorandum:—

The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report dated 5th January, 1917, from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for External Affairs, to whom was referred a despatch, dated 20th November, 1916, from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the colonies, on the subject of the arrangements respecting maintenance expenses of the Canadian Forces in the field,—recommending, with the concurrence of the Ministers of Finance and of Militia and Defence, that the Canadian Government agree to the proposals contained in the memorandum from the War Office, which accompanied Mr. Bonar Law's despatch.

The committee, concurring, recommend that Your Excellency may be pleased to forward a copy hereof to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the colonies for the information of His Majesty's Government.

All of which is respectfully submitted for approval.

The proposal is contained in the following letter from Mr. B. B. Cubitt, of the War Office, to the Under Secretary of State for the Colonial Office, and document which accompanies it:—

Downing Street, November 20, 1916.

My Lord Duke,—With reference to my despatch No. 820 of the 26th August, 1915, I have the honour to transmit to Your Excellency, to be laid before your Ministers, a copy of a letter from the War Office enclosing a memorandum with regard to the maintenance expenses of the Canadian forces in the field.

2. I should be glad to learn whether your ministers agree to the proposals submitted in this letter and the accompanying memorandum.

I have the honour to be,
My Lord Duke,
Your Grace's most obedient
humble servant,
(Sgd.) A. Bonar Law.

Governor General,
His Excellency,
The Duke of Devonshire K.C., G.C.V.C.,
&c., &c.

War Office, London, S.W.,
4th November, 1916.

Sir,

I am commanded by the Army Council to send you for communication to the Govern-

ment of Canada the enclosed memorandum dealing with the estimated expenses of the Dominion Forces in the field.

In the telegram of 27th April, 1915, of which a copy was enclosed with your letter 19536 of 30th April, 1915, the Dominion Government formally notified its desire to bear the whole cost of the Canadian contingents sent for service in the present war. It has been generally agreed that those services in the field which are carried out by the Imperial Government, and which cannot be directly charged to the Dominion Government, should be adjusted at an estimated rate per head based on the average cost of maintaining troops in the field. The scope and amount of the rate to be fixed have been discussed personally, between Mr. Secretary Bonar Law, Sir George Perley (on behalf of the Canadian Government) and Sir Charles Harris (on behalf of this department) and a rate of 6s. per head per diem arrived at.

The terms of the memorandum have been settled in consultation with Sir George Perley, and the Army Council have reason to believe that the arrangements it embodies will be accepted by the Canadian Government. It is suggested that the following explanations on points that have arisen in connection with its application should also be communicated.

As the estimate is based on the assumption that the Dominion troops take the field fully equipped and while there are maintained from Imperial sources, it follows (1) that the articles issued in the field to maintain or replace articles of the original equipment will be the property of the Dominion Government at the end of the war, and (2) that it will be open to the Dominion Government to raise a counter claim against the Imperial Government for any rifles or other articles covered by the rate, which may have been issued in the field out of Canadian stocks for maintenance or replacement.

As regards mechanical transport vehicles, the figures in the memorandum (which has been for some time under discussion) were based on the assumption that maintenance in the field would be met from Canadian sources. It is understood that this is no longer the case, and that issue of spare parts, etc., in the field are now generally made from Imperial stocks; but it has been agreed, after discussion with Sir George Perley, that such issues shall be covered by the 6s. rate.

It is proposed that the rate of 6s. per man per day shall apply from the first arrival of Dominion troops upon the Continent to the present time, and that it shall continue to apply unchanged in the future unless conditions should so alter as to make it clearly unfair either to the Imperial or the Dominion Government.

I am, etc.,
B. B. Cubitt.

Under Secretary of State,
Colonial Office, S.E.

The following is the War Office estimate of the maintenance expenses of the Canadian forces in the field:

1. Canada, Australia and New Zealand, at the outbreak of war signified a desire to bear the whole cost of their Expeditionary Forces.

2. The Dominions make their own issues of pay, cash allowances and pensions.

3. The expenses borne in the first instance by the Imperial Government for Canadian troops in England (rations, forage, clothing, stores, etc., etc.,) are recovered currently through the ordinary medium of accounts, with two exceptions:

(a) Accommodation provided by the War Office, for which in accordance with the undertaking already given by the Imperial Government no charge is made, whether accommodation is provided in hutments or in billets.

(b) Railway charges, the assessment of which in existing conditions offers special difficulties and will be dealt with separately.

4. As regards expenses in the field it is not practicable to keep account of actual issues, and it has always been the intention of the Imperial Government (subject to the concurrence of the Dominion Government) that payment should take some simple form such as an estimated rate per head. This method has been independently proposed by the Government of New Zealand.

5. In the field the Imperial Government provides:

(a) Out of army votes, rations, forage, fuel, clothing, stores of all kinds, such establishments as Ordnance, Supply and Remount Depots, railway transport in France, sea transport for men and material from this country, etc., etc.

(b) Out of civil votes, ammunition of all kinds and replacement of guns, wagons, small arms, etc., also stationery.

6. There are no accounts which show the cost of these supplies and services to Canadian troops in France and the figures can only be arrived at by estimate. Leaving munitions aside, the current rate of expenditure per head of the Army as a whole (excluding Indian troops) is about 9s. 6d. per day. Of this sum, about 4s. represents pay, cash allowances and pensions, the charges corresponding to which in the case of Canadian troops are paid by Canada direct; remounts, for which it has been found possible to make a separate settlement on the basis of actual transactions; and mechanical transport vehicles.

7. The remaining 5s. 6d. includes a certain number of large items which are supplied by the War Office to the Canadian troops in the field, and admit of being estimated with some approach to accuracy. These are rations, forage, fuel, clothing, equipment and general stores, drugs, stationery; and they account for a total of 4s. per day.

8. As regards munitions, the present rate of expenditure (12s. or more per day per man in the field) cannot be taken as affording any guide, as a very large portion of the expenditure represents manufacture of first equipments and the accumulation of stock of ammunition. Estimated on the basis of consumption, small arm ammunition accounts for about 3½d. per day, gun ammunition about 1s. per day and renewal of small arms, machine guns, artillery equipments and material generally for about 6d. per day per man in France.

(Note.—This was written in April, 1916.)

The possible alternative of estimating for munitions at monthly rates for the various natures and numbers of guns in use by the Canadian troops has been fully considered and discussed with the representative of the Canadian Government in London, and it has been agreed that it will be best to adopt the basis of a rate per head of troops in France, for these items also.

9. These charges, with the 4s. in paragraph 6, amount to about 5s. 9d. per day per man.

10. The remaining items of expenditure (about 1s. 6d. per man per day—see paragraph 7) are very various and include such items as the Air Service, Works Services, bridging and other engineer materials, etc., which cannot be regarded as supplied to the Canadian troops at all, while other services such as railway and sea transport, labour establishments at ports and base depots, though they cannot be appropriated to units of the army, are nevertheless properly distributable over all the troops in the field.

11. If 3d. per day is taken for these services, the total of 6s. per day will be an estimate of which it may confidently be said that while it carries out the intention of the Canadian Government to pay the whole of the cost of the Canadian troops, it does not involve any overcharge against the Dominion.

I shall now outline the purposes of the expenditures, due to the war, in the various departments. The expenditure in the Department of Naval Service involves the maintenance of ships and dockyards, the Royal Canadian Naval Volunteer Reserve, Overseas Division, new ships and maintenance, pension and separation allowances, headquarters salaries and expenses, disbursements recoverable for account of Imperial and Allied Governments. For example, it is necessary to keep up the bases at Halifax and Esquimalt so that they will afford sufficient provision not only for the Canadian Naval forces, which are relatively small, but also for the British navy, and for ships of the Allied nations.

The expenditure of the Department of the Interior represents salaries in respect of additional employees required because of enlistments.

The expenditure of the Department of Railways and Canals involves outlay for the guarding of bridges and canal structures, transporting goods for the Red Cross Society and the Belgium Relief Fund, salaries of substitutes for men enlisted.

The expenditure of the Department of Finance represents contributions to relief and patriotic funds, such as the Belgian Relief Fund and the Kitchener Memorial Fund, and extra clerks engaged because of the war.

The expenditure of the Department of Public Works represents the cost of office fittings and filing apparatus required by various departments on account of the war, such as Militia, Pensions Board, National Service Board; salaries and wages for extra employees engaged because of the war.

The expenditure in the Department of Labour represents clerical assistance, printing and stationery rendered necessary by activities connected with the war—for example, the administration of separation allowances for Canadian munition workers in England paid by the Imperial Government, and various matters of that kind.

Mr. GRAHAM: I presume that these expenditures outlined for each department are made by the departments, which are then recouped by the Finance Department out of the war fund.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Nothing is paid out of the war appropriation except by order in council, because it is a grant, not to any department of the Government, but to the Government as a whole. Therefore everything that is paid out is paid out on order in council approved on the recommendation of the minister of the department which makes the application.

Mr. GRAHAM: Each department is reimbursed for its expenditure? For instance the Intercolonial railway handles troops; it is paid for the handling of these troops?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose that expenditure would form part of the bill of the Railway Department, and the same with the Marine Department. May I ask the Prime Minister if the recruits that are being secured for the British navy are being paid by the Canadian Government or by the Imperial Government?

Mr. HAZEN: By the Canadian Government.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Canadian Government would bear the expense?

Mr. HAZEN: They are bearing it.

Mr. GRAHAM: What success is attending the appeal for naval recruits in Canada?

Mr. HAZEN: We get returns usually on Monday, and we had enlisted and sent overseas by Monday or Tuesday of this week somewhere between 1,200 and 1,300.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The object of the vote which is now asked is to cover three different items:

(a) The defence and security of Canada;
(b) The conduct of naval or military operations in and beyond Canada;
(c) Promoting the continuance of trade, industry and business communications, whether by means of insurance or indemnity against war risk or otherwise;

The explanation given by my hon. friend has referred altogether to our share of the expenditures for military operations beyond Canada. I have not observed that anything

has been expended or is in contemplation for the defence and security of Canada. I do not mean that this was an omission. I do not know that very much was needed for this purpose. We never were in danger of invasion, and therefore we have lived in security. But it must have been obvious to anybody that we have been exposed to raids on the part of German cruisers. As we all remember, at the opening of hostilities, we were seriously in danger on the Pacific coast owing to the presence of German cruisers in the Pacific ocean. The Government at the time very properly thought that they were bound to take precautions to protect our cities against raids by these cruisers. They purchased two submarines which, in addition to what we had, were expected to afford sufficient protection. As a matter of fact we were relieved from further anxiety when the last German cruiser was sunk by the warship Australia. On the Atlantic we have always been protected by the British navy, so strong and powerful as to afford security. But we know that German cruisers have succeeded in passing through the British blockade, and have inflicted very serious damage in some parts of the ocean. We are threatened today with further frightfulness on the part of the German navy. The cruisers are dangerous, but the submarines are still more dangerous. I have no doubt that the Government have had that in mind and have taken precautions against anything of the kind occurring on the Atlantic ocean. I do not ask for any details. The only thing I want to be assured of is that they have not forgotten their responsibility and have taken due precaution.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: This subject has occasioned a good deal of correspondence in the shape of secret communications between the Admiralty and the Government of Canada during the past five or six weeks. It would not be proper for me——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN—to make any reference to the details. I can only say that I should be very glad indeed to show to my right hon. friend at any time the correspondence which has taken place and to make him acquainted with the measures which have been taken. I think that I did mention some of these matters rather briefly to him a day or two ago, and I should be very pleased indeed to make him fully acquainted with all that has been done, and with the difficulties that have had to be met.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not sure that I ought to say what is in my mind concerning a situation that may confront us in a very short time, and which has not hitherto existed. I would ask the Government whether they have considered, or will consider, the question of having a more complete defence of Canada, not only of our coasts, but of our land frontier as well. Conditions might arise which will concern Canada more deeply, and bring the war nearer home than it has been heretofore. We need every man that Canada can spare to go to the front where the conflict is raging, but, in my humble judgment, we ought not to neglect preparations to defend ourselves at home, if our friends across the border should be drawn into the conflict. It is possible, I think, to have a home defence service without interfering materially with the men we are sending abroad. That is what I have in mind. I do not know whether I should have suggested it at this time, but I have felt strongly about the matter for a few days, and the dispatches of to-day confirm my view.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We have in Canada a very large force under arms. I had a communication not long since with the Chief of the General Staff as to what provision was available in certain parts of the country in case any need should arise, as to the provision of field guns, machine guns, rifles, and ammunition; and the assurances given to me indicated that we would be pretty well prepared. I think we should have every possible regard for any contingency, however improbable and remote. I agree that we should keep in this country at all times during the war a large and well equipped force. I may say to my hon. friend that the very suggestion which he threw out this afternoon has been under consideration by the Minister of Militia and Defence and his officers for some two or three weeks, and it is not at all improbable that something along the line of my hon. friend's suggestion may eventually be carried out. I am not in a position to say anything more definite at the moment.

With regard to the defence of Canada, of course my right hon. friend will remember that we have had a good deal to do with the defence of our harbours. We have closed some very important harbours in this country, leaving only a certain entrance; we have closed the main entrance in some

cases, leaving a certain space for entrance which would be easily defended. All the protection and care approved by the admiralty have been given to the entrances of certain harbours. My hon. friend will also observe that in the appropriation there is a large increase for the naval service, and the measures to which he alludes have not been overlooked.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MACDONALD: Mr. Chairman, as this will be the only opportunity, before the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) leaves for the Old Country, to consider matters affecting the war, and how it is being conducted, and in view of the fact that the attention of everybody in the country is being turned to the problem of recruiting and the carrying out of the promise of the right hon. gentleman that 500,000 men should be obtained and sent overseas, it would be interesting to have a further statement from my right hon. friend. Apparently, the policy of the Government in regard to that matter has been to follow the system of voluntary recruitment. It seems to me that in view of the interest taken by our people in this subject we might have some consideration of how best to devise methods which will enable us to get the required number of men. The system of billeting which was in existence throughout Canada over a year ago, was very effective. It produced a large number of men in various centres and although I know there are some objections to be urged against it, yet, as a matter of enlisting the interest of men and securing their attachment to the service, it was very successful indeed. I think the Government should tell us what their point of view is in regard to this question and how they expect to obtain the balance of the men whom the right hon. gentleman said a year ago he hoped to get.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What was done a year ago was to authorize the enlistment of 500,000 men. I have already stated what was accomplished in that regard. Something over 400,000 have been mobilized including the active militia called out, including the permanent force and the forces still in Canada. The total number of these last three classes is about 60,000. I stated before the House rose at six o'clock that the Government had under consideration at the present time some further measures with reference to the raising and maintaining in Canada of a suitable force for home defence having in mind the considerations which were pointed out by the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham). I am afraid I cannot say anything more that would be of assistance just at the moment. We are in hopes that the 60,000 men now available for one purpose or another in Canada, or the major part of them, will be sent overseas in the immediate future.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am afraid my right hon. friend's answer to my suggestion does not indicate anything very much in the way of the fulfilment of the promise of 500,000 men for overseas. I quite agree with the statements made by my hon. friend from South Renfrew as to the wisdom and necessity of creating and maintaining in Canada a large force of men prepared for home service in case of necessity and as a matter of precaution. But assuming that that arrangement is made, and assuming that these men are obtained, we will yet have from 70,000 to 75,000 more men to secure before we can send the full quota across the ocean. After all, the determination of this conflict is to be on the western front and on the plains of France. The task of the British and French is to drive the Germans from their entrenchments back into Belgium and from there across the Rhine. The part that we as Canadians want to play in this war is to give to the fulfilment of that task every possible aid we can in the way of men. There has been slackness in recruiting. I think one of the reasons why there has been slackness is that there has been too little system in regard to the matter. There should have been an allocation, or certification, long ago of men whose employment was deemed to be necessary to the production of those things which are essential to the war. The failure to systematize the whole problem has been one of the great difficulties that has stood in the way of this realization of the expectations of my right hon. friend. We had the statement made this afternoon by the hon. the Postmaster General (Mr. Blondin) that the National Service card was not issued for the purpose of securing men to go to the front.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: He did not say that. He said that it did not mean coercion or conscription in itself.

Mr. MACDONALD: I think my hon. friend the Postmaster General went farther in declaring that the National Service cards were not intended for the purpose of obtaining men for military service.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not so understand it.

Mr. MACDONALD: I will wait for Hansard to see exactly what he did say but that is my impression. Either the National Service cards were intended for the purpose of getting men for military service or they were not. I do not think they were. I am inclined to agree with the statement of the Postmaster General. I do not see how you are going to get men as the result of the system which has been proposed by the National Service Commission and for the purpose of my argument I shall, in considering this question fairly and frankly as I desire to do, eliminate the National Service proposition as a means whereby the hon. gentleman's promise is to be implemented. Is the voluntary system to be continued, and if it is to be continued, does the Government intend to develop any new method on the voluntary basis for the purpose of encouraging recruitment and for the purpose of obtaining men? It is evident that the country, which is deeply interested in the war, looks for some action in that particular. I think the right hon. gentleman will agree with me when I say that his statement, in response to my inquiry as to what the Governments' policy is for the purpose of solving the matter, that they think of raising a number of men for home defence, is not a sufficient answer. Do the Government propose to find the 70,000 or 75,000 men necessary to go overseas, and if so, how do they propose to deal with the question?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There are more systematic methods under consideration now for the purpose I have mentioned and also for the purpose of securing men for overseas service. It is likely that if the methods to which I have alluded are employed and the system in that regard carried out there will be provision for obtaining men for overseas service. I agree as to the importance of selecting recruits for overseas service by some systematic method, but I do not agree with my hon. friend that the proposals in connection with the National Service will not be of assistance in that regard. If you are to have any system at all, you must know the age, the physique, the employment, and particulars of every kind respecting the available manhood of this country, and the National Service proposals were designed to obtain that information and have resulted in the very great amount of information which is now coming to hand and which is being tabulated.

Mr. OLIVER: In that connection, I might point out to the Prime Minister that the information received by way of the National Service cards must necessarily be incomplete and therefore misleading because a very large proportion of National Service cards are not being replied to. In so far as they are not being replied to, the Government has not derived any information from them. If they are depending on the information they derive from that source they must be misled by the replies and lack of replies to the National Service cards. That is a condition that must have been obvious to the Director of National Service before he issued his cards. Therefore, I am compelled to say that I cannot accept the suggestion that the National proposition has been directed and carried out with the intention of securing a knowledge of the possible available manhood of the country.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not know on what authority my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) makes the statement that a very large proportion of the cards are not being filled in. That is not the information I have received from the Director General of the National Service.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am bound to say in all frankness that the right hon. gentleman is not giving the country the lead on this question which it expects from the Government at this juncture. Take, for instance, this most peculiar method of recruiting for the Naval Service. I do not know under whose auspices Captain Guinness came to the province of Nova Scotia. But he came to my county, and instead of going to the seaport towns, where he would have found men who have grown up by the sea and would have enlisted, he went to the city of Halifax, and addressed an audience not one of whom would by any possibility think of going on the sea. There is no evidence, so far as we can see, that he went where he ought to have gone, to such counties as Yarmouth, Shelburne and Lunenburg, and to the various harbours that are to be found in the county of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, and in the

counties of Guysborough and Richmond. Captain Guinness, who is most enthusiastic, and, I feel sure, a very able man, instead of going to these seaport places, went to the city of Halifax, the town of New Glasgow and the city of Sydney. Now my right hon. friend knows very well that these were not the centres where recruits were likely to be found for the deck of a battleship. He knows that when Captain Guinness went to New Glasgow, he went to a place which had furnished hundreds of men for service on land, and in addition to that, the people were completely absorbed in the production of munitions. I personally had no notice of the fact that this gentleman was to be in my constituency. Had I known, I should have been very glad, with my local knowledge, to have directed him to the places where he would have been likely to get recruits. I really cannot understand why, when he wanted recruits to fight on the ocean, he should go to munition plants, coal mines, and iron and steel industries, when thousands of men could have been got around the coasts.

My right hon. friend will agree with me that in the past there has been no system in regard to recruiting. Either the men who were working in the coal mines and iron and steel industries ought to be working there, or they ought to be at the front. Yet indiscriminately, and apparently without any system, an enthusiastic recruiter visited these particular districts, and left a great many other districts, where men could have been obtained, unvisited. The result of all that was a confusion of sentiment. Either the men who were working in those places were doing their full duty to their country, or they were not. It is considered by every one that those men ought to be engaged in those industries, and I think that under proper conditions they should be given certificates of exemption just as is done in England. But there was no attempt at that.

Then there has been a disregard altogether of the utilization of the Militia Act and of the militia organizations in the country. All over Canada there were men who, by virtue of their association in youth with militia organizations, were accustomed to dealing with problems of this kind, and in a great many places these men were disregarded; and I do not think they should have been. I think the old militia organizations should have been maintained. They were maintained in one or two cities, but generally all through the country they were disregarded altogether. The result of all this is—and I do not propose to indulge in recriminations—that to-day there is a feeling abroad in this land that somehow or other Canada has not done her duty in the way of sending enough men overseas. My right hon. friend tells us that he has under consideration the idea of recruiting an additional number of men for home defence. That is very laudable, I agree, but it does not meet the case. With regard to the National Service scheme, I believe with my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), that it will not reach the men we want to reach; it won't get the slackers Does any one suppose that the slackers will sign those cards? Everyone knows that it is the men who have not gone to the front, and are not doing their duty at home, that are not signing the cards. The responsibility of finding a solution to these problems rests upon my right hon. friend and his colleagues, for, to them has been committed the task of guiding this country through this great war. We have given them in the past without reserve, all the money that they asked for in order to carry out their idea. It is now proposed to give them this enormous sum, the largest amount that has been asked for yet. Surely on such an occasion we are entitled to information as to the lead the Government propose to give public opinion in this country, which unquestionably is along the line that we should send more men to the front until victory is won.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I notice that on two occasions my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) has called the attention of the Minister of Militia to the fact that a brigade was being recruited in the province of Quebec. There is no question as to the truth of that fact, because I myself have seen large advertisements in the various papers in the province, and notably in the district from which I come, the district of Montreal. I understand that the recruiting is being done chiefly by Col. Mignault, who has distinguished himself in connection with the hospital organization at the front. I can assure the right hon. Prime Minister that if he will act on the suggestion I am going to make it will be of great benefit to the recruiting of that brigade. Last year I called his attention to the fact that General Lessard was considered by everyone, I think, as one of the best officers we have in the Canadian militia. Even the British authorities consider him an ex-

cellent officer. Now I do not wish to indulge in recriminations, but I cannot understand why General Lessard, who served so well in South Africa, has been overlooked since the beginning of the war. With the exception of a little mission on which he was sent to the other side, it is well known that his services have been practically discarded since the war broke out. I saw in one of the Toronto papers recently that at the present time he is a farmer, instead of being what he is by ability and training, a soldier. Let me say in all sincerity to the right hon. Prime Minister that if the Government announced that General Lessard would be given command of that brigade, it would be very easy in my opinion to raise the 5,000 men, which is the number, I think, required to fill a brigade. One great objection that people have to giving their sons for overseas service—and I have discussed this with several people—is the fact that we lack trained officers. Everybody knows, and I am not casting any slurs on the Canadian militia, that until the war broke out we had a very poor military organization in Canada. We had twelve days during the year in which to train our soldiers, and I heard an hon. member, who, I think, is now in command of a regiment on the other side, state to this House that we had but the skeleton of a skeleton of a militia. It is not throwing cold water on the enthusiasm of our officers and soldiers who belong to our Canadian militia to say that we had a very poor organization on the whole. There was enthusiasm; there was patriotism; but every one will concede that there was very little training, and when war was declared I know that some people refused to have their sons enlist because they said: We have no officers, and we do not trust the young men who will be at the head of the various companies or regiments. But now every one will admit that General Lessard does not belong to that class of officers; that he is possibly the best soldier we have to-day in Canada. Why not utilize his services? Why will the Government not make the announcement that this brigade which is being recruited at present in the province of Quebec will be under the command of General Lessard? If it does so it will be doing something that which will at once strike the popular imagination. I make this suggestion in all sincerity and in the hope that the right hon. gentleman will accept it in that spirit. Last year, when I mentioned the name of General Lessard to the right hon. gentleman I thought that he would take my suggestion in a good spirit. I hope he will not forget this time that a war is on us; that we want more men; that General Lessard is available; that we now have a new Minister of Militia, and that, as there is no friction between General Lessard and my hon. friend the new Minister of Militia, an opportunity should certainly be given to that distinguished officer to do something for his country and at the same time to stimulate recruiting in his native province, where he is simply idolized and trusted by the people.

Mr. BURNHAM: Every one, I suppose, who knows at least a little about this may contribute something, especially if it is a fact. Whilst every one will agree with the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) that General Lessard is a man of eminence and of the highest character, a man of the best possible training—and I myself cannot understand why his services are not utilized—the hon. member overlooks one fact, namely, that the testimony which would encourage or deter recruiting amongst our French-Canadians is that of the men at the front, and the French-Canadians at the front are, without any exception—and I say this, not only of those I have met, but of those I have heard of and of those I have come across indirectly—the most enthusiastic men possible. You could not find soldiers more devoted to the cause and more anxious that their compatriots should enlist. When they come back to Quebec, they say to other French-Canadian friends: Why do you not enlist? I am sure the hon. member will agree with me, therefore, that the allegation that there was a lack of training, a fear, or a suspicion, that would deter them from enlisting, falls absolutely to the ground, because the testimony upon which they must rely is that which is gathered at the front, and it is such as I speak of.

There are some other little things which deter people, I must confess. Sometimes it is a small thing which does it, and there may be an explanation; but I am not so saturated with politics that I cannot speak for the mass of the people as I understand it, and here is a small thing which I would contribute which, to my mind, would deter, perhaps not a great many, but at any rate some recruits. Suppose three people go into a chemist's shop; one is a poor man; the other two, we shall say, are evidently not poor. The poor man buys, because

he has to buy, a bottle of patent medicine and pays four cents war tax on it. The second man buys a camera on which there is no war tax. The third man perhaps has a young lady with him and buys a two or three or four dollar box of sweets, on which there is also no war tax. Some one may say that the ingredients are taxed, but that is true of the three purchases. I am also told that the doctors of the present day sometimes prescribe patent medicines to the extent of probably twenty-five per cent of their prescriptions, and if any portion of the medicine is taken out of the patent medicine bottle, there has to be a corresponding amount of war tax paid upon it. I have never heard of any one except the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) wanting to buy a bottle of patent medicine because he regarded it as a luxury. This purchaser buys it because perhaps he has a little child at home who needs it. He sees the man come in and buy a camera and the other man come in and buy a box of sweets and neither of them has to pay a war tax. He is infuriated, and who can blame him?

An hon. MEMBER: No one at all.

Mr. BURNHAM: No one at all. I do not charge the Minister of Finance with doing this sort of thing willingly, because I think, when it is brought to his attention, as it certainly will be by the people, he will change it, because he is a man not only evidently skilled in finance, but of the finest character and the best heart, and I expect he will respond to the appeals of the people in this respect.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I hope my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) will not think that I am guilty of any discourtesy in not speaking more definitely than I have been able to do; but inasmuch as these matters are still under consideration and the plans have not been fully matured, he will realize that I cannot give a more definite answer than that which I have given just now. When the proposals come to be submitted, of course, they will be in the judgment of the House as to whether they will be effective, and the result will indicate as to whether they have been wisely adopted or not.

I did take into consideration what my hon. friend the member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) said to me last year, and I had at least two discussions with General Lessard last summer. I agree in the appreciation which has been expressed with regard to his ability and his services, and I have expressed that same opinion publicly on more than one occasion since the outbreak of war. I do not know that it would be appropriate for me to state the exact nature of the discussion which I had with General Lessard, but I did put before him the considerations which had been placed before me by my hon. friend the member for Rouville and I urged upon him that he should entertain them. I also put before him some other proposals which I do not care to mention just now, but which I would be quite willing to mention privately to my hon. friend the member for Rouville; and when I do mention them, I think he will concur with me that in making those proposals I certainly did not exhibit any lack of appreciation of the experience, military skill, and high qualities of General Lessard. I would be very happy if he could have seen his way clear to undertake certain duties of one character or another which I proposed to him at that time.

The impression seems to be still in the minds of some hon. gentlemen that the services of General Lessard have not been utilized in this war. As a matter of fact, he has discharged very important duties indeed. In the early months of the war it was decided that in view of the very large force under training in Canada we should have two inspectors general, one for the West and one for the East. In the first instance General Steele, if I remember correctly, was appointed inspector general in the West, and General Lessard in the East. Subsequently General Steele went overseas, and General John Hughes was appointed to succeed him. General Lessard, from the time that he was appointed inspector general of the troops in training in eastern Canada, has continued to discharge the duties of that very important office. At times he has had under his direction as many as 75,000 men; at the moment he has supervision over between 30,000 and 40,000 men. From time to time he visits every part of the eastern provinces, Ontario and Quebec; he is now on his way to the Maritime provinces for the purpose of making a visit of inspection. The services which he has given to the country in this way are of no mean order. Moreover, he obtained leave of absence to visit the front in order that he might make himself better acquainted with the character of training which we ought to give to our men in Canada. He went to Great Britain and

France for that special purpose, and, as he told me, came back with ideas and knowledge which were of great service to him in directing the character of the training in the various camps. While he was on the other side of the ocean I took upon myself to request that he should make inspection of the Canadian troops in training in Great Britain. He did that, and brought back the results of the inspection. Although General Lessard has not been at the front, except under the circumstances that I have mentioned, nevertheless I feel that he has rendered a very important service to the country in this war. It is possible that a higher service may still be given by him; I should be very happy indeed if he could see his way clear to undertake that still more important service.

Mr. MURPHY: It is not my intention to intervene in this discussion so far as it relates to General Lessard beyond saying this. It is notorious that at the outset of the war General Lessard's services were not availed of because of the hostility of the late Minister of Militia to General Lessard. Every member of this House remembers the occurrence that took place in Toronto, in which the whole population of that city were ranged on the side of General Lessard and against the late Minister of Militia. I do not want to enlarge on that, but if the members will just keep that in mind they will have no difficulty in recalling what General Lessard's position was at the outset of the war. It is true that later he was given the position to which the right hon. gentleman has just referred, but that was after a number of men inferior in point of training, service and personal attainments had been given positions for any one of which General Lessard should have been selected. What General Lessard is at present doing I am not aware, but it is a lamentable fact that the services of the most accomplished professional soldier that we had in Canada at the time were not availed of by the Government. On the broader and general question raised by the member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) and the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver)—that of recruiting generally—I wish to say a word and to invite a statement from the right hon. Prime Minister. He will recall that on Tuesday last, when the ex-Minister of Militia was making his statement in the House, he gave the House and the country certain information regarding recruiting which has had a very disquieting effect. In point of fact, he proceeded to explain to the House and the country why the 500,000 men promised had not been obtained. I am not going to quote from his speech; I shall allude to certain general statements that will illustrate what I want to bring to the attention of the right hon. Prime Minister. The ex-Minister of Militia asserted that he knew that recruiting had not gone on. He alleged that he could have raised 500,000 men by voluntary enlistment. He even enlarged that and said that he could have raised 600,000 men by voluntary enlistment without any trouble. Then he dwelt on a change that had been made in the method of recruiting and he illustrated the effect of that by saying that three months were lost, not in organizing battalions, but in getting the power to authorize them— this having reference to certain orders in council that were passed. Then he told us that he went to England, and he added that when he came back his officers stated that they had been directed to go slow in recruiting. That is a most serious statement, one which was not referred to by the hon. Minister of Finance when he replied to the ex-Minister of Militia, and which, so far as I know, has not been referred to since. As one member of the House who is sincerely desirous of assisting the right hon. Prime Minister and members of the Government in doing whatever they may deem necessary to help in carrying on this war to a successful conclusion, I invite the right hon. gentleman to make a statement here to-night as to this declaration by his late colleague.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: So far as the orders in council are concerned, the matter is susceptible of the simplest of explanations. Under the order in council which was passed early in January, 1916, it was possible for the officers of the Department of Militia and Defence, by direction of the head of the department, to authorize the raising of battalions in all parts of the country without any further reference to council. It was thought desirable, by reason of the complaints made to me personally by recruiting associations and coming from other sources in various parts of the country, that some control should be exercised over the course that had been pursued. We were assured by delegations that it was undesirable that a very large number of battalions should be recruited at the same time in one particular locality. The point that I recall as having been pressed was that of the expense. It was said that when five, six or seven battalions were being recruited in one locality the officers of these battalions were paid

by the country at great expense during a period which was greatly prolonged before all the battalions were recruited to full strength. The only change that was made was this: instead of these battalions being authorized merely by a direction issued in the Department of Militia and Defence, the amending order in council provided that thereafter they must be authorized by the Governor in Council, so that we might come to a conclusion as to whether in a given place it would be wise to authorize the raising of further battalions until those already authorized had been brought up to strength.

Mr. MURPHY: That is with reference to the battalions. What about the other statement, about the officers having been told to go slow in recruiting?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not aware of what the officers said or who the officers referred to may be. All I have to say is that there were no directions to go slow in recruiting, so far as I am aware, except by reason of what I have just detailed; that is, instead of a free hand being given to authorize battalions without any reference to the Governor in Council, the control was reserved to the Governor General in Council in order that an excessive expenditure of public money in the way indicated might not be incurred.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Can the First Minister give an instance where five, six, or seven battalions were being raised at one time in one place?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I understand that there were that many in Toronto.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Nothing like that.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not sure—

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am quite sure.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not so positive as my hon. friend. The representation was made to me by a recruiting association, many of whose members came from Toronto.

Sir SAM HUGHES: These regiments were raised in these centres on the basis of about one to every forty thousand or fifty thousand souls. In order to start a regiment the officers had first to be selected, trained and got ready, and to have raised only one battalion in a population of nearly 600,000 souls was simply nonsense when we were raising one in every 40,000 area all over Canada. Why should my county of Victoria and Haliburton, the county of Peterborough, the county of Ontario, the county of Durham, with their population of about 40,000 each, be raising one battalion each, while Toronto, with 500,000 or 600,000 population, raised only one battalion? The thing is absurd on the face of it. The basis of the whole thing was this agitation to pander to the cry of labour; the cry went up for men for munitions. That is what started the agitation and stopped the recruiting.

Sir ROBERT BCRDEN: The representations I allude to were not made by labouring men, or people interested in munitions, but by a delegation of recruiting organizations all over Canada, which came to have an interview with me in the month of April last, I think.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Was any representation made to the Minister of Militia at the time?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not remember whether the Minister of Militia was in Ottawa at the time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will the ex-Minister of Militia allow me a question? I understand that what the ex-minister complains of is that the matter of recruiting was practically taken out of his hands.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I have never complained of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No, that is the fault of my hon. friend, and still less does he complain of it latterly.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The recruiting vanished, that is all.

Mr. PUGSLEY: As I understand the Prime Minister, the power was reserved to the Governor in Council to allow the recruiting of a certain number of battalions if they thought it desirable. That power was taken out of the hands of the minister. I want to know if the minister ever made a recommendation for the recruiting of additional battalions in Toronto or elsewhere, which recommendation was not acted upon by the Governor General in Council.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I made recommendations for three battalions in Winnipeg, and it took three or four months to get even authority to start them. In Toronto, fortunately, I had got them organized before the brakes were put on, and before the mental epilepsy got hold of people—I had got things going before that time.

Mr. OLIVER: For the information of the ex-minister and the Prime Minister, I want to say that at this time last year there were being recruited in Edmonton the fol-

lowing: the 51st, the 63rd, the 66th, the 138th, the 151st, the 194th, the 202nd and the 218th battalions. Since that time the 223rd has been authorized; and at the same time and following that period there were authorizations given by somebody for the establishment in Edmonton of some five to ten additional recruiting offices besides those of the battalions which I have mentioned, recruiting for units whose headquarters were outside the district of Northern Alberta, and many of them outside of Alberta altogether. I mention two battalions that are being recruited at the present moment whose headquarters are in Victoria or Vancouver, British Columbia, the Bantams of British Columbia and a Forestry battalion whose number I forget. Besides these the Maclean battalion of New Brunswick had a recruiting office in Edmonton. There had been recruiting offices for the engineers, for the foresters, for the pioneers, for the frontiersmen of Moosejaw, for the Canadian Naval Service—in fact I do not know any form of service that has not had a recruiting office at Edmonton during the past year. I think it is only fair that the committee should have that information in view of the rule so clearly laid down by the Prime Minister, which I beg to assure him was honoured in the breach and not in the observance so far as Edmonton and Northern Alberta are concerned.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think the order in council was passed after my hon. friend raised this question. I think my hon. friend raised this question in the House last session.

Mr. OLIVER: Yes.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: And I think the order in council alluded to, which made it necessary that the authorization of new battalions should come from the Governor in Council, was passed after that.

Mr. OLIVER: Then I may point out that, with this list of battalions still in Edmonton, the 223rd was authorized, I suppose under the order in council. At any rate, I am pointing out that aside from the battalions whose headquarters were in Edmontton, somebody authorized the recruiting of other units.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Would my hon. friend say when the 223rd was authorized?

Mr. OLIVER: I could not give the date, but I think after the 1st of January, 1916.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Authorized in Edmonton? The 223rd is a Manitoba battalion.

Mr. OLIVER: Anyway it is a French Canadian battalion.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Who commands it?

Mr. OLIVER: Colonel Leprohon.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The 223rd is a Scandinavian battalion.

Mr. OLIVER: That recruited in Edmonton too. There is no question that Colonel Leprohon was authorized to recruit a French Canadian battalion in Edmonton, I think after January, 1916, and after the order in council was passed. However that number of battalions were being recruited in Edmonton at the same time, and besides that, as I said, other units, having no connection with Edmonton and absolutely contrary to the letter and certainly to the spirit of the order in council, have been recruited in Edmonton and are being recruited in Edmonton to-day.

Mr. BRADBURY: How many local battalions?

Mr. OLIVER: I have mentioned the number.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The hon. member has read a very nice list, but two-thirds of these were organized and some of them were at the front before the others were completed.

Mr. OLIVER: I beg the ex-minister's pardon.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The 51st and the 66th were both filled up, and another battalion was filled, having 1,500 men. The 66th had 3,000 men and then we authorized two other battalions to take them up straight along. These battalions were filled. Then we authorized more, because the cry went up that the men were coming in to Edmonton to recruit. Edmonton has furnished a fair show of men, but Edmonton does not own all these men, they come from all over the West to Edmonton to recruit.

Mr. OLIVER: Oh no.

Sir SAM HUGHES: And many of them had come from the Peace river, Vermilion and so on, and the cry was that these men had come in to enlist and that we must start new regiments. So, in place of putting new regiments at Vermilion and other places, we used Edmonton as a centre and we did not have regiments overlapping each

other as my hon. friend has indicated to-night.

Mr. OLIVER: It would not be profitable to the House for the ex-minister and myself to discuss facts of which I have knowledge at first hand and of which he has knowledge only at second or forty-second hand. I wish to speak somewhat definitely, and I hope with due regard to courtesy, in regard to the proposals as to National Service. We are here to vote a credit of $500,000,000 to enable Canada to take that part which she ought to take in the war in Europe.

Sir SAM HUGHES: If the hon. member will excuse me I would like to return to a certain matter. Just as I came in, the hon. member for Russell was dilating on General Lessard. I did not catch the hon. gentleman's remarks further than that I heard him say that General Lessard was the first soldier in Canada. I regret exceedingly that I should have to discuss this matter in this House, but I have borne a good deal from the friends of that officer, and I do not purpose bearing any more. In the first place, General Lessard is not the first or in the first twenty officers in the Dominion, he is not so regarded by officers in this country. He has never distinguished himself more than any other officer; in fact, there are at least twenty other men in Canada who are just as good as he, some senior officers and some junior. He was a very excellent officer when I took charge of the department, and we managed to get along very nicely until the deputy minister, for certain reasons, requested that he be exchanged to Toronto. The horse association in Toronto were anxious to get him there to help them with their exhibitions. He went there, and as officer commanding the district he did very well until his health broke down. At the outbreak of the war General Lessard was not in a condition physically to take charge of a brigade, but even if he had been in the best physical condition I would not have been justified in putting him in command of a brigade. He had never commanded a brigade on active service anywhere; he had commanded a battalion, or rather a mounted corps, in South Africa.

But I may point out, what is not generally known, that General Lessard had merited dismissal from the service on two occasions. I am sorry to have to bring this up, but I have given General Lessard's friends every opportunity of keeping quiet, and they have not done so, and therefore I think I am justified in giving the facts. I will show that in two instances General Lessard acted in such a way that any other Minister of Militia in the world would have promptly dismissed him. The first occasion was before the war. The 36th Regiment was being recruited in the country districts around Dufferin, and officers came from the cities to take charge of the men. The men from the country would refer to those from the cities as wharf rats, and the boys would complain. The country fellows would come in and talk of the battalion being filled with wharf rats from the cities. There was a lot of ill-feeling in the old 36th Battalion about the matter, and I ordered a board of inquiry. General Lesard conducted the board of inquiry. I forget the details, but the the report was in favour of the country officers. The city officers were all good fellows. I was told that General Lessard had backed up the city officers, and I believed that, although the city officers, it seemed to me, did not know this. And so the trouble went on. General Lessard sent the report to me, and I read it. Some time later I was waited on by a deputation of the city officers, all very fine fellows, and they told me that they were anxious to have the recommendations of the report carried out. I said "the report backs the other side." They said, No, because General Lessard had read the report and it took their side. I sent for the report and showed it to them, and they said it was not the report which General Lessard had read to them. Then I sent for the Adjutant General, Colonel Williams. They had informed me that the report read to them had been addressed to Colonel Williams. I asked Williams if he had ever received such a report, and he said he had received a report marked "Private and confidential." I asked by what authority he, the adjutant general, presumed to receive a confidential report from the district officer commanding in Toronto. He got the report and it backed the side of the city fellows. General Lessard in the report said he did not know whether it would be carried out, but it stated that as the leader of the country fellows was a great Orange Lodge man, and as the minister was an Orangeman they would have to look out. I maintained that there is no minister except myself but would have dismissed General Lessard for writing such a report. However, I let him go on, and paid no further attention to it.

Later on, when the war was under way, I heard that there was some talk from

Washington about a million Germans being ready to invade Canada from Buffalo. My own personal reports showed that there was no such danger, and that the Germans in Buffalo were attending to their business like gentlemen. However, I went and had a talk with a few friends from Buffalo and they told me the report was absolutely without foundation, that there was absolutely no need for a scare. There was also a report that there were thousands of Germans hidden in the cellars of houses in Toronto, who were going to rise at a certain hour, and all that sort of stuff. The whole country was in a panic. When I reached Welland on the Sunday I was told by Major Sharpe that two regiments had been ordered out, that they were to meet in Hamilton that afternoon and patrol the border. I had heard nothing about this when I left Ottawa. No orders for such a thing had been issued from Ottawa, but I thought that possibly instructions had been given and I had not been consulted. There were lots of things done in regard to which I was not consulted and upon which I should have been consulted. But I made enquiries by telephone, and I found that no such orders had emanated from Ottawa. I telephoned to Hamilton for those gentlemen who were turning out the troops, to meet me, and I told them that they were not to turn the men out, that it would be a waste of money to do so and that it would scare the people and stop recruiting. Already similar agitations had done much to hurt recruiting. I believed that these agitations were started by Germans in order to prevent our boys from recruiting, to divert our energies from the front and to keep them at home. When I arrived in Toronto that evening I was met at Sunnyside station by an officer—I may say he was not the colonel of the Queen's Own, he was not even connected with the Queen's Own, though that statement was made at the time—who told me that there was going to be a scare parade of the troops in Toronto on the following day, that the troops were to be called out. I said that it should not be done because it would startle the city. He said that General Lessard had arranged to turn out the troops and let the public believe there might be a German invasion or that the Germans in the cellars of Toronto might rise and loot the city, the object being to show how quickly the troops could be mobilized. I pointed out that we had only a few thousand troops in the city, and that it would be only an exhibition of our weakness. He said, "That is how I feel about it too, but I thought I would take the liberty of reporting the matter to you." When I got to Toronto, I found two officers waiting at the station, one a Queen's Own officer, and another officer, a colonel, one of them—not the Queen's Own officer—came to warn me about this fool movement that was to take place, and I immediately telephoned to General Lessard. I found he was in the Exhibition building, where he was holding a conclave with the Toronto Board of Control. I took him into a room and asked him what he meant by ordering a turn-out. He said it would be an experience. I said, "It will startle the people, a fool proposition like that; don't do it." He said he did not think it would. He promised me that he would put it in the papers in the morning and on the bulletin board making it plain that there was no surprise in the matter and that it was merely for training purposes. He begged me to allow him to go on and on a distinct understanding with General Lessard that he would have the purpose for which the troops were being called out announced on the bulletin boards and in the papers in the morning, and also on the understanding that the Dominion Government would not be responsible for any of the cost, I consented to his carrying his programme out to that extent. I made a mistake; I should have stopped it there and then but on the ground that they had pledged themselves in reference to it and that they would give warning to the people in the morning that it was only a scare which was being created, I permitted it to go on. I did so on the distinct understanding that I have mentioned. That distinct understanding was not carried out and it subsequently turned out that the object of the affair was to get the city into such a state of excitement that the council would be justified in voting $100,000 for the purchase of some rifles, clothing and that sort of thing for the home guards in Toronto. That was the purpose of the whole scheme and I do not think that General Lessard is entitled to much consideration from the Department of Militia and Defence. This talk about his being the best soldier in Canada is a decided insult to many very superior officers in Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal, Winnipeg and other points throughout Canada.

Mr. OLIVER: I was saying that when we are dealing with this tremendous subject of voting a credit of $500,000,000 for the fur-

ther prosecution of Canada's part in the war, now is the time and this is the place——

Sir SAM HUGHES: Would the hon. gentleman allow me to say one more word?

Mr. OLIVER: Certainly.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Long ago General Lessard was requested to go to the province of Quebec where it was stated he had great influence, but I was assured from the province of Quebec that he had none and he himself admitted that he had none there.

Mr. OLIVER:—this is the time and place in which to have it thoroughly understood by the House and the country how far the pledge of Canada made one year ago has been implemented and how far the means which we have provided have been employed in implementing that promise. There was no reservation in the promise made. It was as distinct as words could make it. It was so accepted by the people of Canada, I think, without regard to locality or race. I believe it was so accepted by the Empire and by the Allies. Canada received a great deal of favourable publicity because of the pledge, but we are standing here to-day, more than one year after the pledge was given, and it has not been fulfilled yet. Is the money that we are voting here to-day for the fulfilment of the pledge, or is the pledge not to be fulfilled? That is the question that I think should be answered unequivocally. Some time ago the announcement was made that the Government had in mind certain proposals for what they called National Service, and it was assumed by the public, or at least by a large part of the public, that the National Service proposals had some relation—had indeed a very direct relation—to implementing the Premier's promise. They have been discussed and considered seriously in that sense by people in all parts of the country. The Prime Minister and the Director of National Service made a tour of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific ostensibly for the purpose of explaining these proposals. I hope it will not be discourteous if I say that no explanation was made, that no explanation has been made, and I think here and now is the time and place to make an explanation as to whether or not the National Service proposals are intended as a means of implementing the pledge of Canada to furnish 500,000 men to the Allied army. If that is the purpose, then the country has the right to know it, and if it is not the purpose the country ought to know it and should know it in unequivocal terms from the lips of the Prime Minister.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) that the purpose of the National Service proposals has not been explained to the people of the country. It was explained as fully as we were able to explain it at every meeting which was held. My hon. friend's ideas as to what constitutes an explanation may differ from my own. As to what an explanation is, I naturally must follow my own ideas and my own judgment as I am not fully acquainted with the ideas of my hon. friend in that regard. The idea was to ascertain the available manhood of Canada, their number, their ages, their residences, their employment, their physical condition, with the object of utilizing in the most effective way the human energy, the man power of Canada for the purpose of throwing the full weight of this country into the war. It was necessarily connected with the desire of securing the greatest number of men for service at the front. That is the most important duty of all. We must throw our energy into the proposal to bring the number of men up to the standard already indicated. We must throw our whole energies into that. In addition to that we want to find out what the entire man power of this country is in order that the energy of our people, in so far as it is not employed in service at the front, may be employed in this country for those purposes which are essentially necessary for the winning of the war. That was the double purpose which was embraced in the proposals for National Service. The information asked for on the cards which have been sent out ought to elicit information which would enable the Director General, and the directors of the National Service to place in the hands of the Government data of a most valuable character for that purpose.

Mr. OLIVER: I presume that it is in order at this time to discuss the merit of the proposal as explained by the Prime Minister. What I desire to point out is that if it was intended or expected that the issue of inquiry cards would secure the information that has been suggested as desired, it is obvious on the face of it that it is entirely, not to say absurdly, unsuited to the purpose.

If it was intended to use any degree of Governmental direction or compulsion, if you like, on the individual it was upon the individual who up to that time had not responded to what might be considered the call of duty. The man to whom compulsion was necessary in order that he should do his duty to his country was certainly the man who was not going to respond to the card of inquiry. If the Government's intention was to have knowledge of the manpower of the country, meaning to include those whose disposition did not favour the giving of their services voluntarily, they would necessarily have to use some directive or controlling authority in order to acquire the information. That is done when a census is taken, simply for the purpose of getting information for the general benefit of the country, and having no regard to the possibility of future compulsion applied to the individual. A census is taken under compulsion as to the information given, and that is done as it is the only way to get the information. Surely, when information is desired for the purpose of applying compulsion to the individual in regard to a matter to which he is opposed, compulsion is all the more necessary if you want to get the information. So I say that on the face of it, judged by any possible standard, the Government did not take adequate means to secure the information that the Prime Minister has said they desired to secure, and which the scheme was intended to give them. In that connection let me point out that a census of the three prairie provinces was taken during the past summer, and there was no reason, from the point of view of expense or otherwise, why that census should not have given all the information that it was possible to get, or that could be utilized for the purposes suggested, and without extra expense to the country. Therefore, again I say, although desiring beyond everything not to be discourteous, we in the western provinces who see this work being done as it is being done, when it might have been done, so far as we are concerned, so much more effectively, and at no expense, we will have to be pardoned if we doubt the good faith shown in the pursuance of this scheme. We are compelled by the circumstances to doubt that it was put forward in good faith. If it was not the intention to use for compulsory purposes the information that has been gathered or that it has been attempted to gather by the National Service inquiries—and we have the authority of two ministers of the Crown given directly to the electors that it was not the intention to use it for that purpose—then the Government was very ill-advised not to say so in so many words.

I am going to ask the Government—they have the knowledge, and I ask them to place it before the House—how many people have left this Dominion of Canada for the United States within the last two months, largely as the result of alarm at the possibility or expectation of the enforcement of compulsory service, indicated by the sending out of these cards and by the irresponsible suggestions that have been made from time to time by public speakers and through the newspaper press. I ask specifically for that information. Our immigration agents on the boundary must have the information, or should have it, and it would be very informing to have it placed before the House. I am compelled to say that it seems to me the Government did not appreciate the serious character of the course they were taking. They did not seem to realize that it was possible to alarm a portion of the public by irresponsible and ill-intended talk in regard to military compulsion, while at the same time drawing up a card of inquiry, which on its face, judged by any standard that you can apply from the English language, was not intended as a step towards compulsion or military service. The card was drawn deliberately, purposely, and cleverly for the purpose of not establishing a basis for compulsory military service. It was intended to be used in those parts of the country and with those people that are opposed to compulsory service, while an irresponsible assertion was permitted to be circulated in other parts of the country, where the people were favourable to compulsory service, that the National Service cards were the first step towards compulsory military service. Now the misfortune was, that the people who do not want to give military service are to be found in all parts of the country, and wherever they were found the effect was the same; they took the advice of the hon. the Postmaster General (Mr. Blondin), and departed in large numbers across the line. If it was the intention to mobilize the labour of the country for industrial purposes, particularly with a view to industries related especially to the war, I want to point out that, by reason of the fact that these people have gone across the line, our industrial efficiency has been considerably decreased, simply because the Government undertook to profess to do something that they had no intention whatsoever of doing. The government of this country in a time of war is a

responsibility that does not admit of such executive action as is involved in the so-called National Service proposals.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend seems to look at the National Service proposals in two lights. One portion of his argument was devoted to showing that the proposals did not go far enough, and the conclusion of his argument was apparently based on the assumption that they went too far and therefore had the result of sending people out of this country for fear that the proposals were directly concerned with the idea of immediate compulsory military service. I do not know that a Government is to be held responsible for all the assertions that may be made in unauthorized quarters in regard to proposals of this character; I do not know how such assertions could very well be prevented, whether in the press or otherwise; but my hon. friend must surely know that before the National Service cards went to the people of this country at all, before the National Service Board was ever constituted, there were some people apparently leaving this country through dread of military service, and more than that, there were people apparently prevented from coming to this country as visitors and tourists through the fear of military service being imposed upon them if they happened to be in this country under such conditions. It is impossible to prevent ideas of that kind from getting abroad. When my hon. friend suggests that the census which was taken in the western provinces during the present year gives all the information that is asked for in the National Service card——

Mr. OLIVER: Pardon me, I said that at that time with the same expense the report could have been obtained. At least, that is what I wished to say.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not so understand my hon. friend, I simply wished to point out that information was asked for in the National Service card which was not included in the census and which is really necessary for the purpose of the Government if it purposes to devote its efforts towards utilizing the human energy of this country in the most effective way for the winning of this war. My hon. friend will understand, of course, that some of the questions to which he has alluded are surrounded with difficulties and complexities; that the course of a Government in such matters is not always free from difficulties. The one purpose that we have had in mind throughout the war from the beginning to the end, so long as we depend upon the voluntary good-will of the people of this country, was to have recruiting carried on under such conditions as would ensure the enlistment of the greatest possible number of men. Reference was made this evening by my hon. friend the member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) to the fact that, according to his view, there had not been a careful system in the selection of men; that recruiting had been carried on without due regard, as I understood him, for the service which the particular individual might, at the moment of his enlistment, be performing for the State.

Mr. MACDONALD: What I desired to indicate was that the whole system of recruiting was lax, and not merely in the particular matter to which my right hon. friend refers; that there was apparently no care nor judgment nor system displayed in the method by which recruits were sought

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I cannot agree with that. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) explained the system which he inaugurated in the first instance. If anyone could have foreseen the length of this war and the very great number of men that eventually would be put into the field by Canada, possibly methods more effective might have been employed. I am not prepared to pass judgment on that at the moment. The recruiting proceeded with a great deal of vigour and earnestness, and the fact that we succeeded in the first three and a half months of the past year in recruiting a hundred thousand men or more is an indication that the work was carried on with a good deal of vigour and with a great deal of success. The criticism has been made that proper regard to selection was not made. I discussed that question with the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence more than a year ago—I think in the autumn of 1915 for the first time. The course which my colleague took in that regard was that he did not think at that time that any more systematic method was necessary, and he said that it would be possible, through instructions given to his recruiting officers, to prevent unwise selection, selection which might result in the closing up of industries essential for the prosecution of the war, when recruits might have been obtained from other classes whose work and service were not so essential. I was informed by

General Hughes that instructions had been given in various instances to adopt methods which would give some system to that purpose.

Mr. OLIVER: About what time was that?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think it was in the autumn of 1915 or early in 1916.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Early in 1916.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Early in 1916, I think, and afterwards it was thought better that the purpose could be carried out in connection with other objects in a more comprehensive way by the proposals for National Service, and that is the explanation of the course which was taken. Before this appropriation has been voted, I shall endeavour to obtain some exact information as to the success which has attended the Director General and the Directors of National Service as to the number of cards that have been returned, and I think my hon. friend, the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) will find that the movement has resulted in a much greater degree of success than that which he seemed to imagine from some remarks which he addressed to the committee before the House rose at six o'clock. The object of the proposals was precisely that which I have stated, namely, to find out the number, the name, the age, the physique, the employment, and all the other particulars with regard to the manhood of Canada which would be of service for the purpose of increasing the forces at the front, and also, as to those who may not go to the the front, to direct their energies into the activities which will be most essential for the winning of this war.

Sir SAM HUGHES: In the matter of asking certain localities to let up in recruiting, I was out of the Chamber and did not hear what the First Minister said just now.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I merely said that a question has been raised as to whether selections for recruiting had been carried on with system—as to whether men had been taken whose services would be more valuable on accounut of their training and experience in the occupations which they then pursued than in the military service. Industries have made complaints that men whose training could not be effected in less than two, three or four years were being sent to the front, while men might have been selected from other classes whose absence could be readily provided for.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I would point out, as an instance of that kind, the case of young Rosamond, of Almonte, who was enlisted as a private or a lieutenant. When I found that he was in the service I realized that I could put a thousand men in as privates, but that it would be difficult to get another experienced dyer and cloth expert like Rosamond. I approached him five or six different times with a view to getting him back, because I knew that he would do more good in making cloth. Take one special instance in which I was asked to take definite steps along this line was when the Prime Minister brought up the matter of the Sydney Mines. I took occasion at the time to point out that when I was first acquainted with Sydney Mines they had a splendid, stalwart type of Highland Scotch workers there. The next time I had the privilege of visiting the mines, a lot of German, Austrian and Hungarian workmen were employed in them, these splendid stalwarts having been driven out. I am not blaming anybody, but it is a fact that these men gave place to foreigners. And then certain gentlemen wanted to fill the vacancies with good stalwart fellows that we thought should be given the privilege of becoming volunteers in Sydney. The Prime Minister will remember that I rubbed the delegation up a little about their treatment of these fellows in days gone by. However, I did ask some of the recruiting officers not to take specialists or men expert in certain lines if they could possibly get along without them, or, at any rate, not to bring much pressure to bear upon them. I was amazed to be asked inside of a month thereafter to give one of these very gentlemen who had been asking me to stop the recruiting in that locality the command of a battery so that he might take some of these very men away with him. His patriotism carried him away.

Mr. OLIVER: With regard to the Prime Minister's comparison between the people who left Canada at the beginning of the war and those who left within the last two or three months, I would point out that at the beginning of the war there were economic reasons which took people across the line, whereas no such economic reasons have existed within the last few months. Wages are high enough now and employment plentiful enough in Canada to hold all our people so far as economic reasons are concerned, whereas at the beginning of the war this was not the case. At this time, when there is great need for men, the policy

of the Government is driving men out of the country.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Does my hon. friend think that if refusal to sign the card had been attended with fine or imprisonment the result would have been more satisfactory?

Mr. OLIVER: No, but I think that if the Government had a serious intention of enforcing compulsory service they would have taken compulsory means to that end. They have not taken means to establish compulsory service, yet they have taken such means as have alarmed those who are easily alarmed. The result has been that these people have gone out of the country and we have lost their productive labour. If the Government's proposal merely aimed at industrial results they have absolutely and directly defeated the very purpose they had in view, for they have driven labour away. If the purpose was a military one, they have made no success. I wish to bring forward another point in connection with this proposal which is not a proposal, if I may use the expression. We were depending on voluntary enlistment for the fulfillment of our pledge. As long as we depended absolutely upon voluntary enlistment the response, while it may have been decreasing to some extent, was still very creditable. But when the National Service cards were spoken of, and the idea was given out that the Government was going to take upon itself the responsibility of choosing whether an able-bodied young man should take up a five-dollar-a-day job at home or go into the trenches in France, risking his life and everything he had, naturally nobody was going to volunteer to go into the trenches when he had a fair chance of being selected to go into a munition plant at $5 a day. As a consequence recruiting, to all intents and purposes, absolutely stopped as soon as the National Service proposals were put forward. That is to say, as soon as the Government intimated to the young men who were eligible that it would take the responsibility upon its shoulders, it lifted the responsibility off their shoulders—and they simply sat back and waited. It is an established fact that recruiting has gone down to its very lowest ebb since the National Service proposals were brought in. Any person can establish for himself, by inquiring amongst the men who are affected, the fact that the proposals of National Service, so-called, are directly responsible for that drop in voluntary enlistment. I am quite aware that the Government had no intention of producing that result, any more than they had any intention of driving people across the line. But we should be doing much less than our duty if, having observed certain definite and unquestionable results from a certain course of action, we did not state the facts to the Government and to the country for their information.

Mr. BURNHAM: What remedy would the hon. gentleman suggest? For those conditions exist in France, England, Russia and Italy.

Mr. OLIVER: My suggestion would be that the Government follow its policy of 1911, "Let well enough alone." When we depend on voluntary enlistment we should improve the conditions for voluntary enlistment and not introduce other conditions and other considerations having the effect of absolutely killing voluntary enlistment.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The hon. gentleman said 1911; did he mean it?

Mr. OLIVER: I said 1911.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not think you meant it.

Mr. OLIVER: That was the policy of the Opposition of that day—let well enough alone. Let the Government stick to that policy now. When the people responded as they did respond under the system of voluntary enlistment, the thing to do would have been to find the weaknesses of that system and strengthen it—not abandon it and adopt some new idea.

Mr. BURNHAM: What other idea?

Mr. OLIVER: I cannot give my hon. friend ideas

Mr. BURNHAM: I thought not.

Mr. OLIVER: There are things beyond my possibilities. I say that the part of wisdom would have been to have carried on and bettered conditions for the voluntary system, rather than to have abandoned the reliance upon voluntary service and introduced the idea of compulsory service, without daring to introduce the fact.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend, I think, is overlooking some of the facts as to which he is enlightening the Government and the committee. As a matter of fact, the falling off in recruiting, if I recollect aright, was some months before the National Service cards went out. The recruiting proceeded at the rate of nearly one thousand a day from the 1st of January,

1916, till about the 15th of April; and then, when the spring opened and the seeding and work of preparation for the summer began, it fell off in a very marked degree. I would not like to trust my memory for the figures.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I understood there were 26,000 in the month of June, not a bad falling off.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think that in the middle of April there was a considerable falling off. I do not remember June, but I think it fell off about the middle of April and through May.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The falling off came in August.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think there was a marked falling off in the middle of April, with all deference to my hon. friend. I will find out about that and put the figures before the committee. I remember that my attention was directed to the fact that there were about one thousand recruits a day from the 1st of January until the 15th of April, and that after that recruiting did not proceed on anything like so large a scale. However, I will give the figures to the committee for the whole year, and my hon. friend will see whether or not his conclusions are justified by the facts, of which, at the moment, I am somewhat doubtful.

Sir SAM HUGHES: In regard to recruiting, the Prime Minister is correct in saying that in April we did let up. We had all our barracks and places where soldiers were kept in the distribution system pretty well filled, and when it came on towards spring I did not wish to incur any additional expense for buildings in the transition months between winter and the time when it would be possible to have the men go under canvas, so we left off for a couple of weeks. But I think my right hon. friend will find that the recruiting kept up well, and I know I could have kept it up longer only for this talk of the labour question and National Service, all this piffle about labour. That is what caused the men to stop going to the colours; they said: why should we go to the colours and be shot for $1.10 per day, when the Government may send us to a $10 job in a factory?

Mr. GRAHAM: The question of recruiting is one in which I have taken a good deal of interest ever since the war started. We first had recruiting speakers' leagues, and as many public men as were at liberty to do so placed their services at the disposal of these leagues or organizations. I think they did a good deal of useful work, and, with all humility, I am of the opinion that a good deal of the success of the recruiting in the early days was due to the efforts of men who had only one object in view, that of assisting the cause, and who, without any expense to any one, went from one end of the country to the other, wherever they were asked to go, wherever it was thought that their services would be of benefit, trying to educate, or rather inform the young men of Canada of the seriousness of the situation. At the beginning it was easy, comparatively, because we must admit that even in Ontario the great mass of our first enlistments were from the British-born. That is true, and all honour to them. They understood what it meant. Some of them had had military service before. They had been brought up in an atmosphere where war was, if not ever present, at least not very long absent from them in some degree. The fathers of most of them had seen military service. They enlisted at once without any hesitation, and we were able to send off our first contingent with amazing rapidity. But to our own young men, who had been educated along other lines and trained rather to the conquests of commerce and peace than those of the battlefield, it was a new idea and required a good deal of explanation on the part of public men, or private effort, to convince them that the situation was so serious that they ought to give up their employment and go to the front. The end of results from this effort seems to have arrived. I am free to admit, though I have been attending some of these meetings quite recently, that the apparent results from these efforts are now a bit discouraging. Whatever the reason may be I do not know; but the young men who ought to go but have not gone seem to find some reason or excuse for not going; argue as you will. They will agree with your argument, but will not carry it out in practice. Just what is the best step to take in order to renew activity, to give new life, call it new leadership if you like, I am not prepared to advise this House. Perhaps if I wished to raise a controversial question, I could give advice as to how I think new life could be infused into the whole thing.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Go ahead.

Mr. GRAHAM: Some say it ought to be a national government. Well, it ought to

be some other than the present Government anyway; I think that would help a good deal.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Did you say a Nationalist Government?

Mr. GRAHAM: No; they want to take the "ist" out of this present Government. Every other Government of the Allies has turned itself inside out in order to get out of the rut, to give new life and new vigour; but our Government seems to lag in that respect and rather hesitates to cease being a Government. But that is not what I intended to say along this line—I was diverted by the Prime Minister. At another time I will discuss that perhaps more fully.

Now as to the National Service: I am free to admit that I think a mistake was made in the way in which the selection of the National Service Board was gone about. I think that these men ought to have been selected irrespective of how they voted—so long as they were for the war—from the biggest men we could find in the Dominion of Canada. I think the second error was made in paying the men selected for this service. I was astonished the other day to find that most of these men were accepting $250 a month for being members of the National Service Board. The men that ought to be on that board, if results are to be obtained, are men whom you could not hire with five times $250 a month if you were paying them for their services. In Canada, I believe, there are at the present time thousands of men who would have been glad to do that for the great cause without any money. There are hundreds doing as much without any pay, and paying their own expenses all over the country. And the selection of these men and the payment to them of $250 a month for this bit of work, whatever they may accomplish, rightly or wrongly, has given the public the idea that there is a flavour of making jobs for party friends. That is not a National Service.

All that kind of thing should be cut out as far as possible. There are men, known for scores of miles from the point at which they reside who, I believe, would be willing and glad to undertake this work. I will not criticise the personnel of the board; I only wish to say that there are men on that board who are not known twenty miles from where they reside, who are not conversant with the conditions even in their own locality. These men do not bring the dynamic force to their work that the Government ought to have in this National Service scheme if it is to accomplish anything. I am not speaking disparagingly of these men, but it is a great cause in which we are engaged. The nation's life depends upon it, and personal feelings or personal regard must be set aside because that for which we are fighting is too great a thing to be influenced in any way by such considerations. I say again, without any wish to criticise the individuals themselves, that the National Service Board has not in some instances, men who command influence even in the districts in which they reside. I do not know what work the members of the board have to accomplish as members, but I do know that the Director General, full of energy, full of steam, has gone through the country, and up and down, expounding the National Service scheme, accompanying the Prime Minister. But so far as I can ascertain, and I am speaking as one acquainted with several localities in which there is one of these directors—I have a more intimate knowledge of the territories in Ontario in which some of these men are located than they themselves—they have not the influence, the far-reaching, strong, gripping influence that some big outstanding man in the locality would have who would be willing to serve his country gladly without being placed on the pay-list of the Government under the present circumstances.

Here are one or two little items that affect recruiting in detail.

10 p.m. One came before me just recently. A woman has three sons, two at the front, and the youngest boy ready to go. The two at the front are missing. It is the policy of the department, whether it be the law or not, to give to the person at home the pay assigned by a missing soldier for a period of three months after he is reported missing. This woman, who has two sons missing, received the assigned pay for December—I think it was for December, but the month is immaterial—for the month in which the son was reported missing, and she was told in a letter from the department, that she would receive it for the three months following. But before the next payment becaue due, she was notified from Ottawa that the paymaster had stopped the payment of the assigned pay. I have the correspondence in my possession. That poor woman has another son missing, and I submit in that particular locality, that one circumstance alone will injure recruiting more than anything else that could take place, because the mother is the one whose heart is torn most by seeing her boy go away. In this particular case she had sacrificed her

three sons, two of whom were missing, and this is the condition with which she is confronted. Under what circumstances could the paymaster stop that assigned pay? I take the position that once that pay is assigned, it ceases to be the property of the soldier who assigns it, and that neither the department nor the paymaster has any right to violate the contract with the mother by stopping the assigned pay of that soldier.

Another little thing came to my notice—these matters may seem small, but you have to recruit men by individuals, and not by the hundred, and everything that tends to dishearten the mothers of these boys at the front will affect the recruiting of other mothers' sons more than anything else.

Mr. HAZEN: What reason was given in the correspondence for stopping the pay?

Mr. GRAHAM: No reason whatever; the letter simply stated that the paymaster had ordered the assigned pay to be stopped.

Mr. KEMP: There was surely some reason assigned.

Mr. GRAHAM: I assure my hon. friend that no reason was assigned.

Mr. KEMP: I would be glad to have the correspondence.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have the correspondence, and I have asked the department for an explanation, because none whatever was given. That is one case, and I suppose there are scores of cases in which not only is the mother's heart being broken but financial stress is being caused. These mothers are telling their story to everybody in that particular locality, with the result that recruiting is bound to be affected.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I may say that sometimes I have correspondence in regard to administrative matters where some mistake has been made, or some misunderstanding has arisen, and the course I take is to bring the matter at once to the attention of the minister in order to have it remedied.

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister knows that I have bothered him considerably about these things. This matter is before the department now, but we are here discussing the question of recruiting, and it is a case which I think is of sufficient importance to bring to the attention of the House.

Sir HERBERT AMES: Usually, in the case of a missing soldier, the assigned pay is continued for three months, and the separation allowance for thirty weeks. At the end of thirty weeks, the man is officially declared dead, and the pension commences. Meantime the Patriotic Fund looks after the family.

Mr. GRAHAM: I shall come to that in a moment. I am not going to depart from the facts I have stated. I have the correspondence, and have talked the matter over with the family. I immediately took the case up with the branch of the department immediately concerned. I wrote for particulars, and am waiting for a reply. Nevertheless, the case is as I have stated it.

Another matter brought to my attention concerns what is known, I think, as work pay. I received a letter a day or two ago from a gentleman who said he had been waited on by several men who complained to him that as skilled mechanics—he named several callings, such as blacksmiths, and horseshoers—they had been given the pay of the ordinary private with an equal amount added which was called work pay. That was paid to them for quite a time, but without any preliminary notice they were told that the work pay would cease, and they were given the option of returning home, if they desired discharge, or of remaining in the service with the pay of a private. That was not the understanding on which these men joined the service, and they feel that they have a grievance. I am not arguing about the merits of the grievance; I am pointing out that such small matters affect recruiting, and that if these men have a grievance they tell it to their neighbours here, there and everywhere. We who are endeavouring to do our best to induce men to enlist meet these complaints, and it is not an easy thing for us, who are not in the inside, to explain why it is or how it is that such things are done. In short, Mr. Chairman, I think it ought to be, as possibly it is, the aim of the Government to err on the generous side, even if it costs a little more money, and to keep absolute faith with the men who go to the front. Furthermore, we must absolutely keep faith with the families whom the men leave behind; that is, perhaps, more important. We are discussing that question now, and we will be discussing it more and more as the soldiers return, but it is just as important at the present time and perhaps more important that we should take care that, as far at least as our contract is concerned, the family of the man whom we have induced to go to the front is not neglected.

As to the Patriotic Fund, my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) deserves a good deal of credit for the work he has done in connection with it I am not going to criticise the Patriotic Fund but just let me express an opinion. They are making appeals now for the Patriotic Fund. I am glad I represent half a county that, I think, does as well as any county in Canada. Consequently, I will be excused for saying a few things. We have too many societies with good aims, with aims that are laudable but with results that are not satisfactory. There is not a day now in which any one of us, upon going down town, when we are at home, does not encounter some person who presents some method of contribution. No man who is a man objects to contributing to any fund that is going to help forward this cause; no man who is a man objects to contributing anything which will bring comfort or consolation or aid to the soldiers at the front. But there is a diffusion of effort that some force ought to grapple with so that we will not have that diversity that does injustice to those who are doing work without getting the desired results. I could bring to the mind of the committee many instances, but my experience is the experience of a great many members. Well-intentioned women of the best families in Canada undertake work laudable in its purpose but they do not accomplish the results that they ought to get for the effort or expenditure of cash, merely because there is no direction to all these things. Perhaps it would be a little awkward if one were to go so far as to say that no society ought to undertake work for the war, where the question of raising money is concerned, unless it was authorized by the Government so that it would have the official imprint.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Would my hon. friend apply that to proposals coming from abroad sometimes, such as the fund in aid of the sailors?

Mr. GRAHAM: The Government should approve of it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Make it general?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think so.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not suggesting that it should not be general.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have been met on the streets of one city by a poor woman who said that she was selling shoe laces on behalf of the soldiers. It was nonsense; she was not doing anything of the kind. But we have so many of these societies that if the Government would take them in hand and at least say to the public that any society that has not the authorization of the Government is not working along the lines upon which we wish to have it work, it might have a good effect. I started out to say that we have many splendid women whose energies are not being rewarded to the full merely because they are not properly directed.

Sir HERBERT AMES: While the hon. gentleman (Mr. Graham) is examining the documents I have sent to him, I want to put myself on record as most heartily agreeing in what has been expressed by him in reference to the necessity of some organization of charitable and patriotic enterprises in Canada. They have found it absolutely necessary in England and they have passed the War Charities Act, 1916, making it illegal for any so-called charity to collect money for patriotic purposes unless they have been examined, certificated and authorized by the Government. They realize in England that in every patriotic endeavour it is quite important to have proper supervision and not to have wasted effort, and I entirely agree with what has been said that something of the kind ought to be done here.

Mr. GRAHAM: I take strong exception to some of the methods that were adopted in distributing the Patriotic Fund and the funds of the various societies. I have a strong view that the wives and families of men who are at the front are not under any obligation to us. We are under obligation to them. They are making more sacrifices in affection than we are in money. No matter how good the disposition is, when either a man or a woman goes to the family of a soldier who is at the front and in some unpleasant way pretends to guide the affairs of the family, treats them as wards not knowing why they are getting this money and intimating that if they will be good they may get some more, it is a misuse of the purpose of these funds. It is all wrong. These families are entitled to all we can do for them, and it is not our business to be criticising the internal economy of their homes. I go that far. However, I am glad to say that as much of that is not being done now as was being done formerly.

Sir HERBERT AMES: It is being done much more tactfully now.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have had the wives of soldiers come to me quietly at meetings and make the complaint that while they were glad to receive the fund as they could not live without it, yet they were often humiliated by the acceptance of it. One lady put it to me in this way: I wish I could get along without it because every time they come to my house they treat me as if I were receiving some charity which was being doled out to me.

Sir SAM HUGHES: As if they owned the country.

Mr. GRAHAM: As if they owned the country and as if the men who were fighting for the country were of some inferior caste. I am saying this in the hope that the conditions to which I refer may be altered and that my words may be of some use. These are only a few of the things that have hampered our recruiting. I am anxious to go on and do anything I can along the line of trying to get our full quota of men. But I have come to the point where, unless the Government can give me some new idea, some new line, some way of getting up steam, some way of getting out of the rut, of putting the question in a new light, I am afraid that recruiting speeches are going to be futile. I do not intend to quit; I propose to keep going on so long as I can be of any assistance, but it is going to be slow work unless we can get some new impetus, some new dynamic force, by which the people can be aroused. But, in order that we may arouse the people, we must first arouse ourselves, and if we are in a rut, for Heaven's sake, let us get out of it and lead the people along the right path.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is a good deal of force in the suggestion of my hon. friend, that there should be some control over the creation of funds. It may not be very easy to deal with it, but it seems to me that, in view of the occurrences during the past two or three months, matters that have come under my own observation, it will be the duty of the Government to consider whether or not some measure should be proposed to Parliament, or action taken under the War Measures Act for that purpose. I agree also that such instances as my hon. friend has alluded to, where a mistake is made in the administration of some branch of the Department of Militia and Defence, possibly through the oversight of some official, create an unfortunate impression that may be detrimental to recruiting; but it is absolutely impossible to prevent these things happening sometimes. The only thing the Government can do is to remedy them in the most effective way when cases are brought to their attention.

I rose for the purpose of calling attention to the actual figures for recruiting for 1916. I have here a statement which has been handed me by an hon. gentleman in the House. I have not had the officers of the department verify it, but it is obviously in the form in which such official statements are sent out, and the figures given here correspond with my recollection. The figures are: January, 1916, 29,212; February, 26,658; March, 32,819; April, 23,289. I have seen the figures from the 1st to the 15th of April, and from the 15th to the 30th; I have not them here, but I will get them; but I am sure the recruiting began to fall off about the 15th of April. The figures for the rest of the year are: May, 15,090; June, 10,796—not 26,000 as my hon. friend (Sir Sam Hughes) seemed to imagine—July, 8,675; August, 7,267; September, 6,337; October, 6,005; November, 6,509; December, 5,796; making a total for the year of 178,453. I should be surprised if the figures for January, 1917, did not show a considerable increase over those of October, November, and December last year. in fact I should be disappointed if they did not.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Are not the figures for January this year largely made up of timbermen and railwaymen?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not know precisely how the figures are made up, but I say that the figures for January this year will exceed those for October, November or December of last year. The figures I have quoted for last year include Construction, Labour and Forestry Battalions, so that if the figures for January this year do happen to include timber men and railway men, as my hon. friend suggests, they will include precisely what has been included in the figures for the past year.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is not the First Minister aware—he is well up in matters of this kind—that many more battalions of this kind are being raised now than formerly?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The battalions are being raised precisely in accordance with requests that have come from the British Government, and not otherwise. When they ask us to raise these battalions we endeavour to raise them, and unless they do ask us to raise battalions of this char-

acter we do not attempt to raise them. So the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) will see that the falling off in recruiting was not coincident with the sending out of the National Service cards. They were sent out about the end of December, I believe. The falling off in recruiting is, therefore, more coincident with certain demonstrations on the other side of the House in the early part of April last year. If we are to adopt the theory of post hoc ergo propter hoc we should have a different conclusion from that which my hon. friend from Edmonton has arrived at.

Mr. MACDONALD: When was it decided to abolish the system of obtaining recruits by billets?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not aware of the precise date.

Mr. MACDONALD: They stopped last spring.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think the billeting system was designed altogether for winter months. In the summer the men are trained in camps. The falling off in recruiting, then, really began in the spring, at about the date I have mentioned, and it was obviously due to the conditions which began to prevail at that time in connection with preparing the land and getting ready for spring operations. Whether rightly or wrongly, I attribute it very largely to that cause.

Mr. LOGGIE: When I addressed the House last year, I appeared in the character of a doubting Thomas, because I intimated that in my opinion recruiting was falling off, and when the Prime Minister asked in what locality, I said all over the country. If I were to say that I am a doubting Thomas to-night regarding the effect of the National Service cards, I should simply be expressing the conviction of my own heart, that the results that were hoped for from the signing of these cards will not be obtained, because I believe in a great many districts the men that could go and ought to go will not sign the cards.

Mr. MACDONALD: The slackers will not sign.

Mr. LOGGIE: If a man is unwilling to do his whole duty to his home and country, he is not very likely to sign a card which may bring home to him that duty more effectually. So far as I am concerned, I had pleasure in sympathizing with and confirming the statement made by the right hon. the Prime Minister, that Canada should send at least 500,000 men to the field of battle. I am still more convinced that that number does not represent the full duty of the Canadian people to-day. Personally, I cannot see any difference between the duty of a Canadian living here in Canada to defend his home, and the duty of an Englishman, Scotchman or Irishman to defend his home in the United Kingdom. If 42,000,000 people have placed in the field of battle 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 men to defend the United Kingdom, equal to ten per cent of the population, are we doing our full duty when we say we will attempt to raise only five per cent? For 400,000 men is about five per cent of our population of 8,000,000. We are not doing one-half as much as they are doing in the old land, and the natural question arises, what can we do to better the situation? The Government of the day have undertaken to find out the number of available men fit, or probably fit, for the front, as well as the number of men available for the industrial work of the country. I take issue with hon. gentlemen who say that a man is fulfilling the same duty to his country whether he works in a munitions factory or works on a farm or whether he dons the khaki and takes his life in his hands in defence of home and country. The representatives of the people should make it clear to the people that the highest duty of any man who is fit is to don the khaki and fight. Whilst it is important to get men to work in munitions factories, I have no doubt that you can get many men who are unfit for going to the front who might very well be educated to work in munitions factories; and if young men are not available for such work, I am sure the women of Canada will come to the rescue and aid in that very important class of work.

Unless there is something behind the situation that we do not se at present, my opinion is that the Government of the day, instead of issuing the National Service cards —because they will certainly not get the names of a great many men who should go to the front—should enforce the Militia Act and call out the militia for home defence and train them and make them fit, and then, if the situation should become any more tense than it is at present, the Government could send them across the seas in defence of home and country. In that way I believe they would aid the Empire and give a greater impulse to recruiting throughout the land. Because if those young men don the khaki under the Militia Act

and are trained and made ready for the front, other young men will be encouraged to enlist, perhaps not under the Militia Act, but under voluntary enlistment as it is carried on at present.

Some reference has been made to-night by hon. gentlemen, to the fact that the services of competent officers have not been utilized in the defence of our country. I can best illustrate that by an example. In my county, there is a gentleman who has been a militiaman practically all his life, who has, I think, attained to perhaps the highest standards and who has, I know, trained himself for the highest commands. I refer to Colonel McKenzie, and I know the ex-Minister of Militia is well acquainted with the gentleman to whom I refer. This gentleman, instead of being in khaki and commanding a battalion at the front, is doing his ordinary civil duties in the town of Chatham.

Sir SAM HUGHES: How old is Colonel McKenzie?

Mr. LOGGIE: I should think he is not quite as old as the commanding officer who recruited a battalion with headquarters on the north shore of New Brunswick.

Sir SAM HUGHES: How old was he?

Mr. LOGGIE: He was upwards of sixty years of age, and I understand the gentleman who recruited that battalion, took it over to England and is now coming back to Canada. I am sure, if it had been Col. McKenzie's good fortune to have given his services to the recruiting of that battalion, he would not be coming back to Canada but would be sent across the channel to take charge of his men on the field of battle.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Did not his son go?

Mr. LOGGIE: One of his sons went, and perhaps the ex-minister has noticed in the papers within the last few days that he has received the D.S.O.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I think that one of my last official acts was to make him a colonel.

Mr. LOGGIE: That is very nice, but it does not make up the shortage in the other regard.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The trouble with Mercereau was that he had three sons fighting, but he was the best man of the lot. The other has two sons fighting and both of them claimed they were better than the old man.

Mr. LOGGIE: The fact is that the old gentleman is coming back on account of illness. After the battalion was practically completed, there was a desire in New Brunswick to recruit a Highland Battalion, and again this gentleman to whom I refer as a capable militiaman was overlooked, and the commanding officer was a returned soldier, Col. Guthrie. I have nothing to say against anyone, but the results are very discouraging at the present time. The battalion is known as the 236th McLean's Highlanders, and while recruiting has been going on since early last summer, only some 400 men have so far enlisted, and the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) tells me that men went all the way to Edmonton seeking recruits for that battalion. Now, there must be something wrong. The commanding officer apparently has not the drawing power that another commanding officer might have. At any rate, it is to be regretted that this Highland battalion now recruiting at Fredericton, N.B., is not getting more recruits, and I regret that the services of Col. McKenzie have not been utilized. This war has been going on now for over thirty months and Col. McKenzie's services have been offered to the Militia Department. Why they are turned down, gossip says one thing, and I would perhaps be getting into politics if I went into that.

Mr. CARVELL: You might find the true reason if you did.

Mr. LOGGIE: I might find the true reason, but I am timid.

I want to refer to another little matter that I think tends to discourage recruiting, and I ask the attention of the Minister of Militia (Mr. Kemp) whom I take very great pleasure in congratulating on his elevation to that high office. This letter is dated January 25, and refers to Sergeant Edward Bernard, formerly of my home town, who was killed in action in October last, leaving a wife and four or five little children. I will read a paragraph from the letter:

> As due to the fact that the Secretary of the Militia Council has not yet supplied Mrs. Bernard with the certificate of death, she has not been able to collect any of her husband's insurance, nor has she since his death had any pay or separation allowance. Mrs. Bernard is therefore in need of money and would like the matter of the pension quickly settled so that she may get her affairs somewhat straightened out. She has a family of small children depending on her and I trust this matter will receive your immediate attention.

I have taken this matter up with the secreary of the militia council, and I expect favourable action in the matter, because I fancy that there has been an omission on the part of an official or an employee of the department. An omission of this kind tends to discourage enlistment. I may say that I shall be delighted to aid the Government in any possible manner to encourage enlistment. I think that if they would put into force immediately that part of the Militia Act which provides for the calling out of men, they would help along the cause for which we are all striving. Then they could go on with the National Service idea and get out of it everything that there is in it. I hope that all persons whether they are fit for military service or not, will return their cards. Although I am above military age, I signed and returned my card for the sake of the example.

Mr. NICKLE: If the lady to whose case the member for Northumberland has directed attention will make application to the Pensions Board, by signing one of the forms supplied by the Pensions Commissioners and submitting her marriage certificate as well as the birth certificates of her children, her pension would automatically be granted. Before she can get the pension it is necessary that she should make application to the board. I understand that the hon. member does not suggest that she has directed the attention of the commissioners to the fact that she is deserving of a pension.

Mr. LOGGIE: Application was made for her, but the necessary form was not supplied.

Mr. NICKLE: If the hon. gentleman will be good enough to let me have to-morrow the name of the deceased soldier and of the widow, I promise him that attention will be directed to the matter at once. The regulations of the department provide that where a man is reported missing, as distinguished from dead—I am referring to the case of a private—the assigned pay is paid at the rate of $15 a month, separation allowance at the rate of $20 a month, and Patriotic Fund allowance at the rate of $5 a month. I am assuming that in this case there are no children. At the end of the first three months the assigned pay ceases, but the separation allowance and Patriotic Fund money continue. At the end of six months, if nothing has been heard of the man, the pension is granted. Then, from the eight months' pension payable—six months being the regular pension and two months gratuity—the sums paid as assigned pay, separation allowance and Patriotic Fund money are deducted, and the balance goes to the widow. In the case to which the member for South Renfrew directs attention, if the letter that he speaks of has been written there must be some misunderstanding or some fact of which he is not aware.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Pension is granted from the date of death.

Mr. NICKLE: Certainly.

Sir HERBERT AMES: Every branch and sub-branch of the Patriotic Fund in Canada voluntarily and gratuitously acts as agent for people who wish to apply for pensions. Every branch has the necessary blank forms and whenever a death occurs the widow is communicated with, is told that she can obtain the form and is instructed how to fill it out. The Patriotic Fund branch then endeavours to help her secure her pension, which she succeeds in getting within three or four weeks from the date of death.

Mr. PROULX: Is the Pensions Board bound to follow the rules laid down last year by the committee which dealt with the question of pensions? Last August a soldier from my county was killed. His foster-father is an invalid and unable to earn a living for himself and his family. The regulations provide for granting a pension to a de facto wife or to the children born of the de facto wife of a soldier. I think that the claim of a foster-father to a pension is as meritorious as that of a de facto wife.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The recommendations of the committee on pensions last session were put in force by order in council, but with the understanding that at this session a Bill should be introduced. That Bill has been prepared and will be introduced. Some question has arisen as to whether the recommendations of that committee might not need some addition or modification, and it is probable that when the Bill is introduced it will be again referred to a committee, presumably the same committee that dealt with the subject last year. The whole subject may then be taken into consideration and a conclusion arrived at as to whether the recommendations made last year should be modified or added to in any way. When that committee is constituted the suggestion which my hon. friend has made will be a matter for consideration.

Mr. PROULX: Will this committee be appointed before recess?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not sure whether the Bill is quite ready, but if it is there is no reason why it should not be read the first and second time and submitted to the committee at once. Possibly we may be able to overtake it.

Mr. COPP: Do I understand from the Prime Minister that it was recommended by the Pensions Committee that an invalid father whose son, his only support, had been killed at the front would receive a pension? For instance, in my county there is an elderly man who has been an invalid for years and unable to work. His two sons went to the front. One of them was his only support and looked after the father and mother. Both sons have been killed. I received a letter from this man to-day asking if there was any provision by which he would receive a pension under those conditions.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My friends who are members of the committee inform me that it is a question as to whether the father was mainly dependent on the son who was killed.

Mr. COPP: Entirely dependent.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Then, as I understand, he would be entitled to a pension.

Mr. MICHAUD: In case that man were able to partially support his family and himself, would he receive a partial pension to supplement what he could earn himself?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I suppose it would depend on the question whether he comes under the expression "mainly dependent."

Mr. OLIVER: I wish to bring up a matter that may require an amendment to the existing legislation or orders in council. It is the case of a homesteader who has a son and daughter. The father and the son volunteered. The daughter is fifteen years of age and the father at the time of his enlistment secured a separation allowance for this dependent daughter of $20 a month. On that understanding he and the son enlisted. The farm is, of course, abandoned while the men are in the service of the country, and the daughter is dependent on the separation allowance and whatever pay her father and brother can let her have. Comparatively recently an order in council was passed to the effect that the child of a soldier could receive an allowance of only $12 a month, consequently this girl is now receiving only $12 a month instead of the $20 separation allowance which she did receive at the time her father and brother enlisted. I brought the matter to the attention of the department, and was simply told that the order in council provided that a child could get only $12 a month. I submit that is not encouragement to recruiting, that it is not fair play, and that the Government of Canada is not keeping faith with the men who are making sacrifices for the good of Canada and of the world.

Sir HERBERT AMES: A delegation from the Patriotic Fund had an interview with the minister himself as soon as he assumed office and went carefully over that matter. We are given to understand that there is under advisement a change which will be brought into effect shortly by which one child will be given $20 and two children $30 and so on, and that the allowance will also be graded up according to rank. That is now under consideration, and I have seen a draft form of what they expect to put through.

Mr. OLIVER: I want to say, as emphatically as I can, that when the Government of our country breaks faith with our soldiers—

Sir HERBERT AMES: You are quite right.

Mr. OLIVER—as faith was broken with this man and his son, damage is done to recruiting that nothing can repair.

Mr. MACDONALD: I should like to point out a case which has caused a great deal of dissatisfaction in a country district of my constituency. A young man enlisted and received an assurance from a clergyman who was one of the recruiting officers, that his sister, the only relative he had in the world, who lived on the farm with him and depended on him for support, would receive a separation allowance. The man went to the front, and is now in France with the 106th regiment. I received a letter from him complaining that his sister did not receive the separation allowance, and complaining bitterly of the bad faith of the recruiting officer who made the promise to him.

I wish to follow up what my hon. friend pointed out. On one occasion about a month ago four ladies came into my office, all of whom had relatives in the 106th regiment. Every one of these people was

dependent upon the separation allowance and assigned pay from husband or son; every one of them had had trouble in regard to pay. The pay was coming irregularly, and in some cases had stopped altogether. I brought the matter to the attention of the Militia Department and one of the cases has been straightened out. But you can well understand that, where you have four ladies with grievances of that kind talking in the community in which they live, there will not be much enthusiasm amongst the wives and sisters of other men who ought to go. Only to-day I received a letter from a man who is an adjutant in the 185th. This man was a clergyman who gave up his church and went out in the ranks and is now an adjutant. His wife is living in my county and has not received for the last three months, since he went to England, a single dollar of assigned pay or separation allowance. These cases are not isolated. Every member has numerous cases, and they seem to have become more frequent of late. I know that they are due to faults of certain under officials, but it seems to me that, in regard to regiments that have been broken up and lost identity, the greatest possible care should be exercised in regard to the paymasters so that the identity of the men should not be lost track of. Some supervision should be given to the transfer of the pay so that there will not be an interim in which some poor soul away back home has to suffer, particularly in our Canadian winters, because she is not getting the little money she depends on. How can you expect enthusiasm among the plain people of the country when you have cases like this right under their noses? It is no wonder that recruiting falls off.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The instances to which my hon. friend refers are, of course, regrettable. He must remember that there is a great number of cases to be dealt with, and I imagine that the proportion of instances in which there has been any mistake is not very great.

Mr. MACDONALD: In almost every case the trouble occurred where regiments were broken up and the paymasters did not look after their own.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I agree that where a regiment is used as a draft or depot regiment there should be the greatest care, and I can understand how some cases may have occurred through the lack of that care.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

I suppose that my hon. friend has brought all these cases to the attention of the department?

Mr. MACDONALD: Yes.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I understand that every effort is being made to try and minimize that trouble as much as possible.

Sir HERBERT AMES: One word in connection with failures to receive assigned pay and separation allowance: Every member of this House has had cases of that kind brought to his attention and they seem a good many; but there is not a very large number compared with the immense number of men who have enlisted. We have had a great number of cases brought to our attention in the Patriotic Fund, so many, in fact, that we have had to keep one member of our staff here in the office entirely to deal with rectifications of those matters.

But complaints of that nature are becoming less and less all the time, and we are satisfied that the department is becoming more and more careful in dealing with assigned pay and separation allowances. A great many mistakes occurred at the outset through errors on the part of the paymasters. The paymasters of several regiments went to England, taking their pay rolls with them, and it was not until we had them cabled back that the office here could work on the assigned pay and separation allowances. In those cases the mistakes were due entirely to the ignorance of the paymasters who were new men. Then, a great many men who enlisted failed to fill out the necessary cards for their separation allowances and assigned pay. Quite a number enlisted as single men who were really married, but who were afraid to say that they were married because they thought they would not be accepted. These matters have occasioned some trouble, but we are getting things rectified. In a general way our fund exists to obviate hardship on part of the families. Where avoidable mistakes occur, as they do occur sometimes, and when it is brought to the attention of one of our branches that a woman is not getting her assigned pay or separation allowance through some reason not explained, she need not suffer, because the Patriotic Fund will give her all the money she needs until the rectification is made.

Mr. OLIVER: I see several members of the Pension Committee of last session in the House, particularly my hon. friend from

Kingston (Mr. Nickle), who is very active, and, I presume, is in close touch with the Government. I recall that that Committee discussed at some length a suggestion or arrangement that the succession of the pension to the service pay should be automatic; that is to say, that the service pay should continue until the pension began. If I remember rightly, that suggestion was discussed in the committee, but on representations being made that it would not be advisable to make such a hard-and-fast rule, and that the Pension Board would undoubtedly see that in fact that provision was left open, no recommendation was made by the committee in regard to it. That is my recollection of the case. My information is that there have been a great many cases in which the service pay has stopped and the pension has not begun for months and months, with the result that men have been left absolutely stranded, receiving neither service pay nor pension. I submit that in fairness and justice, and having regard to the views of the Pension Committee of last year, it is obligatory upon the Pension Board to see to it that that condition does not exist in any case. I submit that the suggestion that there are many difficulties in the way is not a sufficient answer in such a case as this. It is a matter in which the honour of Canada and the future of Canada are absolutely concerned, particularly the future of Canada's participation in the war, and I say that no excuse is acceptable for such a condition.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is a matter that I would like to bring to the notice of the Minister of Militia so that he may be able to give us some information upon it to-morrow. In that part of the country from which I come there are a number of English miners employed in the mines, and from time to time many of them go back to England to visit their friends. When war broke out quite a number of these men happened to be in England, and instead of coming back to Canada to enlist, they enlisted in the Old Country, leaving their families in Canada. Some of these men were killed, but as they had enlisted in the Old Country there was no record of their enlistment in Canada, and there has been a great deal of difficulty in getting that provision made for their families which they would have received if they had enlisted in Canada.

Mr. KEMP: Did they join our forces in England?

Mr. McKENZIE: No, they joined English regiments, and they were killed while fighting with English regiments. What I desire to ask the minister is whether there is any working arrangement between the department and the authorities on the other side in connection with those men who were really Canadians, but who joined the English forces on the other side, so that provision may be made for their families. There was one case—I do not remember the name of the man—in connection with which I had some correspondence with the department. This man was killed and left a widow and two children. The British authorities have been sending a portion of the pension to the two children, but they have made no provision for the mother; and I propose to bring the circumstances of the case before the department to ascertain whether something cannot be done to put that family in the same position as they would have been in if the father had joined our own forces. To all intents and purposes, these men were Canadians, and their families are still in Canada. We should try to look after them, and see that they are placed at no disadvantage because the husband happened to join the forces on the other side. I hope the minister will be able to give us some information to-morrow or some other time on this point.

Mr. KEMP: There is no working arrangement to cover the situation to which my hon. friend refers. These men joined the British Army, though their relatives are in Canada. Notwithstanding that fact, we intend to take up these cases on behalf of the relatives in Canada, and to correspond with the War Office, or with whatever authority deals with such matters, with the view of having the cases straightened out. Whether a board will be established later on, such as was established in connection with the South African war, remains to be seen after the war is over.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at 11.07 p.m.

Friday, February 2, 1917.

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

ARBITRARY FIXING OF PRICES.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 21, to amend the Criminal Code.

Mr. HAZEN: Explain.

Mr. KNOWLES: The purpose of this Bill is to make it an offence for a manufacturer, selling goods to a wholesaler, to enhance or dictate in any way, by agreement or contract, the price at which the goods shall be sold. If the Bill is favourably considered by the House, the result in my opinion will be an immediate reduction of from 5 per cent to 10 per cent in the cost of many of the foodstuffs we consume. I have in my hand quite a number of these price-maintenance agreements, commencing with the E. B. Eddy Company, which the wholesale men are compelled to sign. These agreements dictate and bind in the most ridiculous and heartless way the wholesaler as to the price and conditions under which he shall sell the goods he has purchased. The object of this Bill is to prevent the continuance of that condition, and to leave the wholesaler or retailer, when he has purchased the goods, free to call them his own, and sell them for what he pleases.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GOVERNMENT GRAIN ELEVATORS.

CANADA GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 22, to amend the Grain Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. KNOWLES: The Dominion Government has now gone into the elevator business, having elevators at Moosejaw, Saskatoon, Calgary and Vancouver. The business is carried on between the Government and the farmers; the Government is also an employer of labour. I am seeking legislation to the effect that any claims against the Government shall be adjusted in the ordinary courts of the province, and also that the Workmen's Compensation Act shall apply to these Dominion Government employees just as it applies to the employees of any ordinary elevator company. The present system of having the claims brought before the Exchequer Court is very inconvenient and expensive, and the object of this Bill is to bring His Majesty into the same relation to his employees as is the ordinary subject who is engaged in this business.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

[Mr. Knowles.]

SUPPLY—INTERIM VOTE.

On motion of Hon. Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance), the resolutions adopted by Committee of Supply were read the second time and concurred in.

WAR LOAN—$500,000,000.

House again in Committee to consider the following proposed resolutions.—Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

1. That it is expedient to provide that a sum not exceeding five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000) be granted to His Majesty towards defraying any expenses that may be incurred by or under the authority of the Governor in Council during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1918, for:—

(a) The defence and security of Canada;

(b) The conduct of naval or military operations in and beyond Canada;

(c) Promoting the continuance of trade, industry and business communications, whether by means of insurance or indemnity against war risk or otherwise;

(d) The carrying out of any measures deemed necessary or advisable by the Governor in Council in consequence of the existence of a state of war; and

(e) Payments made for the said purposes during the fiscal year ending the thirty-first day of March, nineteen hundred and seventeen, in excess of the amounts authorized by The War Appropriation Act, 1916.

2. That the Governor in Council be empowered to raise by way of loan, temporary or otherwise, such sums of money as are required for the purpose of making any payment authorized by any Act founded on these Resolutions.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): I have just received a letter from the parish priest of Port Daniel East, the Rev. J. Philippe Cyr, in which he calls attention to the fact that one of his parishioners, a young man named Joseph Doiron, has enlisted, leaving at home a wife and six young children, the eldest of whom is ten years, and the youngest nine months. His wife receives only $20 a month separation allowance. The parish priest wants to know if anything can be done to relieve this woman, either under the law as it stands, or from the Patriotic Fund.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Has the soldier assigned say part of his pay to his wife?

Mr. MARCIL: According to this letter, all she gets is the separation allowance of $20 a month.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Perhaps it would be worth while finding out whether she receives any assigned pay.

Mr. MARCIL: In the meantime, if she is not receiving it, will this woman have

to be content with $20 a month? The right hon. gentleman will understand that if he wants to stimulate recruiting he will have to be a little more generous than that.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not quite clear at the moment whether there is any power to insist on a soldier assigning part of his pay to his family. I understand, however, that the Patriotic Fund makes provision in cases such as my hon. friend has mentioned.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I would ask the hon. member for Bonaventure if that woman has applied to the Patriotic Fund at Riviere du Loup. If she belongs to the district from Montmagny down to Gaspé, and would apply to the branch of the Patriotic Fund at Riviere du Loup, of which I am president, she would receive $50 a month from the Patriotic Fund.

Mr. MARCIL: I understand that those along the coast of my constituency would come under the Restigouche branch of the Patriotic Fund, with headquarters at Campbellton. This soldier is named Joseph Doiron. His number is 889720. He enrolled on February 23, 1916, with the 189th Battalion at New Carlisle. He has since been transferred to the 22nd Battalion, which is now at the front. His wife's name is Elizabeth Langlois, and she has six children. These particulars are given in a letter I have received from the parish priest at Port Daniel East.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It would appear that if pay were assigned and if the ordinary allowance were made from the Patriotic Fund, this woman would be receiving something over $50 a month, as my hon. friend says she is already receiving $20 a month separation allowance. I have some recollection that an order in council was passed, empowering us to deal with cases where a soldier at the front refuses to assign his pay. I am informed by the deputy minister that there is an order in council which provides that if a man is married and has a family, one-half of his pay will, on application, be retained and paid over to his family while the man is serving at the front. Perhaps the reason that has not been done in this case is that the woman has not brought the matter to the attention of the department. Will my hon. friend say whether that has been done or not?

Mr. MARCIL: On reading the letter a second time, I see that it says the only amounts she has received is the separation allowance. I will hand the letter to the right hon. gentleman or to the Minister of Militia so that the case may be investigated.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If the matter were brought to the attention of the proper officers of the department, and if the matter were also brought to the attention of the Patriotic Fund, it is perfectly obvious that the family in question would be receiving something over fifty dollars per month, instead of twenty dollars per month. That really would be a more effective way of dealing with the matter than bringing it to my attention in the House of Commons, because I never heard of it until my hon. friend mentioned it.

Mr. TURRIFF: Would the Prime Minister say as a matter of information if a soldier's wife who has six children dependent upon her receives the same separation allowance as the soldier's wife who has no children?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I understand that, so far as the separation allowance is concerned, no distinction is drawn, but so far as the Patriotic Fund is concerned, there is a distinction.

Mr. MACDONALD: I would suggest the desirability of having printed in short form for distribution amongst the members the rules regarding separation allowance. I put a question on the Order Paper to which I yesterday received a lengthy answer intimating that certain orders in council had been passed at different times; but it was impossible to gather any information from that answer without looking up the orders in council. It would facilitate matters if the department would have printed for members of this House a succinct statement of conditions in regard to separation allowances.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. gentleman's suggestion is a very good one. I understand he does not want the printing of the orders in council, but the printing of their purport. The deputy minister informs me that the orders in council are being printed now, but it might be more convenient if the purport of them in simpler form were printed and distributed. The deputy minister informs me now that what I have just mentioned is also being done.

Mr. OLIVER: I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister of Militia another

matter similar to the one which I brought up last night. I received this morning a letter in regard to a case affected by the order in council that I mentioned. A civil engineer, who sacrificed a valuable business to enlist, entered an Edmonton battalion as a lieutenant on July 3, 1915. He was promoted to be a captain in December, 1915. He was wounded at Pozières on September 13, 1916. He had a dependent and invalid mother and a young child; he had no wife. His sister kept the child and took care of the mother, receiving a captain's separation allowance of $40 per month up to the passing of this order in council, and since that time she has been receiving $12 per month only on account of the child. The writer says:

"My brother, Captain ————, has offered without hesitation his life and possessions and no doubt the country will deal generously with him in return."

I think it is hardly generosity to cut down the captain's separation allowance to an allowance of $12 per month under those circumstances.

Mr. KEMP: The large number of combinations that can occur in respect to separation allowance and similar matters is surprising. We are trying to consolidate them and the regulations are being printed not only in respect to separation allowance but in respect to other things. I am to-day having certain other regulations printed which I purpose having distributed amongst the members, in respect to requests for leave, which come under different headings and are being continually changed. Improvements are being made from time to time, and I hope that in time all these cases will be covered. That is all I can say to-day about the matter.

THE ROSS RIFLE—DISCUSSION IN COMMITTEE.

Mr. CARVELL: I notice from the report of yesterday's proceedings in this House that the Prime Minister, in giving the War Estimates for 1917-18, includes an amount of $2,660,000 for the Ross rifle. There should be some declaration on the part of the Government as to its policy on this question, and I want to review the matter very hurriedly. First of all, I desire to assure my right hon. friend that I do not intend to hark back to what has taken place regarding the Ross rifle. Some one has blundered and a great loss has resulted to Canada, I believe, in men, and we know, in money, but I do not desire to discuss that phase of the question. Before this session is over an opportunity should be given to discuss that phase, and I think an investigation should be held to find out who is actually responsible for the very unsatisfactory condition of affairs which existed.

It was with some surprise that I listened to the Prime Minister yesterday, and I wondered if I had heard him aright. I find I did, because there appears in Hansard this morning a proposed appropriation of sufficient money to purchase 80,000 Ross rifles during the coming fiscal year. In order to have a clear understanding of the situation as to the Ross rifle in Canada, as we understand it and as we are able to conclude from documents placed in our possession, I desire to refer hurriedly to some of the documents found in Sessional Paper No. 44, being a return laid on the table of the House regarding the Ross rifle.

We know that there was a great deal of discussion on this subject in the country, and in this House during the last session of Parliament. In discussing the Estimates in the month of March, 1916, I remember making the statement that I had been in favour from the beginning of the manufacture of rifles in Canada, and that until I had some absolute knowledge that the Ross rifle was not satisfactory, I did not feel like criticising it; but it was criticised by many hon. members, and there was a great deal of discussion about the matter both in the House of Commons and in the press. It seems that in the month of May there appeared in the Ottawa Citizen an article which I think must have led to the discussion in the House. While I was not here at the time, I find that the article appeared on the morning of the 15th of May, 1916, and that on the 15th, 16th and 17th days of May a great deal of discussion over the Ross rifle took place in Parliament. The substance of the statements was that there had been difficulties with the Ross rifle on account of jamming, but that as the chamber had been enlarged, it was hoped that that difficulty would cease to exist.

Then we find some correspondence which began some time in May, and finished about July 11, and which shows that the Canadian Government were asked to send no more Ross rifles to England. In this correspondence the first communication is a cablegram from the Governor General to the Secretary of State for the Colonies:

Ottawa, June 5th, 1916.

Secret. Following from Prime Minister for Sir William Robertson. By reason of rumoured dissatisfaction with Ross rifle I held consultation with General Hughes on 15th May and sent unofficial message to Commander in Chief that we were prepared to leave matter to his judgment after making all necessary tests of both rifles under such conditions as are experienced at the front. We suggested that men making tests should be of equal experience. Ross rifle is only arm we are equipped to produce in Canada at present and we believe it efficient if properly used, but are content to abide by judgment of Commander in Chief after thorough investigation and adequate tests. We realize absolute necessity of two conditions: first, that men shall be armed with thoroughly efficient rifle; second, that their confidence in such rifle shall be unshaken. Please let me have your judgment as to proper course to pursue.

On the same day there was a communication from the Prime Minister to the High Commissioner. It is somewhat along the same lines as the foregoing, but, as a new element is introduced, I wish to read it:

Ottawa, Ont., June 5th, 1916.

Perley, Dominion,
London.

Secret. Please ascertain whether British Government have finally and definitely decided on new rifle, or whether they propose before final action to study lessons obtained in present war. If new type of rifle has been finally adopted we are prepared after suitable investigation to adopt it if found satisfactory, so that our rifle in future will be of same type as British. In that case British order for Ross rifles might be cancelled and new order for one hundred thousand rifles new type given instead. Cost of machines and gauges for new type of rifle would approximate five hundred thousand dollars, and this cost might be equally divided between two governments. Am making this suggestion because of continued criticism of Ross rifle which undoubtedly creates lack of confidence. No rifle however efficient is useful unless it commands thorough confidence of men.

Borden.

The answer to the Prime Minister from the High Commissioner was as follows:

London, June 8th, 1916.

Prime Minister,
Ottawa.

War Office considers except trajectory the new Lee-Enfield now being made in United States is as good as any weapon that could be made with present experience and in present war apparently high trajectory no particular disadvantage. Lessons obtained in present war have evidently not brought any new experience so far as rifles are concerned. Not considered possible say definitely what rifle will be finally adopted by British Government after war. Hardly to be expected that War Office would under present circumstances definitely commit themselves regarding their future service rifle. Master General Ordnance considers rifle now being made for them in United States exceedingly good weapon and would be glad see you use same pattern. Question of money arrangements would have to be taken up officially, but personally should consider that of minor importance.

Perley.

So, it would seem that as early as the 8th of June, 1916, the War Office, through the acting High Commissioner in London, indicated pretty strongly to this Government that they would like the Government to manufacture the Lee-Enfield rifle then being manufactured in the United States. We have no evidence before us as to when the manufacture of this particular mark of the Lee-Enfield rifle was begun in the United States, but it must have been after war was declared. So it is plain that between August, 1914, and June, 1916, that is, within a period of less than two years, a rifle satisfactory to the British Government had been devised, the machines for its manufacture provided, and shops erected, and that they were actually turning out a rifle in the United States which met all the requirements of the British War Office. On the same day as the communication I have just quoted, there was this other cablegram from the High Commissioner to the Prime Minister:

London, June 8th, 1916.

Prime Minister,
Ottawa.

Confidential. Have shown and discussed with Aitken your secret cable to Chief General Staff. Question will now doubtless be settled by him. Have seen him personally today and impressed strongly as possible upon him your views regarding necessity thorough test and also that Canadian Government would need official documents giving full facts and statements which could be made public if thought desirable. Also impressed upon him that Ross rifle is only one which Canada can produce at present and that if our troops are re-armed at front it naturally would raise question whether Canada should continue manufacturing Ross rifle, and if not some alternative feasible plan would have to be suggested. Showed him copy your cable 5th regarding new type rifle which I answered this morning. Whole question will doubtless be thoroughly considered within next few days.

Perley.

There is a statement from the High Commissioner that the whole matter would be discussed and thoroughly considered within the next few days. The natural inference is that a decision would be arrived at within a few days after that date. I have only two more communications to read in order to lay before the House the complete record so far as this branch of the matter is concerned. Here is a cablegram from the High Commissioner to the Prime Minister:

London, June 5th, 1916.

Prime Minister,
Ottawa.

Your cable 24th ultimo. Have communication from War Office covering letters recently received from Commander in Chief Armies in France, who reports efficiency Ross rifle thoroughly tested by actual fighting in field, that he has again consulted General Officer Commanding Second Army in case fresh points have come to light during recent heavy fighting by Canadians near Ypres. Latter states his experience working Ross rifle during last fight has only confirmed his opinion that Canadians in Third Division have lost confidence in their rifle, and he recommends that rifles this Division be exchanged. Sir Douglas Haig remarks that although reports from Second Division not to same effect he is of opinion Lee-Enfield rifle should be issued to all three divisions Canadian Corps. Army Council agree with this opinion and have approved his proposal to exchange rifles second and third divisions for Lee-Enfield pattern and steps will be taken forthwith effect exchange. Army Council hope be able utilize Ross rifles released from France, also those in possession Canadian troops England, for other purposes connected with war. They would be glad if steps could be taken stop any more Ross rifles being brought to England, it being understood they thereby make themselves responsible for supplying necessary rifles to Canadian troops on arrival here, and they see no reason to doubt being able do this. Army Council add should Canadian Government be desirous undertaking manufacture rifle of different patterns suitable for use during present war, in their opinion rifle made same pattern as now produced in United States for British army, which is on lines Lee-Enfield, Mark III, embodying improvements, probably best one to adopt. Mailing copies correspondence. War Office wishes this matter regarded as secret until July 15th.

Perley.

Between 8th June and 5th July, the general commanding the forces in France, Sir Douglas Haig, had been asked by the authorities in England to make a report upon this rifle. The object was to put them in a position to give a satisfactory answer to the Canadian Government. I think that any hon. gentleman who reads the correspondence will come to the conclusion that this was the object. A report was made by Sir Douglas Haig, and evidently this must have been in the hands of the High Commissioner before he sent his communication to the Prime Minister.

This report is not very lengthy, and I purpose reading it. It is addressed to the Secretary of the War Office, London, and is as follows:

General Headquarters
British Army in the Field,
28th May, 1916.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that I have satisfied myself, after extensive inquiries carried out throughout the Canadian corps, that, as a service rifle, the Ross is less trustworthy than the Lee-Enfield, and that the majority of the men armed with the Ross rifle have not the confidence in it that is so essential they should possess. The inquiry on which these conclusions are based, was the outcome of an urgent application from a battalion of the third Canadian Division for re-armament with the short Lee-Enfield rifle, in consequence of a high percentage of jams experienced with their Ross rifles during a hostile atack on the 1st May, 1916.

2. I am accordingly of opinion that the second and third Canadian Divisions should be re-armed with the short Lee-Enfield rifle. It will be remembered that the first Canadian Division was so re-armed on the 12th June, 1915.

3. I am not in a position to effect this with the means at my disposal in France. I have the honour to inquire, therefore, whether the necessary number of rifles can be supplied from home sources, without interfering, or delaying, the arrival and arming of the divisions due from England and Egypt on which I am relying.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
(Sgd.) D. Haig, General,
Commanding-in-Chief.
British Armies in France.

Sir Douglas Haig, evidently on account of communications which had passed between the Canadian Prime Minister and the Acting High Commissioner for Canada, was called upon for a second report. This report, dated June 21, 1916, is as follows:

Sir,—In reply to your No. 77/15/5307 (M.G.O.) of 10th June 1916, forwarding a copy of a telegram dated 7th June, from the Governor General of Canada, I have the honour to inform you that the efficiency of the Ross rifle has been thoroughly tested by actual fighting in the field, and the application conveyed in my O. B. /174 of 28th May 1916, was made after very careful consideration of all the evidence available.

2. I have again consulted the General Officer Commanding Second Army in case any fresh points had come to light during the recent heavy fighting by the Canadians near Ypres. He tells me that his experience of the working of the Ross rifle during the last fight has only confirmed him in his opinion that the Canadians in the third Division, at all events, have lost confidence in their rifle and he recommends that the rifles in this division be exchanged.

3. Although the reports from the Second Division are not to the same effect, I am of opinion that the Lee-Enfield rifle should be issued to all three divisions of the Canadian Corps.

I must therefore adhere to my recommendation that the second and third Canadian divisions should be re-armed with the short Lee-Enfield rifle, and I would urge the necessary steps to give effect thereto be taken without delay.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
(Sgd.) D. Haig, General,
Commanding-in-Chief,
British Armies in France.

I wish to read also the following communication from Mr. Bonar Law to the Governor General of Canada, dated at London, July 11, 1916:

With reference to my telegram June 10th. Report from General Officer Commanding in Chief in France has now been received by Army Council recommending that second and third Canadian Divisions should be re-armed with short Lee-Enfield rifles and Army Council have approved this. They hope to be able to utilize Ross rifles released and also those now in possession of Canadian troops in England for other purposes connected with the war, but ask that no more Ross rifles should be brought to England. Army Council will be responsible for supplying necessary rifles to Canadian troops on arrival in England. If your Government desire to undertake manufacture of different rifles suitable for use during war, Army Council think that rifles now being produced in America for British Army on lines of Lee-Enfield Mark 111 but with improvements would be best.

(Sgd.) Bonar Law.

This correspondence from the official file shows that on July 11, 1916, the British Government had decided that no more Ross rifles should be used in the field, that they had all the Ross rifles in England that they required and that they specifically requested the Canadian Government to send no more of these rifles to England. There does not seem to be any intimation in the correspondence that the Ross rifle could be improved or changed so that it would meet the requirements of the War Office. I shall not go into the question of whether the chamber was too large or too small, or whether there was something wrong with the bolt, because probably every member has received or seen letters from soldiers at the front in which the defects were pointed out. In view of these facts, I think we have a right to ask the Government what course they intend to pursue. We have an army which, we are told, numbers about 400,000 men, and it is up to the Prime Minister and to every man in Canada to see that within the next six months that army shall number 500,000 men. These men will have to be armed. It is evident from the correspondence that since July 11, 1916, the British army has been looking after the arming of our troops in the field. The question arises: are we to continue to manufacture rifles in Canada, or not? In the month of July last a statement appeared in the press to the effect that the Government had made arrangements with the Ross Rifle Company for the manufacture of Lee-Enfield rifles, and up to the last three or four weeks I believed that the Ross Rifle factory had been employed in that work. I have no official information on the subject, but I am told that the Ross Rifle factory is not manufacturing Lee-Enfield rifles. Indeed, I am informed that no move has been made towards remodelling the Ross plant for the purpose of manufacturing Lee-Enfield rifles. According to the cablegram sent to the Prime Minister by the Acting High Commissioner, the remodelling of that plant for the manufacture of Lee-Enfields would involve an expenditure of only half a million dollars. In the United States they have been able to remodel a plant within a very few months, get all the necessary tools, and turn out Lee-Enfield rifles in large quantities. The Government were advised eight months ago that if they wanted to continue the manufacture of rifles they should manufacture Lee-Enfields such as are turned out in the United States. Unless my information is very much at fault—I do not think it is, but if it is my right hon. friend will correct me—no attempt has been made to manufacture anything but Ross rifles. We have the statement from the Prime Minister that the Government intend to continue manufacturing Ross rifles and an amount has been placed in the Estimates for the next year to provide for the manufacture of 80,000 of them. The time has arrived when the Government should take the members of the House, the people of the country and, above all, the Canadian soldiers, into their confidence respecting their intentions as to the arming of our army. This is a question much bigger than a matter of dollars and cents. It goes to the very root of recruiting and of national confidence in our ability to play properly our part in winning this war. It is the most important thing which is before the Canadian public to-day, and until the matter is cleaned up recruiting will not be as it should be. I shall not dwell upon what Canadian soldiers have said in letters from the front; I do not think it would be patriotic to do so. Besides, these letters would not look good in print. While it is true that the soldier may grumble over a very small matter and that the Ross rifle may have been a very good arm in many ways, yet a prejudice has sprung up against the further continuance of the Ross rifle as the national arm of Canada. If the Government are going to continue the manufacture of rifles, as I presume they are, they ought to tell us what they are going to do about it. Personally, I was not in Parliament when the contract with the Ross Rifle Company was made, but the matter

came up on very many occasions in 1905, 1906, and 1907, when I was in Parliament. I was always in favour of manufacturing rifles in Canada, and I am just as strongly in favour of manufacturing rifles in Canada to-day as I was in 1905, 1906, 1907 and 1908. The very fact that we have a factory in Canada that has turned out the finest target and sporting rifles in the world is evidence that we can manufacture rifles in Canada. The fact that we have in the city of Quebec a factory that has turned out 1,000 rifles a day is all the evidence we want that we can manufacture rifles, and on a very large scale. The whole difficulty with regard to the Ross rifle seem to be in the breech mechanism, something regarding the bolt and the chamber. While that is a very important part of the rifle, when it comes to the question of manufacture, to the cost of manufacture and to the complications of manufacture I cannot see that it is at all an insurmountable difficulty. It seems to me that we have only to change over that portion of the chamber, and make a Lee-Enfield chamber, bolt and magazine, instead of a Ross bolt, chamber and magazine; and if we have the plant in which we can manufacture a rifle of any kind, surely we have a plant which, with a small additional expenditure, and with some application of brains and ability could manufacture the rifle which the British Government tell us they would like us to manufacture. They put it as plainly as the English language can make it. They would like this Government to enter into the manufacture of the improved Lee-Enfield rifle, the same as in the United States. We know that in twenty-four hours the British Government would furnish this Government with the sealed pattern, and with the standard rifle. I do not know how long it would take—I suppose it would take some months, but not very many months to convert our Ross factory into a Lee-Enfield factory. I ask, and I do not think I am asking anything that is confidential, have the Government taken any steps to manufacture any other rifle than the Ross rifle in Canada; have they taken any steps to convert the Ross rifle factory into a Lee-Enfield factory; have they done anything to get us out of the unfortunate position in which we find ourselves; or are they simply going to manufacture 80,000 more rifles in Canada and turn out an arm which, according to the official representations, does not inspire our troops with confidence, and which is not taken to England at the request of the British Government.

I hope the Prime Minister will appreciate that I approach this question in no controversial spirit. I have not tried to go into any of the difficulties that have existed heretofore. I am simply asking him, in the interests of Canada, and in the interests of the troops of Canada, whether he will take the country and the House into his confidence and tell us what the Government have done. I think I might go so far as to ask him to tell us what they propose to do, and whether they intend, in the first place, to carry on the manufacture of rifles in Canada, and if so, whether it is to be the Ross or the Lee-Enfield rifle.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think the request of the hon. gentleman is a very reasonable one, and I entirely appreciate the spirit in which he has approached the subject, and the general tone of his remarks in regard to this very important matter. The merits of the Ross rifle have been a matter of discussion in this House on various occasions during the past ten years. I recollect very well when I was on the other side of the House—I think my hon. friend was not then in Parliament.

Mr. CARVELL: I was. I was not a member when the contract was signed, but I was here during all the discussions.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend will recollect then the various reports that were placed before the country and their general character. I do not think there was any doubt in the minds of members that, as a marksman's rifle, there was no better rifle in the world than the Ross rifle. I recollect that the consideration which impressed me at the time was whether or not the rifle as then ordered was of a sufficiently strong type to endure successfully the wear and tear of active service. I believe that certain portions of the rifle, which were thought to be weak, were afterwards strengthened, and the contract was acted upon Rifles were ordered from time to time, and thus the situation presented itself to the present Administration at the outbreak of war.

It might be proper for a moment to advert to the contract which was made by the former Government and which had to be taken into account by the present Government when it came to deal with the question. I am not referring to this by way

of reproach, but merely in order that the House may be possessed of the character of the contract that was made, and thus be enabled to understand what the contractual position was as between the Government, on the one hand, and the Ross Rifle Company on the other. The contract reads as follows:

Memorandum of Agreement made in duplicate this 27th day of March 1902.

Between

Sir Charles Ross, Bart., of Balnagowan, hereinafter called the Contractor, of the first part.

and

His Majesty the King, represented by Honourable F. W. Borden, Minister of Militia and Defence for the Dominion of Canada, hereinafter called the minister, which expression as herein used includes also the successors in office of the said Minister of Militia and Defence, His Majesty so represented being hereinafter referred to as the Government, of the second part.

Whereas it is considered in the general interests of Canada that the rifles required by the Government for the purposes of Militia and Defence should be manufactured in Canada and whereas the contractor has proposed by himself or his assigns to undertake the establishment and operation of a suitable factory in Canada for the manufacture of such rifles, and to supply the Government with the rifles so required manufactured at said factory and delivered at a cost to the Government, not exceeding that which the Government would have to pay for similar rifles purchased by or for the Government as heretofore in the English market.

This agreement therefore witnesseth, and it is agreed by and between the Contractor and the Government, as follows:—

1. The contractor is to establish at or near the city of Quebec in Canada a factory for the manufacture of rifles, with the necessary plant.

2. The contractor undertakes to deliver to the Government between the first day of January, 1903, and the first day of January 1904, 12,000 rifles manufactured at the said factory corresponding and equal in every respect to a standard sample rifle which is to be approved by the minister, such rifles to be delivered by monthly even quantities, as nearly as may be of 1,000.

3. The Government shall be bound and entitled to purchase from the contractor all rifles required for the use of the Government during the continuance of this contract. The contractor agrees that if the Government so desires and signifies its desire in writing on or before the 30th day of September in any year after the year now current, the contractor will deliver to the Government within the year following the next succeeding first day of January a number of rifles not less than 10,000 manufactured at the said factory, such rifles to be delivered by monthly even quantities, as nearly as may be, of not less than 800. If during the year the Government shall require any number of rifles in excess of the number hereinbefore specified for that year, the Government shall immediately notify the contractor of the additional number required, and the contractor shall do his utmost to manufacture at the said factory and to deliver to the Government all such rifles as may be reasonably required, and if need be he shall operate the factory at any time twenty four hours per day, and he shall if required, furnish the total output of the said factory to the government; provided however, that in case of war, actual or threatened, or any national emergency, requiring in the opinion of the Government, the immediate supply of additional arms, the contractor upon receiving any notice or demand from the Government for any number of rifles specified to be urgently required in view of this proviso shall, within thirty days after receiving such notice or demand notify the Government in writing of the number of rifles which he will undertake to furnish in accordance with such notice or demand, and the Government shall not under any circumstances be bound to purchase from the contractor in respect of any such notice or demand, any number of rifles in excess of the number which the contractor so notifies the Government that he will be able to supply.

4. All the said rifles hereby contracted for are previous to delivery to be inspected by the Inspector of Small Arms of the Government of Canada, and upon such inspection the same rifles being found up to sample as aforesaid, delivery shall be taken as complete at the factory.

5. If at any time or from time to time, the Government should desire to have any changes in or modification of the rifle to be manufactured and supplied by the contractor, the Government may give to the contractor at least twelve months notice in writing, specifying such changes or modification, and requiring the contractor at the expiration of the period of such notice to manufacture and deliver rifles so changed or modified, and the contractor shall therupon be bound upon and after the expiration of the said period, to manufacture and deliver the rifles subject to such changes and modifications, and the said standard sample rifle so furnished as aforesaid shall in respect of all rifles to be delivered after the expiration of the said period be deemed to have been altered or modified in accordance with the changes or modification specified by the said notice.

6. If a new rifle shall be invented which the Government shall desire to adopt or use the Government may furnish to the contractor a standard sample of such new rifle, and give the contractor twelve months notice in writing, requiring that the rifles to be delivered by the contractor upon and after the expiration of the period of such last mentioned notice shall correspond to the standard sample of such new rifle so furnished, the Government to protect the contractor against any actions for infringements of patents so far as such new rifles supplied to the Government are concerned, and upon and after the expiration of the said period all rifles to be delivered by the contractor shall accordingly correspond to such substituted standard sample, and the contractor agrees to originally lay out and adapt his plant, machinery etc., so as to provide the best facilities which can reasonably be foreseen to enable him to apply the same to the manufacture of any such new rifle which may be desired.

7. The Government shall furnish to the contractor, a standard sample rifle mentioned in the second clause of this contract, on or before the 10th day of April, 1902. If for any reason such standard rifle should not be furnished until after the said date, the said contractor shall, if he so desires, be entitled to equivalent extension of the time herein provided for manufacture and delivery.

8. The Government shall pay for the said 12,000 rifles mentioned in the second clause of

this contract at the rate of $25 for each such rifle. The Government shall pay out of the moneys to be appropriated by Parliament for the purpose for all rifles subsequently ordered as herein stipulated the same price of $25 for each of such rifles, unless one of the parties hereto shall upon the occasion of any such demand for further rifles notify the other of such parties that the price of such rifles in similar quantities in the markets of Great Britain has relatively to the present time increased or diminished, in which case the aforesaid price of $25 shall no longer govern, but the price for the rifles so ordered and to be thereafter ordered shall depend upon a further agreement of the parties, and in default of agreement the price to be fixed as provided in the 9th clause hereof. The price of all rifles herein contracted for or to be supplied pursuant to the provisions of this agreement shall be payable upon delivery; provided however, that after the establishment of the said factory and supplying of the plant for the running of the same, the contractor shall be entitled to payment in advance of delivery of moneys actually expended upon the rifles or parts thereof or fixtures therefor, to be delivered in that year upon a statement certified by him of the amount so spent upon establishing the fact of such expenditures to the satisfaction, testified by his signature of such statement, of the Government Inspector of Small Arms, such payments in no case to exceed 75 per cent. of the price of such rifles, the contractor undertaking whenever such advances are made, to insure and keep insured said rifles, parts and fixtures against loss or damage by fire for the benefit of the Government to the extent of such advances.

9. Provided, however, that in case of any changes in or modification of the rifle to be manufactured by the contractor, hereunder, pursuant to any such notice as aforesaid, or in case of the adoption by the Government of a new rifle to be invented as aforesaid, the price to be paid shall be the price above named, or such price increased or diminished by a sum to be agreed upon between the Government and the contractor, having regard to the question as to whether such changes or modification increase or diminish the cost of production, or in the case of the adoption of a new rifle, a price to be agreed upon between the Government and the contractor; provided, further, that in default of agreement, the amount of such increase or diminution of the price, as the case may be, shall be settled by two experts, one of whom shall be chosen by the Government, and the other by the contractor, whose decision, if unanimous, shall be final, while in the event of a difference between them the two experts so named shall name a third, and the decision of any two of the three shall be binding; it being the intention of this agreement that the price of the rifles furnished hereunder shall so far as is possible be the same as that of similar rifles in like quantities purchased by or for the Government from the British manufacturers in the open market in England and delivered in Ottawa.

10. The contractor shall be permitted to import into Canada all tools and machinery not manufactured in Canada up to the required standard necessary for the said factory, and also all material, or parts in the rough, unfinished, to be used in rifles to be manufactured by him for the Government free of duty, or in the case of payment by the contractor of any duty on any such tools, machinery or material or parts aforesaid, the contractor shall be entitled to a drawback or remission of the amount so paid; provided, also, that the contractor shall be entitled to import free of duty or shall be entitled to drawback or remission of duty paid in respect of the finished parts to be used in any such rifles, consisting of screws, nuts, bands and springs; and provided, further, that if at any time during the continuance of this contract the demand of the Government for rifles shall be such as to make it necessary for the contractor to enlarge the capacity of his factory then the machinery plant and material imported by him for that purpose, not manufactured in Canada up to the required standard, shall similarly be entitled to free entry, drawback or remission of duty.

11. The contractor shall not be bound to deliver at the time specified in the case of strike or in the event of unforeseen occurrences beyond his control preventing manufacture, but in such cases the contractor shall have an equivalent extension of time, he hereby undertaking to resume work as soon as possible.

12. The standard sample rifle to be approved by the minister, as provided in paragraph 2 of this agreement, and all standard samples substituted therefor pursuant to this agreement shall remain in the custody of the minister.

13. Any notice to the contractor, hereunder, shall be deemed to be well and sufficiently given if the same be left at the contractor's office or mailed in any post office to the contractor at the said factory.

14. This contract is hereby, pursuant to the provisions of the 16th section of chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, made subject to the express condition that no member of the House of Commons of Canada shall be admitted to any share or part of such contract or to any benefit to be derived therefrom.

15. This contract shall enure to the benefit of and shall be binding on the executors, administrators and assigns of the contractor, and where the context admits any reference, therein to the contractor shall be taken to extend equally to his executors, administrators and assigns.

16. The wages to be paid in the execution of this contract shall be those generally accepted as current in each trade for competent working men and working women in the district where the work is carried out.

In witness whereof the contractor and the minister have hereunder set their hands and seals at Ottawa aforesaid the day and year first above written.

Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of
(Sgd.) Charles L. Ross (seal)
(Sgd.) L. F. Pinault.
(Sgd.) F. W. Borden (seal)
Minister of Militia and Defence.

The contract, after it was made, was assigned with the sanction of the Government to the Ross Rifle Company, and at the present time it is therefore a contract between the Ross Rifle Company, the assignee of Sir Charles Ross, and the Government of Canada. I have read the contract in order that it might be known from its terms that

no period was fixed for its termination. The Government is advised that the contract therefore continues indefinitely, the Government having no power to bring it to a conclusion.

I appreciate the fact, and I do not want to minimize it, that the contractor, Sir Charles Ross, and the company which he afterwards organized, were required to incur a very considerable expenditure in establishing a rifle plant in Canada, and it was therefore necessary to give them a contract of long duration, as otherwise no person could be expected to invest his capital in this country for such a purpose, considering that the company would have to depend, outside of its contract with the Government, upon such orders as they might be able to obtain for sporting and other rifles not designed for military purposes. The rifle has gone through various stages of development. First of all there was the Mark 1, as to which some criticism was made, and there were suggestions as to its improvement by expert officers of the Government. The defects, whatever they may have been, pointed out in that way, were supposed to be remedied by the adoption of the rifle known as Mark II. Criticism having also arisen of that rifle, and certain defects having been found, an endeavour was made to eliminate them by the adoption of the Mark III, which is the rifle mentioned in the correspondence that my hon. friend the member from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) has read.

Now, the Ross rifle factory was the only factory in Canada capable of producing rifles for military purposes when the war began. As a matter of fact this should be said, and it is to the credit of Sir Charles Ross and of the Ross Rifle Company that it can be said, that, after the outbreak of war, I understand that factory was more successful in greatly increasing its output than any other factory on this continent. I believe that the increased output which that factory developed in at least the first year and a half of the war was very much greater than the increase in output which was shown by any of the great rifle factories in the United States.

With regard to the extent of orders given by the Government, I might as well clear that point up at once, and the House is certainly entitled to the information. The Government of Canada have ordered since the outbreak of the war 290,000 rifles, and the Ross Rifle Company has delivered to the Government of Canada since the outbreak of the war 218,547 rifles. There remains to be delivered 97,590 rifles, upon orders already given.

Mr. CARVELL: There seems some discrepancy there.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, there is an explanation here. The discrepancy in the figures is due to an order for 30,000 rifles which was placed before the war, and of these 26,137 were delivered after the outbreak of the war.

Let me refer for a moment to the situation as it presented itself to the Government in the summer of 1915. My hon. friend and other hon. gentlemen have referred to the criticism which Sir John French made of the rifle, and I think it is just as well at this stage that I should allude specifically to Sir John French's report, because in the light of that report the House and the country must judge of the steps which the Government took when that report had been communicated to them, and when, in consequence of it, the first Canadian division was armed with the Lee-Enfield instead of the Ross rifle.

I want to emphasise that point right here; I do not want hon. members in this House or any one in the country to forget it. Whenever we were told by the competent authorities at the front that it was in the interest of the Canadian soldiers that the Lee-Enfield rifle should be substituted for the Ross rifle on any occasion, the Government of Canada have always assented and placed themselves within the judgment of the military authorities at the front who ought to know better in respect of such matters than we, sitting around a council board at Ottawa, could possibly know. So, when it was proposed in the summer of 1915 that the First Division should be re-armed with the Lee-Enfield rifle, for the reasons stated in Sir John French's report, we, of course, interposed no objection, and the First Division was re-armed with the Lee-Enfield rifle. Let us see what Sir John French said about the rifle. His report which has been brought down and laid on the table of the House is as follows:

Confidential.

From the Field Marshal, Commanding in Chief, British Army in the Field, to the Secretary, War Office, London, S.W., General Headquarters, June 19, 1915.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of War Office letter No. 77-15-5209 (A.5), dated 16-6-1915, regarding the action taken by

me in the matter of the Ross rifles of the Canadian Division.

2. The circumstances are as follows:—

I had heard rumours that there was a growing want of confidence in this rifle, as evidenced by the fact that the infantry of the Canadian Division were taking every opportunity of exchanging their rifles with those of the Lee-Enfield pattern from casualties on the battlefield.

3. To satisfy myself whether there was any real justification for this state of affairs, without at the same time lending encouragement to the idea that the Ross rifle was unsatisfactory, such as might have resulted from an investigation by the divisional authorities, I gave instructions for the assembly of a small committee at my general headquarters to test the rifle with the various natures of ammunition in use, including ammunition of Canadian manufacture, of which a small supply was obtained from England for the purpose, none having been sent out to this country for use with rifle.

4. The proceedings of this committee were laid before me on the eve of a serious offensive operation in which the Canadian Division was to take part, and I was at the same time informed that over 3,000, or more than one-third of the infantry, of this division had already succeeded in re-arming themselves with the Lee-Enfield rifle without any authority having been given for them to do so.

Looking:

(1) To the unanimous opinion of my committee that the Ross rifle could not be relied upon to work smoothly and efficiently in rapid fire with any ammunition other than that of Canadian manufacture;

(2) to the fact that no ammunition of this nature was available in this country, and that sufficient supplies could not be obtained from England, and,

(3) to the want of confidence in the rifle which a large number of the infantry evidently felt, as evidenced by the fact that over 3,000 had, without authority, exchanged their rifles for those used by their British comrades, and taken from casualties on the battlefield.

I did not feel justified in sending this Division into battle with the Ross rifle, and ordered the re-arming of the infantry of the Division with the Lee-Enfield rifle, which was carried out before they went into action on the 15th instant;

5. As regards the suggestion made by the Army Council that the opinion of one or two selected Canadian officers should be obtained, I submit that this is a difficult and complicated question which can only be satisfactorily settled by the best expert opinion, and that the views of a few selected Canadian officers, who may or may not be prejudiced in the matter, will not be of any material assistance.

6. I would, therefore, suggest that the Army Council should send to this country one or more of the most highly qualified experts obtainable to make the necessary tests under service conditions and report whether ammunition of British manufacture is or is not suitable for use with the Ross rifle. For this purpose a supply of ammunition of Canadian manufacture should be brought out for comparison.

The Army Council can then decide whether, looking to all the circumstances, it is advisable to restore the Ross rifle to the Canadian Divisions.

7. In conclusion, I would observe that in my reports I have never condemned the Ross rifle, nor have I any sufficient data to justify me in doing so.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

I have expressed and acted on my opinion, that, so far as I can judge, the ammunition of British manufacture is not suitable for use with Ross rifles, and that there is a large and growing feeling of want of confidence in their rifle on the part of the men in the Canadian Division, which is amply justified by the report of the committee.

8. Owing to the difficulty at present experienced in turning out rifles in sufficient numbers for our requirements, I shall most heartily welcome an authoritative statement which will carry conviction to the men that their apprehensions are unfounded, or what may possibly be found more easy of attainment, viz.: a slight alteration to the chamber of the rifle which will better adapt it for use with our British ammunition.

I have the honour to be, sir, your obedient servant,

(Signed) J. D. P. French.

Mr. CARVELL: Before the right hon. gentleman goes any further on that point, I would like to ask if the Government was ever furnished with the report of the experts whom General French stated he intended to bring over from Great Britain?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am under the impression—I shall obtain accurate information on that—that we did not receive the report to which my hon. friend has alluded.

Mr. CARVELL: The article that appeared in the newspaper in the month of May last has, I think, been referred to as the Alderson report. Was that report in the hands of the Government, and would that possibly be the experts' report to which General French referred to?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As I understand it, the communication to which my hon. friend alludes was a private letter from General Alderson to General Gwatkin; it was not an official document at all. In some mysterious way, which has never been explained, and without the authority or knowledge of General Gwatkin, a copy was taken and was given or sold to some person outside of the department altogether, and was made public. I did not know anything about it, so far as my recollection goes, until I saw it in the newspapers. No copy was ever furnished to me, and I do not know whether a copy was ever furnished to the ex-Minister of Militia.

Mr. OLIVER: My memory is that at a certain time during last session when a discussion in regard to the Ross rifle was going on, I asked the Prime Minister if he would lay on the table an official report by a board of inquiry made in England which was mentioned at the time. He declined to do so on the ground of military disadvantage if it were done.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In so far as my hon. friend's questions do not have immediate reference to the subject we are discussing, if he will kindly make a note of them and permit me to continue the thread of my remarks, I shall be grateful. It is difficult to deal with interruptions that are not precisely relevant.

The situation which confronted the Government in the summer of 1915 was this: We knew that Sir John French had concluded that the First Canadian Division ought to be re-armed with the Lee-Enfield rifle. He based that conclusion very largely upon the consideration that the men of the First Division, or a considerable number of them, had lost confidence in the Ross rifle. He took the view, in which I am sure we all concur, that no rifle, however effective, would be useful to the men if they had lost confidence in it. He said, in that same report, that he did not condemn the Ross rifle—that he had no data upon which he could condemn it; and he said further that the difficulty had arisen by reason of the fact that the ammunition supplied in this country, which might have made the rifle useful, could not be supplied in sufficient quantities. We also knew that the chief difficulty at the front was from the jamming of the cartridges, and that is alluded to by Sir John French in the concluding paragraph of his report when he himself makes the suggestion that if other rifles cannot be provided a remedy might be found by altering the chamber of the rifle, enlarging it so that the cartridge would not stick. We were also confronted with the fact that we did not then know of any other source from which we could procure rifles for the arming of our troops. It may be suggested that we should have given notice to manufacture the Lee-Enfield rifle. Well, it took something more than three months, according to my recollection, to get a sealed sample of the rifle that, as I shall point out later on, was suggested by the War Office as the new standard rifle for this country. I first asked in September, 1916, that a sample rifle for the purpose of making the change should be furnished. We did not receive it until January. We were confronted with the further consideration that under the terms of the contract the contractors were permitted the full period of one year before they could be called upon to produce rifles of a different type. We also had information from the British Government, whom we consulted on the subject, that a period of considerably more than a year would undoubtedly elapse, in their opinion, before the Ross rifle factory could be changed and the new plant acquired to enable them to produce a rifle of another type. In connection with that we had to take into account, of course, the extreme demands which were being made upon all the resources of this continent for plant and machinery of every kind, the lack of suitable steel, the great delay attending the filling of orders for machinery of any kind, and the fact that the machinery for turning out rifles is of a highly varied and complex character. So that, even if a contract were undertaken to deliver at a certain time, no one could be absolutely sure that it would be delivered within the period mentioned. And the war would not wait for these people, whoever they might be, to perfect their arrangements and secure their plant and machinery.

We must bear in mind, further, that in June and July, 1915, people in this country were not as thoroughly impressed with the possible duration of this war as they are to-day. I have already stated publicly that when I came back from Great Britain and communicated to some of my colleagues and to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) my belief that the British Empire would not be able to throw its full strength into this struggle before June, 1916, every one of them was greatly surprised, and some could hardly credit the accuracy of the impression I had thus formed. We were looking forward then to a conclusion of the war some time in 1916; and as matters lay before us then, it did not seem possible that we could produce rifles of the Lee-Enfield type before the probable date of the conclusion of the war.

But then, further, the jamming difficulty was not confined to the Ross rifle, it affected the Lee-Enfield rifle as well. I do not know whether it affected the Lee-Enfield to the same degree as it affected the Ross, but of this I am perfectly confident, on information communicated to me by my late colleague the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) and others, that there was serious difficulty with the Lee-Enfield rifle itself in using the ammunition that was furnished. We came to the conclusion that the only course for us to pursue was to enlarge the chamber of the Ross rifle with a view to preventing the

cartridge from jamming. The size of the chamber, as I am informed, had been fixed originally at ·463. If I am not mistaken, that was done in 1908. Afterwards, in 1910, it was reduced to ·457, and about January, 1911, it was fixed at .460. Now, the British ammunition is precisely the same—.460. So, you had a cartridge which fitted tightly in the chamber of the rifle, and if the least bit of dirt should adhere to the cartridge before it went into the chamber, the jamming of the cartridge was inevitable.

What did we do? In view of what Sir John French had said, and in view of the experience of the men at the front, we decided that our only course was to enlarge the chamber of the Ross rifle. In July, 1915, it was decided to enlarge the chamber to ·462, which is the diameter of the chamber of the Lee-Enfield rifle. But the then Minister of Militia and Defence, on looking into the matter more carefully, came to the conclusion that, for the purpose of absolutely preventing if possible, any danger of jamming, he had better go a little further; and so, in August, 1915, he directed that the chamber should be enlarged to ·464. That was done, and, as I understand it, the Second Division, when it went to the front, was armed with the Ross rifle with the enlarged chamber.

Mr. MACDONALD: Did the Small Arms Commission recommend the last change to ·462?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am informed by the deputy minister that the Small Arms Commission did recommend that change.

Mr. CARVELL: Did the Small Arms Commission recommend the change from ·462 to ·457?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really could not tell my hon. friend that. I obtained the information not from the department, but from what I regarded as a reliable source. I had not time to verify it, but I will do so and see whether I am correct.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Where was the last enlargement made?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The enlargement was carried on in Great Britain. I have fairly full reports as to all that took place with regard to that, but I will not deal with that phase of the matter just at the moment. I shall be prepared, however, to do so later if my right hon. friend desires it.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Mr. MACDONALD: Was the question considered of making ammunition in Canada which would fit the chamber?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend will realize that at the beginning of the war the only ammunition production that we could rely upon was that of the Dominion Arsenal, which, of course, was trivial as compared with the need. Afterwards we made contracts. The ammunition that was produced in this country was, as I am informed by the Deputy Minister of Militia, sent forward and pooled with the British ammunition, this country being given credit for it. Then the troops at the front were supplied by the general ordnance organization, as there could not be a separate ordnance arrangement for the Canadian troops in France. Unless, therefore, we attempted to carry out an apparently impracticable project, that of having a separate Canadian ordnance department for the Canadian troops at the front, we could not rely upon Canadian ammunition being served out to the Canadian troops. It seemed impossible to make that arrangement.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will the Prime Minister state what was the result of enlarging the bore of the rifle in England?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The result was supposed to be satisfactory, so far as the jamming was concerned. My hon. friend has before him the report of Sir Douglas Haig, to which I will refer in a moment. The Second Division went to the front on September 13, 1915, and as the enlargement of the chambers of the Ross rifle had not proceeded to a sufficient extent to enable the men of that Division to be armed with the Ross, they went to the front, as I am informed, armed with the Lee-Enfield rifle. The Third Division began to go to the front in January, 1916. By the end of February, 1916, nearly the whole division was at the front; the Engineer and Artillery units, however, went later. The whole division was in France at the end of June.

In February, 1916, the question arose as to whether further orders should be given for the Ross rifle and, if so, to what extent. The Government had before them a recommendation from the Master-General of the Ordnance for 200,000 Ross rifles, if I remember correctly. We did not accede to that in the whole; we gave an order for 100,000 Ross rifles with the enlarged chambers. In March, 1916, when the question came up as to the remaining portion of

the order, I sent a despatch to Sir George Perley, dated March 30, which has already been brought down, and which was as follows:

We have ordered * * Ross rifles of which * * * have been delivered and delivery of balance will not be completed before * * * We are considering giving an order for an additional * * * but before deciding we desire to obtain any available information and advice from British Government. It is said that they have an order for * * * rifles placed with an organization controlled by * * at * * * visited these works and was greatly impressed with progress made. Possibly these rifles would cover our requirements if war should continue for more than a year.

To which on April 26, nearly a month afterwards, we received the following reply:

Your cable 30th ultimo. Minister Munitions presumes firm referred to is * * * with whom Imperial Government have contract for * * * rifles. Deliveries not yet commenced and probability is contract will not be completed by * * * Minister adds there will be no surplus from British orders other than that already allotted * * * Regrets therefore not in position to allocate from British orders any rifles to Canadian Government. Desirable not place contract with * * * in view work for Imperial Government.

We were looking around at that time, in view of an earlier termination of the war than now seems probable, to see whether or not provision could be made by which further very large orders for the Ross rifle should not be necessary. We realized that with the orders already outstanding a very large supply of rifles would be in the hands of the Government at the end of the war. Having regard to the fact that during the previous summer the question of jamming had arisen, and also to some further rumours that came to our attention, we considered that it might be better, if it were possible, to make provision that the Canadian troops be supplied with standard British rifles to which no objection had been taken. We were, however, informed at that time, April 26, that no such provision could be made; therefore we had to consider the situation from that standpoint.

These rumours, to which I have alluded, began to assume more definite shape, and I saw a telegram on the 12th May, 1916, from Sir Max Aitken to General Hughes, a portion of which has been brought down, and which was as follows:

Serious situation has arisen regarding Ross rifle * * * I request that you will show this telegram to Prime Minister.

To this I replied on the 15th of May, two days, I think, before the Alderson report, so-called, had made its appearance in the press. That report appeared on the 17th of May, but on the 15th of May I had sent to Sir Max Aitken the following telegram:

Have consulted with General Hughes and we are prepared to leave matter to judgment of Commander in Chief after he has had all necessary tests of both rifles under such conditions as are experienced at front. Men making tests should be of like experience. * * * It is only arm we are equipped to produce in Canada at present and we believe it effective if properly used. Minister informs me that reports just received of recent official tests in England thoroughly demonstrate efficiency of our rifle.

I had discussed the subject with General Hughes, and he had given me that assurance and expressed very great confidence in the efficiency of the rifle, if properly used. I may say here that the test to which the Ross rifle was subjected was one of very great severity. It was a longer rifle than the Lee-Enfield, and that interfered, perhaps, to some extent with its use in the trenches. No one before the outbreak of the war, or in the early months of the war, could have foreseen that trench warfare would dominate the situation to the extent which it did. Further than that, the use of rifles in trench warfare, with the mud a foot, or two or three feet deep, with rifles falling into the mud and becoming dirty—all that was a particularly severe test of the Ross rifle which was of higher quality in many respects than the Lee-Enfield rifle. It was put to a further severe test in this way: It was placed in the hands of men who were not trained soldiers, men as gallant and splendid as the world ever produced, but men who were not trained soldiers, who naturally were not trained as efficiently as the men of a regular army would be in the care of their weapons. Therefore, the conditions of the test to which the Ross rifle was subjected were of an unusually severe character. I am not at all sure that with an enlarged chamber, and under ordinary conditions of warfare, the Ross rifle would not be found a thoroughly efficient weapon. But the question with which we were always confronted was whether the men had confidence in it. Once we were convinced that they had not confidence in it, we agreed immediately that they must be armed with a rifle in which they had confidence, or they could not be effective.

In pursuance of these communications, I sent on the 5th day of June, 1916, a telegram to Sir William Robertson, Chief of the General Staff. It was sent through the

Governor General to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. That telegram read:

Secret. Following from the Prime Minister for Sir William Robertson. By reason of rumoured dissatisfaction with Ross rifle I held consultation with General Hughes on May 15 and sent unofficial message to Commander in Chief that we were prepared to leave matter to his judgment after making all necessary tests of both rifles under such conditions as are experienced at the front. We suggested that men making tests should be of equal experience. Ross rifle is only arm we are equipped to produce in Canada at present and we believe it efficient if properly used but are content to abide by judgment of Commander in Chief after thorough investigation and adequate tests. We realize absolute necessity of two conditions: first, that men shall be armed with thoroughly efficient rifle; second, that their confidence in such rifle shall be unshaken Please let me have your judgment as to proper course to pursue

On the same day I sent to Sir George Perley, who had taken a very keen and active interest in the matter, this telegram:

Confidential. Please ask Colonial Secretary to show you my secret cable to-day for Chief General Staff respecting Ross rifle and confer with Aitken to whom you may disclose terms of that message.

On the 5th day of June, I also sent to Sir George Perley the following telegram:

Secret. Please ascertain whether British Government have finally and definitely decided on new rifle, or whether they propose before final action to study lessons obtained in present war. If new type of rifle has been finally adopted we are prepared after suitable investigation to adopt it if found satisfactory, so that our rifle in future will be of same type as British. In that case British order for Ross rifles might be cancelled and new order for one hundred thousand rifles new type given instead. Cost of machines and gauges for new type of rifle would approximate five hundred thousand dollars and this cost might be equally divided between two governments. Am making this suggestion because of continued criticism of Ross rifle which undoubtedly creates lack of confidence. No rifle however efficient is useful unless it commands thorough confidence of men.

Mr. MACDONALD: I notice that in the communication which my right hon. friend has just read, he referred to the fact that the British Government had given an order for Ross rifles.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am coming to that now.

Mr. MACDONALD: Perhaps my right hon. friend could tell us whether that order is still in existence.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I shall go into that fully. In the early months of this war we had a good deal of communication with the British Government as to the supply of rifles. The question was surrounded with much difficulty, and some of the calculations made at that time were not justified by subsequent events. The British Government took up the question of obtaining rifles in Canada, and in the autumn of 1914 they ordered 100,000 Ross rifles. I have asked for and obtained a memorandum as to what has been accomplished by the Ross Rifle Company in supplying rifles under that order. The memorandum which has been given to me by the Department of Militia and Defence is as follows:

Number ordered for the War Office, 100,000; number delivered to 20th January, 1917, 48,800; number still to be delivered, 51,200.

The Ross Rifle Company is still engaged in the production of those rifles for the British Government. It will be observed from the telegram which I have just read that I made a certain suggestion to the British Government in that regard. I suggested to them in effect this: There has been criticism of the Ross rifle; we are told that the men have lost confidence in it; you have an outstanding contract for the Ross rifle; we have outstanding contracts for the Ross rifle; the cost of the new machinery to make the necessary changes will be $500,000 (as a matter of fact, I think it would have been a great deal more than that); would it not be better for the two Governments to arrange with the Ross Rifle Company to cease the production of Ross rifles, and to change the orders, in so far as they have not been fulfilled, to the Lee-Enfield rifle, or the type of new rifle which is now being produced for you in the United States? That was the suggestion, which, however, the British Government did not accept.

Mr. CARVELL: What was the date of that?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The 5th day of June, 1916.

Mr. CARVELL: Did the Government, or any of its officials, ever receive from the British Government an offer of machinery and the different tools necessary to re-equip the Ross Rifle factory for the purpose of manufacturing Lee-Enfields?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We asked them about experts. They said that in so far as some dies, machinery and plant were concerned, they would be procured and placed at our service for use in the production of a new rifle.

Mr. CARVELL: When?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I cannot recall that but I will find out. Sir George Perley advised us on the 8th of June:

London, June 8th, 1916.

***War Office considers except trajectory the new Lee-Enfield now being made in United States is as good as any weapon that could be made with present experience and in present war; apparently high trajectory no particular disadvantage. Lessons obtained in present war have evidently not brought any new experience so far as rifles are concerned. Not considered possible say definitely what rifle will be finally adopted by British Government after war. Hardly to be expected that War Office would under present circumstances definitely commit themselves regarding their future service rifle. Master General Ordnance considers rifle now being made for them in United States exceedingly good weapon and would be glad see you use same pattern. Question of money arrangements would have to be taken up officially but personally should consider that of minor importance.

Then, in reply to a previous telegram as to the test of the Ross rifle, I had from Sir George Perley, on the 8th June, 1916, this telegram already laid on the table of the House:

London, June 8th, 1916.

Confidential. Have shown and discussed with Aitken your secret cable to Chief General Staff.

—that is the telegram to Sir William Robertson which I have already read—

Question will now doubtless be settled by him. Have seen him personally to-day and impressed strongly as possible upon him your views regarding necessity thorough test and also that Canadian Government would need official documents giving full facts and statements which could be made public if thought desirable. Also impressed upon him that Ross rifle is only one which Canada can produce at present and that if our troops are re-armed at front it naturally would raise question whether Canada should continue manufacturing Ross rifle and if not some alternative feasible plan would have to be suggested. Showed him copy your cable 5th regarding new type rifle which I answered this morning. Whole question will doubtless be thoroughly considered within next few days.

Then, on the 10th of June, in reply to my telegram to Sir William Robertson, I had this communication through the Secretary of State for the Colonies. It is a telegram addressed to the Governor General:

The following, from the Chief of the Imperial General Staff. Begins:

I am much obliged for your telegram 6th June. It has been referred to Sir Douglas Haig and his reply is awaited before any opinion can be given.

On the 24th June I sent this telegram to Sir George Perley:

Most confidential, Secret. We have had under consideration since January last an order for one hundred thousand additional Ross rifles, none of which can be delivered before April, 1917. If we decide to order the additional one hundred thousand company requires nearly a year's notice before commencement of delivery in order to secure necessary material of various kinds for which there is great demand at present. Several months ago the Master General of Ordnance strongly recommended immediate action, but we have delayed by reason of doubts raised as to efficiency of rifle. Time has now arrived when immediate decision should be made. To this end it is important that we should have a definite, reliable and thorough report upon the merits of rifle. If it is so defective as to forbid its use at the front, or if confidence in its efficiency has been undermined in our troops, it would be a waste of public money to give further orders. Please consult Aitken, with whom I have had much correspondence on this subject and advise me whether any such report as above mentioned exists. If not, it should be made immediately for our guidance.

On the 5th of July I received from Sir George Perley a telegram as follows:

London, July 5th, 1916.

Your cable 24th ultimo. Have communication from War Office covering letters recently received from commander in chief armies in France who reports efficiency Ross rifle thoroughly tested by actual fighting in field, that he has again consulted general officer commanding second army in case fresh points have come to light during recent heavy fighting by Canadians near Ypres. Latter states his experience working Ross rifle during last fight has only confirmed his opinion that Canadians in Third Division have lost confidence in their rifle and he reccommends that rifles this Division be exchanged. Sir Douglas Haig remarks that although reports from Second Division not to same effect he is of opinion Lee-Enfield rifle should be issued to all three Divisions Canadian corps. Army Council agree with this opinion and have approved his proposal to exchange rifles Second and Third Divisions for Lee-Enfield pattern and steps will be taken forthwith effect exchange. Army Council hope be able utilize Ross rifles released from France, also those in possession Canadian troops England, for other purposes connected with war. They would be glad if steps could be taken stop any more Ross rifles being brought to England, it being understood they thereby make themselves responsible for supplying necessary rifles to Canadian troops on arrival here and they see no reason to doubt being able do this. Army Council add should Canadian Government be desirous undertaking manufacture rifle of different pattern suitable for use during present war, in their opinion rifle made same pattern as now produced in United States for British Army, which is on lines Lee-Enfield Mark III embodying improvements, probably best one to adopt. Mailing copies correspondence. War Office wishes this matter regarded as secret until July 15th.

It will be observed that the improved British rifle, what is known as the Enfield 1914 rifle, was not being produced in Great Britain; it was only being produced in the United States. The standard Lee-Enfield rifle was being produced in Great Britain.

but in the United States a new plant and a new organization had to be created. The improved type of rifle could be produced as quickly as the old type. The Enfield 1914 rifle had a ·276 bore instead of ·303 bore; it was impossible to adhere to the ·276 bore, for the reason that the ammunition being produced in England would not be suitable for that rifle; therefore, they took the new improved type, the 1914 Enfield rifle, and adapted the barrel to a ·303 calibre and that is the rifle for which they have made contracts in the United States.

Mr. CARVELL: Would that not require a new chamber?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The chamber, as I understand, is included in the barrel. At all events, that is what I am informed by the technical officer. The improvements effected in the new type, called the Enfield 1914, which was practically, but not formally, adopted before war broke out, were utilized and adopted in the orders given in the United States, but the barrel was of a ·303 calibre and not a ·276 calibre.

Then follow in order certain documents which my hon. friend has referred to, and which I should like again to place before the House. I need not read Mr. Cubitt's letter. I will read Sir Douglas Haig's report, dated May 28, 1916:

May 28, 1916.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that I have satisfied myself, after extensive inquiries carried out throughout the Canadian Corps, that, as a service rifle, the Ross is less trustworthy than the Lee-Enfield, and that the majority of the men armed with the Ross rifle have not the confidence in it that it is so essential that they should possess. The inquiry on which these conclusions are based, was the outcome of an urgent application from a battalion of the 3rd Canadian Division for rearmament with the short Lee-Enfield rifle, in consequence of a high percentage of jams experienced with their Ross rifles during a hostile attack on May 1, 1916.

2. I am accordingly of opinion that the 2nd and 3rd Canadian Divisions should be re-armed with the short Lee-Enfield rifle. It will be remembered that the 1st Canadian Division was so re-armed on June 12, 1915.

3. I am not in a position to effect this with the means at my disposal in France. I have the honour to inquire therefore, whether the necessary number of rifles can be supplied from home sources, without interfering with, or delaying the arrival and arming of the divisions due from England and Egypt on which I am relying.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) D. Haig, General,
Commanding in Chief,
British Armies in France.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

There is a further report from Sir Douglas Haig, dated June 21, 1916, which is also significant. It is addressed to the Secretary of the War Office in London, and reads as follows:

June 21, 1916.

Sir,—In reply to your No. 77/15/5307 (M.G.O.) of June 10, 1916, forwarding a copy of a telegram dated June 7, from the Governor General of Canada, I have the honour to inform you that the efficiency of the Ross rifle has been thoroughly tested by actual fighting in the field, and the application conveyed in my O.B./174 of May 28, 1916, was made after very careful consideration of all the evidences available.

2. I have again consulted the General Officer Commanding Second Army in case any fresh points have come to light during the recent heavy fighting by the Canadians near Ypres. He tells me that his experience of the working of the Ross rifle during the last fight has only confirmed him in his opinion that the Canadians, in the 3rd division at all events, have lost confidence in their rifle and he recommends that the rifles in this division be exchanged.

3. Although the reports from the 2nd division are not to the same effect, I am of opinion that the Lee-Enfield rifle should be issued to all three divisions of the Canadian Corps.

I must therefore adhere to my recommendation that the 2nd and 3rd Canadian divisions should be re-armed with the short Lee-Enfield rifle, and I would urge that the necessary steps to give effect thereto be taken without delay.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
D Haig, General,
Commanding in Chief,
British Armies in France.

It is well to remember, in justice to the Ross Rifle Company, that Sir Douglas Haig states in his report that the opinion which seems to have been pretty general in the Third Division was not shared by the men of the Second Division; but he thought it desirable and wise to arm all three divisions with the Lee-Enfield, in order that all the British forces at the front should be equipped with the same rifle. On the 11th day of July the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in consequence of these reports, sent us the following telegram, addressed to the Governor General:

July 11, 1916

With reference to my telegram, June 10, report from General Officer Commanding in Chief in France has now been received by Army Council recommending that second and third Canadian divisions should be re-armed with short Lee-Enfield rifles and Army Council have approved this. They hope to be able to utilize Ross rifles released and also those now in possession of Canadian troops in England for other purposes connected with the war, but ask that no more Ross rifles should be brought to England. Army Council will be responsible for supplying necessary rifles to Canadian troops on

arrival in England. If your Government desire to undertake manufacture of different rifles suitable for use during war, Army Council think that rifles now being produced in America for British Army on lines of Lee-Enfield Mark III, but with improvements would be best.

Hon. members will observe that on the 26th of April, 1916, we had been informed that the British Government had no supply of rifles which would be available for rearming the Canadian troops. But conditions as regards supply and production evidently improved, because on the 11th day of July they entered into a clear and distinct engagement with us that they would hold themselves responsible for arming all the Canadian troops with the Lee-Enfield rifle, and they have carried out that engagement up to the present, and I have no doubt they will carry it out in the future. So that from the 11th day of July up to the present all the Canadian troops at the front have been armed with the Lee-Enfield rifle, and the British Government have undertaken on their part to see to it that all the Canadian troops sent to the front shall be armed with that rifle.

Mr. CARVELL: Might I ask why, after that date, the Fourth Division went over armed with the Ross rifle?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is an explanation of that in the correspondence which I shall come to in a little while, and it seems to have been very much misunderstood by an hon. gentleman opposite who addressed a very fervent speech to the House. I had an informal communication with the Secretary of State for War, as a result of which I received the following telegram from Sir Max Aitken on the 11th day of July, 1916. I might say that this telegram is due to the expression of the desire on my part, which is repeated in the later correspondence, that the British Government and the governments of the Overseas Dominions should get together and select a uniform type of rifle, which would be the standard type of rifle for the British, the Canadian, the South African, the New Zealand, and the Australian troops, so that we might have one uniform type of rifle for the whole Empire, because, if we are to fight side by side in defense of the Empire or any part of it, it is highly important that there should be one type of rifle used by the armies of the Mother Country, and of the Overseas Dominions. More than that, it should be produced not only in the United Kingdom, but in each of the Overseas Dominions as well. The telegram to which I have alluded, containing a message from the Secretary of State for War, now the Prime Minister, reads:

July 11, 1916.

Sir Robert Borden,
Ottawa.

I am authorized by the Secretary of State for War to inform you as follows: 'Since outbreak of war improved type of Lee-Enfield rifle has been adopted and manufactured under orders of the British Government. With a view to uniformity, the Lee-Enfield rifle has been offered to Canadian Government for Canadian troops at the front. It is expected that negotiations will be carried on in immediate future between British Government and Governments of Dominions with a view to securing for all His Majesty's forces throughout the Empire a uniform type of service rifle. Doubtless all existing facilities for production of rifle in overseas Dominions will be utilized for manufacture of new service rifle when adopted.'

(Signed) Aitken.

I regret that I am obliged to occupy the attention of the committee at such length; but it is necessary, in view of certain misconceptions with regard to the course taken by the Government in the matter, that the whole correspondence, so far as it is relevant, should be placed before the committee and before the country.

My hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) has alluded to the fact that the Fourth Canadian Division went to the front armed with the Ross rifle. We saw a statement in the press to that effect, and in the correspondence brought down there is a telegram and a reply on that subject which were occasioned by the following considerations. The Government of Canada had made an announcement, following the correspondence which I have read, that the Canadian troops at the front would be armed with the Lee-Enfield rifle. Therefore, when it appeared that the Fourth Canadian Division had gone to the front armed, not with the Lee-Enfield rifle but with the Ross rifle, we were placed in a peculiar position, because, apparently there was either a lack of knowledge on our part of what was being done or a misrepresentation to the public. Therefore when the matter came to my attention, I addressed on the 30th day of August last a cable message through the Governor General to the Colonial Secretary, in these terms:

Secret. In pursuance of your cable message of July 11, my advisers announced that Canadian troops at front would in future be armed with Lee-Enfield rifles. They are confident that no departure from this decision has been made without their knowledge, but they desire to be informed as to report which has reached them that Fourth Canadian Division was armed with Ross rifle when recently despatched to France.

To which, on the 7th day of September, 1916, the following reply was received from Mr. Bonar Law in a cable message to the Governor General:

Your telegram of the 31st Fourth Division were sent to France armed with Ross rifles, but Lee-Enfields have since been sent to France for purpose of re-arming. Re-arming should be completely performed by now.

From this I understand that although the Fourth Division went to France armed with the Ross rifle, the British Government, in pursuance of their engagement with us, re-armed them with Lee-Enfield rifles before they were actually at the front.

That is the situation up to that time, the net result of it being this: In the summer of 1911, when the Canadian Government were made acquainted with the view of Sir John French that, for the reasons expressed in his report, it was advisable to re-arm the First Canadian Division with the Lee-Enfield rifle, we assented at once that this should be done, because it appeared that there had been jamming of the Ross rifle; that the ammunition was unsuitable; that the men had lost confidence in the rifle, and that a change was absolutely necessary. Then, having regard to the suggestion of Sir John French that the rifle might be made right by enlargement of the chamber; having regard to the fact that there was no other source from which rifles could be obtained; having regard also to the fact that, according to the best judgment we could procure, it would occupy at least a year before rifles of any other type could be turned out by the Ross company, we concluded, following the lines of Sir John French's suggestion, that the only course was to enlarge the chamber of the Ross rifle. Accordingly the Minister of Militia in July, 1915, determined to enlarge it from .460 to .462, and in August, 1915, he determined still further to enlarge it to .464, with the expectation that the enlarged chamber would prevent jamming. When the question of further provision of rifles came rather urgently before us in the winter of 1916, after giving an order for 100,000 rifles with the enlarged chamber, we made inquiry of the British Government on the 30th day of May, 1916, whether out of the supply of rifles which they had ordered, it would be possible to supply Lee-Enfield rifles to us, and what number; and on the 26th of April, 1916, we received a reply that no rifles out of those ordered by them would be available for our use.

Later on, when further difficulty arose with regard to the rifles, we sent a communication first to Sir Max Aitken and afterwards to Sir William Robertson, suggesting that tests should be made, pointing out that according to our view the rifle was efficient if properly used, and desiring, after those tests had been made, that the result should be communicated to us. In June, 1916, we left the whole question of the re-arming of the Canadian troops at the front to the absolute judgment of the Chief of the Imperial General Staff and the Commander in Chief of the British army in the field; and when they determined, having regard to all consideration, that although some of the Canadian units were perfectly satisfied with the Ross rifle, it would be advisable that all the forces should be re-armed we assented to that conclusion at once, accompanied as it was by the condition and undertaking that the British Government in the future would make themselves responsible for the arming of all the Canadian troops at the front with the Lee-Enfield rifle to which no exception seemed to have been taken, and in which at all events the troops seemed to have confidence, so far as we could learn from the reports available.

Now, that is the situation as it presents itself to my mind. I have endeavoured to give the whole facts to the House so far as they can be disclosed with the consent of the War Office. My hon. friend, however, goes on and puts before us another question: What do we propose to do about the production of rifles in Canada? I want to point out in the first place that, so far as the arming of Canadian troops is concerned, we have the definite engagement of the British Government that our troops shall be armed, when they go to the front, with the Lee-Enfield rifle. That engagement has been lived up to, as I understand it. For, although the Fourth Division went to France armed with the Ross rifle, they were immediately afterwards armed with the Lee-Enfield, and are so armed today. The question of the production of rifles in Canada ceased to have the immediate urgency that it would have had if that engagement had not been given to us by the British Government. With this in mind, we come back to the question of what the Government has done with respect to the production of rifles in this country in the future.

Certain negotiations are going on as to the disposition in Great Britain of our supply of Ross rifles, the most of which have been in use either by the British Government or by ourselves. We require a considerable number in Canada of course for the

training of our own troops—though I entirely agree that would be better, if it were possible, that our troops should be trained with the rifles they are to use at the front. In considering the question of what should be done, there are a couple of telegrams which have not yet been brought down and which it might be well that I should communicate to the House. In the telegram from which I am about to read there are some portions that, from considerations of public interest, I cannot disclose to the House:

Ottawa, September 5, 1916.

My advisers consider it important for purposes of common defence that adequate facilities for production of rifles should be maintained in Canada. They are impressed with the view that a standard rifle to be called Imperial Service Rifle should be adopted by Mother Country and all Dominions of Empire. If British Government can give them assurance that rifle known as Enfield .276 pattern adapted for .303 ammunition will be definitely adopted by British Government as standard service rifle my advisers would proceed to necessary examination for its adoption and preparation for adequate production here. If on the other hand British Government have reached no definite conclusion as to type of rifle to be ultimately adopted my advisers would naturally desire to limit as far as possible expenditure for this purpose as it would have to be repeated in case another type should be adopted in early future. They would be grateful for full and prompt expression of views of His Majesty's Government as to situation which must be considered with regard to needs of whole Empire.

I have stated that the date of that telegram is 5th September. In order to prevent misapprehension as to dates of telegrams, I may explain that when we send a telegram dated, for instance, 5th September, that telegram is received by the British Government on the 6th September. There is a difference of five hours in the time. Telegrams are thus referred to by the British authorities as of the following day—in the case I speak of this telegram is referred to as of 6th September. The reply is as follows:

Paraphrase of cypher telegram from Mr. Bonar Law to the Governor General.

London, September 19, 1916.

With reference to your telegram September 6th it is regretted by Army Council that it is impossible for them at present to give definite assurance as to the pattern of service rifle to be adopted after the war. Further experience may modify views now held, while the large stock of rifles which will have accumulated by the end of the war may render the adoption of any new pattern unlikely for some years to come. As regards the present manufacture of rifles suitable for use during the war the Army Council adhere to their opinion conveyed to you in the penultimate sentence of my telegram of July 11th.

Bonar Law.

As the telegram of July 11 may not be clearly recalled by hon. members, because of the mass of this correspondence, I will refer to it again in order that the allusion in the document just quoted may be understood. The penultimate sentence of the telegram of July 11th is as follows:

If your Government undertake the manufacture of different rifles suitable for use during war, Army Council think that rifles now being produced in America for British Army on lines of Lee-Enfield Mark III, but with improvements would be best.

That is the same rifle described in a somewhat different way in my telegram of 5th September. In that telegram I referred to it as "the rifle known as Enfield, .276-pattern, adapted for .303 ammunition." I used that expression because I was informed by the Master General of the Ordnance that it would be understood by the War Office, being the technical description of that rifle. I think it was in September, 1916, that we asked the Government to furnish us with a sealed pattern of that particular rifle in order that we might take steps, under the contract with the Ross Rifle Company, for its production in this country. On November 14 I made a recommendation to Council with regard to it, and that recommendation was approved by His Excellency on November 15. It is proper that I should read that order in council, as it adopts for the purpose of future production in Canada the approved Lee-Enfield rifle which is being produced for the British Government in the United States, but which, as I understand, is not yet being produced in Great Britain, for the reason which I have already mentioned. The order in council is as follows:

November 15, 1916.

The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report dated 14th November, 1916, from the Right Hon. the Prime Minister, stating that on the 27th day of March, 1902, His Majesty the King, represented by the Hon. F. W. Borden, then Minister of Militia and Defence, entered into an agreement with Sir Charles Ross, Bart., of Balnagowan, copy of which is appended, whereby the Government of Canada agreed with the said Sir Charles Ross to purchase from the said Charles Ross or his assigns all rifles required for the use of the Government. The said contract fixes no limit as to the time for which it shall remain in force.

That the said contract provided for the manufacture and delivery by the contractor in each year of such number of rifles not less than 10,000, as might be desired and signified by the Government in writing on or before the 30th day of September of the year preceding the year in which delivery was to be made, each to correspond to a standard sample rifle to be provided by the said minister.

That the said contract further provided that should a new rifle be invented which the Gov-

ernment should desire to adopt or use the Government might furnish the contractor with a standard sample of such new rifle and give the contractor twelve months' notice in writing requiring that the rifles to be delivered by the contractor upon and after the expiration of the period of such last-mentioned notice should correspond to the standard sample of such new rifle so furnished, the Government to protect the contractor against any actions for infringements of patents so far as such new rifles supplied to the Government were concerned and upon and after the expiration of the said period all rifles to be delivered by the contractor should accordingly correspond to such substituted standard sample, and the contractor agreed to originally lay out and adapt his plant, machinery, etc., so as to provide the best facilities which could be reasonably foreseen to enable him to apply the same to the manufacture of any such new rifle which might so be desired.

That the said contract further provided for the fixing of the price to be paid for the rifles to be manufactured and delivered thereunder from time to time.

That from the date of the said contract all rifles required and used by the Government were, in accordance with the terms of the said contract, purchased from the contractor named therein, or from his assigns, the Ross Rifle Company, and the standard sample rifle furnished by the Minister of Militia and Defence as provided for in the said contract in 1902 with certain improvements and modifications made from time to time has been the rifle produced by the contractor up to the present time.

That much difference of opinion and much controversy has arisen as to the merits of the rifle so purchased and its usefulness as an active service weapon compared with other standard rifles adopted by the British Government. As a consequence repeated inquiries have been made and varying opinions given as to the desirability of substituting a new standard rifle for the rifle so manufactured. Concurrently with these inquiries, information was sought as to the possibility of procuring other standard rifles for the use of the Canadian forces. The readjustment of the contractor's factory for the production of a new standard rifle would involve great delay, and adequate provision for arming the Canadian forces in the meantime is necessary. Since the outbreak of war, however, the Government was not able, until very recently, to procure any other rifle in Great Britain or elsewhere for that purpose. On April 26, 1916, in response to an inquiry made on March 30, 1916, the Imperial Government stated that even up to June, 1917, there would be no surplus from British orders other than that already allotted to the Allied Governments, and that it was impossible to allocate from such orders any rifles to this Government. Early in July, however, the British Army Council, to whose decision the matter had been left by the Canadian Government, concluded that the Canadian Expeditionary Force should be armed with the Lee-Enfield rifles, and the Army Council undertook to make themselves responsible for supplying the necessary rifles to the troops from Canada on arrival in England. This arrangement was accepted, and it has been carried out. On the 5th September, 1916, the Imperial Government informed this Government that the condition indicated in their communication of the 26th April had changed, and that it would be possible to arrange for the transfer of a certain number of standard rifles to Canada from existing British orders.

Further correspondence took place with regard to the type of rifle which should be adopted in Canada. The Imperial Government, since the beginning of the war, has commenced, and is now carrying on the production of an improved rifle known as the Enfield 1914, or .276, adapted for .303 ammunition. The minister is informed that this rifle, as it is produced from time to time, will be issued by the Imperial Government to the British army, and the Army Council have advised that if this Government desire to undertake the manufacture of a new standard rifle the said improved rifle is considered the best.

In view, therefore, of the fact that other standard rifles are now available, the minister recommends that no further orders be given for the manufacture of the standard Ross rifle heretofore supplied to the Government under the said contract.

In view of the information obtained from the Army Council and of the very great desirability that the rifle to be issued to the Canadian forces should be the same in every respect as that to be supplied to the other forces of the British Empire, the minister further recommends that a new standard sample rifle be provided by the Minister of Militia and Defence, the same to be in every respect the rifle so to be supplied by the Imperial Government, namely, the Enfield, 1914, or .276, adapted for .303 ammunition, and be furnished to the contractor and his assignee, The Ross Rifle Company, in accordance with clause 6 of the said contract, and that the contractor and the said company be required, on and after the first day of December, 1917, to make all rifles supplied under the said contract to correspond to such last mentioned substituted standard sample rifle the Government undertaking to protect the contractor and his assignee against any actions for infringement of patents as stipulated by the contract, and, moreover, that the Minister of Militia and Defence be authorized to give a notice in the form hereto annexed to the said Sir Charles Ross and his assignee, The Ross Rifle Company.

The committee concur in the foregoing recommendations and submit the same for approval.

(Signed) Rodolphe Boudreau,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

It is necessary, for the purpose of giving the notice, referred to in the order in council, that it should be accompanied by the standard rifle itself. We were not able to procure a standard rifle in the time limited; therefore the order in council had to be amended as to the date at which the contractor should be called upon to undertake the production of the new standard rifle. As the new standard rifle was not supplied to us by the British Government until the 15th or 20th of January last, an amending order in council was passed by which the notice given to the contractor requires him to produce the new rifle on and after the 1st day of February, 1918, it being necessary under the terms of the contract that he should have a year's notice.

The matter stands in that way at pre-

sent, and the question for the Government to determine is as to the extent of the order which should be given to the Ross Rifle Company for the improved rifle, or as to what other course, if any, the Government ought to take in the premises. On the one hand, we are confronted with the fact that after the conclusion of the war, we shall have, unless we dispose of them in the meantime, a very considerable number of Ross rifles, Mark III. I have spoken of some negotiations still pending with regard to disposing of some of these rifles. For the purpose of training under ordinary conditions of peace they would be useful to our troops, and it is quite possible that, under conditions of warfare different from those which have been encountered during the past two years, the Ross rifle might give perfect satisfaction. I am not prepared to pronounce an opinion upon that, because there has been so much difference of opinion, so much controversy amongst experts, that it would be idle for me to venture on a subject which depends upon technical considerations as well as upon actual experience in the field.

The question, therefore, is under the consideration of the Government at the present time, and we shall give our best attention to it. I should be very glad indeed if hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, who have taken an interest in this subject, and who are now fully seized of the situation as it presents itself to the Government, would be good enough to give us the benefit of their views, which, of course, will be most carefully and attentively considered. The situation is as I have described it. We have made provision, by arrangement with the British Government, that our troops shall be armed at the front during the continuance of the war with a rifle to which no exception has been taken. We have the question as to whether anything can be done with the supply of Ross rifles which are not in use at the front; and, lastly, there is the question as to the extent upon which we shall enter upon the production of rifles of a new type. Hon. gentlemen who heard me read the telegram of the British Government dated 19th September will remember that they expressed a great doubt as to whether or not any rifle other than the improved Lee-Enfield rifle would be adopted as the standard service rifle in the immediate future, putting forward, as the reason for that view, the reasonable consideration that they would be in possession of so enormous a supply of rifles after the war that they would not care to embark upon the production of a new rifle upon the scale that would be necessary. The condition which confronts them confronts us in a smaller degree, because we shall have on hand, unless we dispose of them in the meantime, a very large number of Ross rifles, Mark III, at the conclusion of the war, more than will be ordinarily required by this country for several years to come under conditions of peace. In the meantime, the order which was given in February last to the Ross Rifle Company is being carried out, and the order which the British Government gave to the Ross Rifle Company in the autumn of 1914 is also being carried out. Altogether the company has still to produce and deliver about 150,000 rifles, about 97,000 for us, I think, and about 57,000 for the British Government.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at 8 o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 5, respecting the Guardian Accident and Guarantee Company and to change its name to the Guardian Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Achim.

Bill No. 6, respecting the Athabaska Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Bennett (Calgary.)

Bill No. 7, respecting the Continental Heat and Light Company.—Sir Herbert Ames.

Bill No. 8, to incorporate the Bishop of Mackenzie River.—Mr. Bennett (Calgary).

Bill No. 9, respecting the Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill No. 10, to incorporate the Grand Lodge of the Canadian Association of Stationary Engineers of the Dominion of Canada.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 11, respecting the Canadian Order of the Woodmen of the World.—Mr. Glass.

Bill No. 14, respecting the Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited, and to authorize it to change its name to "United Grain Growers, Limited."—Mr. Bradbury.

Bill No. 15, respecting the Saint John Board of Trade.—Mr. Pugsley.

Bill No. 16, to confirm certain agreements made between the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company and the Canadian Northern Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 17, respecting the Western Dominion Railway Company.—Mr. Smyth.

WAR LOAN—$500,000,000.

ROSS RIFLE—DISCUSSION IN COMMITTEE.

House again in Committee, Mr. Blain in the Chair.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) asked me a question in respect to the test which had been made in France, and which is referred to in Sir John French's report. I do not think I had seen the report of that test. It was not on my file, but I procured what I understand to be a copy from the Department of Militia and Defence. It may have been brought to my attention at the time—I am not quite sure—but I did not happen to have it on my file this afternoon when my hon. friend addressed the question to me. I find attached to the copy of Sir John French's report, which has been procured from the Department of Militia, the following document which purports to be a copy of the report of the committee that was assembled at the rifle range at St. Omer, France. As Sir John French refers to a test carried out at headquarters, and as the headquarters of Sir John French were at St. Omer at that time, I assume that this is the report of that test. Perhaps it would be both convenient and desirable that this report should be placed upon the records of the House so that hon. members may know just what the result of the test was. It is as follows:

The following committee assembled at the rifle range, St. Omer, at 2.30 p.m., on June 5th, 1915: Colonel Mathew, Director-General Ordnance Service, General Headquarters; Colonel Wood, Assistant Quartermaster General, Canadian Division; Lt.-Col. C. R. Woodroffe, Acting Quartermaster General, General Headquarters; Capt. Campbell, Assistant Ordnance Director; Lt.-Col. Murray, Ordnance Officer, Canadian Division; Major Baker Carr, Commandant Machine Gun School; Major Guest, General Staff, General Headquarters.

The following tests were carried out:

Test No.

1. 15 rounds Canadian manufactured D.A.C. 1914 Mk. VII ammunition fired from Ross rifle—No jambs.
2. 5 rounds British ammunition B. 1915 Mk. VII fired from Ross rifle quite cold. 3 last rounds partly jammed. Ejection very stiff.
3. 45 rounds of British ammunition K. 1914 Mk. VII fired from Ross rifle. No jambs.
4. 5 rounds British B. 1915 Mk. VII ammunition fired from Ross rifle heated from test No. 3. First round partly jammed, second round completely jammed.
5. 65 rounds continuous rapid fire British K. 1914 Mk. VII fired from Ross rifle. After 40 rounds all remainder jammed slightly.
6. 65 rounds British K. 1914 Mk. VII ammunition fired from Lee Enfield British rifle. No jambs.
7. 100 rounds Canadian manufactured ammunition D.A.C. 1914 Mk. VII fired from Ross rifle, continuous rapid fire. No jambs.
8. 5 rounds British ammunition B. 1915 Mk. VII fired from Ross rifle (cold) all jammed slightly.
9. 100 rounds Canadian manufactured D.A.C. 1914 Mk. VII in another Ross rifle. 55th, 56th, 60th, 72nd, 73rd, 84th, 91st, 94th and 99th rounds jammed very slightly.
10. 100 rounds Canadian manufactured D.A.C. 1914 Mk. VII ammunition fired from British Lee Enfield Short rifle—no jambs.
11. 50 rounds British ammunition B. 1915 Mk. VII fired from Lee Enfield short rifle. All rounds fired jammed sightly.

OPINION OF COMMITTEE.

A unanimous opinion was expressed that the Canadian manufactured D.A.C. 1914 Mk. VII ammunition only, of those tried, was suitable for rapid fire with the Ross rifle, that provided a sufficient supply of Canadian manufactured ammunition of this type could be supplied, the other defects apparent were not sufficient to condemn the Ross rifle in view of the present shortage of rifles generally, and that those types of British made ammunition which were tried should not be issued to troops armed with the Ross rifle.

The committee were practically unanimous in advising that the Ross rifle should be employed on the lines of communication, and that if possible, the Canadian troops should be armed with the British rifle.

With regard to the following specific points which the committee were asked to answer, the questions and answers as stated below:

1. There are frequent reports that the bolt action jambs after about 5 rounds.	1. Yes, but with British B. 1915 Mk. VII ammunition only.
2. Full value of rapid fire cannot be developed unless:	2. (a) Full value of rapid fire can be developed with ammunition of Canadian manufacture only.
(a) Ammunition of Canadian manufacture is used.	
(b) Rifle is perfectly clean.	(b) This point was not tested.
3. That English made ammunition is slightly larger than Canadian so that immediately the cartridge exploded the cartridge case fills the chamber so tightly as to cause a jamb.	3. The British made cartridge case appears to be of a slightly thicker gauge than that of Canadian manufacture and the diameter of the cartridge immediately under the rim appears to be slightly greater than that of Canadian manufactured ammunition. This may be the cause of jamming.
4. (a) That orders exist that on no account are troops to take out their magazine as it necessitates stripping the rifle.	4. (a) Yes.
(b) Unless the magazine is unloaded every 24 hours and the spring action eased, the magazine fails to respond.	(b) This possibly is the case but the committee were unable to test this point.
5. That dirt accumulates easily in the bolt head and also in the receptive thread in the breech of the rifle. Owing to difficulty of cleaning jambs are caused.	5. This may be so, but the rifles were not tried under dirty condition.
6. The screw of the bolt head expands under heat and renders it difficult to open the breech (presumably due to the number of bearing surfaces affected).	6. The expansion of the bolthead was not apparent when firing 100 rounds of Canadian manufactured ammunition.
7. The Ross rifle sight is defective because of its delicacy and the smallness of the figures which make it difficult to adjust the sight easily.	7. Admittedly the figuring of the sighting is small and difficult to read as compared to the British Lee-Enfield rifle.
8. The magazine case is too thin and is dented easily. This causes a jamb as the spring cannot work.	8. The magazine case is flat and any dent therein would seriously affect the spring therein.
9. The foresight is not good for service work. The circular cover easily gets filled with mud and is difficult to clean.	9. The committee did not consider that any great amount of difference existed in this respect in comparison with the British rifle.
10. A hole has recently been bored in the base of the magazine to enable the cleaning of the magazine to be carried out with stripping the rifle.	10. This hole should be covered by a small revolving plate, adjusted by a screw.
11. It is far easier to load the Lee-Enfield rifle than the Ross rifle with a clip of ammunition. A Lee-Enfield rifle takes 10 rounds a Ross 5 rounds.	11. Undoubtedly the loading of the Lee-Enfield can be carried out in half the time, mainly owing to the fact that the guide for the clip on the British rifle is directly over the magazine chamber.
12. That the shape of the fore part of the chamber of the Ross rifle is different to that of the Lee-Enfield. That this does not allow of the same expansion and is the cause of the jamb.	12. Undoubtedly there is a difference of the shape of the fore part of the chamber, but the committee was not able to decide that this was the cause of the jamb.

(Signed)

C. M. Mathew, Colonel, D.D.O.S., G.H.Q.

C. R. Woodroffe, Lieut.-General A.Q.M.G.

H. Guest, Major, G.S.

C. D. Baker-Carr, Major, Commandant Machine Gun School.

T. Burchall Wood, Colonel, AA and Q.M.G., 1st Canadian Division.

J. A. Murray, Lieut.-Colonel, D.O.O., 1st Canadian Division.

W. H. McNeil Campbell, Captain, R.A.

It should be noted that twenty-six Ross rifles per battalion are used in the Canadian forces at the front at present for sniping purposes, there being no question at all that for that purpose the Ross is superior to any other rifle known.

I do not know that I have emphasised sufficiently one point that ought to be borne in mind by every hon. member of the House, and by every one in this country who is disposed to consider in a reasonable way the situation that confronted this Government in the summer of 1915, after Sir John French's report had been received. I know, in a very intimate and confidential way, what the situation in regard to rifles was both for the British Government and certain others of the Allied Governments. The situation with regard to rifles, machine guns, 18-pounder field guns, howitzers and guns of larger calibre, such as were being increasingly used in the field—the situation with regard to all these matters was detailed to me in a very frank way by the present Prime Minister of Great Britain two days before I left England in 1915. I cannot even at this date go into the particulars of the information which he then afforded to me. But I do desire to emphasize to hon. gentlemen in this House that there was the most desperate and urgent need of rifles of any description in 1915. I could give the House, if it were permissible, information with regard to certain negotiations that were carried on in that year, in which our co-operation was asked for securing rifles of a somewhat antiquated type. The situation was not such as would justify the Government in considering a selection of rifles. The situation was one which demanded every possible effort that could be made in every direction to procure rifles of almost any description. Men were undergoing training not only in this country but also in Great Britain, some without rifles at all and others with dummy rifles. The need was most intense, insistent and urgent. The Government could have the chamber of the Ross rifle enlarged, as the chamber of the Lee-Enfield had been enlarged, so that jamming would be prevented. What else could it do? I again point out that under the contract the Ross Rifle Company was entitled to one year before it could be called upon to produce rifles of a different type and that the British Government thought it could not be done in less than two years.

On the 21st of July, 1916, we requested the British Government to furnish the Ross Rifle Company as soon as possible with all technical information including drawings, specifications and samples of the new standard rifle to which I have alluded. We also inquired on that occasion as to whether or not the British Government proposed to continue their contract with the Ross Rifle Company for the Ross rifle, Mark III, or whether they would require Ross to produce the new pattern of Lee-Enfield rifle under that contract. Various reminders were sent requesting a reply to that telegram, but none was received until the 28th of August, 1916, when the following reply was made:

With reference to your telegram of July 21, Army Council state that the improved pattern of Lee-Enfield rifle is not at present manufactured at Enfield, as considerable time would have been taken up in turning arms to new pattern. At present the new pattern is only made in America, and under the circumstances, the Army Council consider that there is no necessity for the Ross Company to communicate with Enfield.

There had been a suggestion in the previous telegram that the Ross Rifle Company should be put into direct communication with Enfield for this purpose. The telegram continues:

It is not considered possible by the Minister of Munitions to obtain delivery from the Ross rifle factory of the new pattern rifle in quantities under two years, but I am asking him to advise as to the best manner for the company to obtain the necessary specifications and drawings. I will telegraph as soon as possible as to the company's contract with His Majesty's Government

They supplemented that telegram on the 5th day of September, 1916, with this message:

With reference to my telegram August 28, position as regards contract for supply of 100,000 Ross rifles to His Majesty's Government is as follows: Ross rifles now being delivered though not authorized for service in the field are still of value for many purposes, training, arming home defence units, and arming marines. Therefore, immediate supply of these rifles of service. On the other hand it is not considered possible to obtain deliveries in large quantities of new pattern rifle from Ross factory in less than two years. At a certain date the supply of Enfield rifles will be more than sufficient for needs of British troops and all requirements of Allies will have been met. Minister of Munitions in these circumstances does not propose to modify contracts and so far as this contract is concerned could not agree to change of pattern. Minister of Munitions further suggests that if it is decided to change over factory to new pattern for manufacture for Canadian Government it will be very desirable from company's point of view, both as regards finance and shop organization to carry out contract with His Majesty's Government while plant is being changed over. On learning that it has been decided that company should take up

manufacture of new pattern rifle for Canadian Government, Minister of Munitions will render every assistance in his power; he will give instructions that specifications and drawings be prepared in United States and will place representative of Ross company into communication with British experts who are watching manufacture in United States; further there is a certain amount of equipment (jigs and tools) accumulated rifle plant here and not now required; if this can be adapted to Ross company's plant, Minister of Munitions will be glad to supply it to Canada. Suggested that representative of Ross company should examine this equipment with view of transfer.

Then there is a passage which I shall omit.

Mr. CARVELL: Will the Prime Minister state the date when the British Government will be able to take care of all their requirements?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is precisely what I think it is not desirable to state.

Further on there is a telegram of the 11th of September which relates to the efforts of this Government to obtain a standard rifle of the type which the British Government advised us to manufacture. The members of the committee will bear in mind that we had already been informed that this rifle was not being manufactured in Great Britain and that it was being manufactured in the United States. Therefore, being desirous of obtaining it as soon as possible, if we were going to adopt it as a standard, we started out on our own account to get necessary specimens of the rifle in order that we might take proceedings under the contract. But on the 11th day of September, 1916, we received this telegram:—

Stated by Minister of Munitions that Master General of Ordnance, Canada, has applied to Ministry Organizations of New York for a few serviceable rifles of new pattern. It is considered undesirable by minister to send any rifles not critically examined by Chief Inspector of Small Arms in this country, and he will therefore select five rifles of pattern mentioned and despatch from here.

We did not receive those rifles until about the 20th day of January, 1917. I suppose they had to be sent from the United States to Great Britain, where they had to be critically examined by the Chief Inspector of Small Arms, and thereafter they were despatched to this country, sealed and in the form which was necessary under the contract.

It was necessary for us, if we proposed to give an order for rifles of that type, not only to have the rifle itself, but to have the specifications and drawings; so we proceeded to take steps for the purpose of acquiring them. On the 19th day of November, 1916, not having received the drawings and specifications, this Government despatched to the Colonial Secretary a telegram in these terms:

Ottawa, November 19, 1916.

Your telegram September 5. Rifles. Specifications and drawings of Enfield rifle, 1914 pattern, urgently required before 1st December. Please telegraph probable date of arrival and also of shipment.

Devonshire.

And on the 19th November we sent this despatch:

Ottawa, November 19, 1916.

Your cypher telegram of 11th September last. Rifles. Urgently required for use as sealed patterns five Enfield rifles 1914 pattern. Hope this can be arranged and should be grateful to know by telegram date of shipment.

Devonshire.

On 12th December we received from the Colonial Secretary the following telegram addressed to the Governor General:

London, December 12, 1916.

With reference to your cypher telegram November 19, it is regretted by Minister of Munitions that he is not at present in a position to supply specifications and drawings of 1914 pattern Enfield rifle. No standard pattern of this rifle has yet been definitely settled upon, as it has been found necessary for manufacturers to alter certain points in original design. With reference to the taking up of the manufacture of rifle Minister of Munitions wishes to give every assistance to your Government, and will give instructions that specifications and drawings should be prepared in America or this country as soon as all details of pattern are definitely settled, and as promised in my telegram of September 5, will place representatives of Ross Company in communication with British experts who are in United States watching manufacture of rifle.

Up to the present time the necessary specifications and drawings alluded to in these several telegrams have not been received. As I stated, we have received the pattern of the rifle itself, and, having that pattern, we have given notice to the Ross Rifle Company in accordance with the contract as already mentioned. But, as I am advised by the Department of Justice—by the Solicitor General who looked into the matter—that for an order under the contract it is necessary not only that we should have the rifle itself but that we should have the specifications and drawings which, as I have said, although asked for some months ago, have been delayed owing to the fact that the exact nature of these specifications and drawings had not been fully settled.

It may be that in these remarks, which have been somewhat extended owing to the necessity of reading so many documents, I have overlooked some point suggested by hon. members on the other side, or it may be that some new point may be raised on which it would be proper to give information. I can only say in concluding my remarks, that if any further information is desired in any respect I shall be very happy to give it to the best of my ability. The Government has absolutely nothing which it desires to conceal in connection with this matter, except so far as considerations of the public interest may make it undesirable to place certain communications or portions of communications before the House in such a way that the information will reach the enemy.

I submit to the House and to the country this correspondence, and this account of the conditions with which we have to deal, with a good deal of confidence that our course will be appreciated, as it must be if it is understood. Throughout we have been animated by one purpose alone, namely, that the gallant men overseas fighting in the Canadian forces should be equipped with an efficient rifle, and, more than that, a rifle in which they could have absolute confidence. That has been the purpose, the desire, and the intention of the Government, and I think it is manifest from the correspondence I have read and the incidents I have described that the intention has been well carried out.

Mr. CARVELL: I think the House accepts the statement made by the right hon. the Prime Minister in the spirit in which it is offered. We all realize that in a subject of such a confidential nature as this there is some correspondence which the right hon. gentleman could not produce to the House. It is very evident from the manner in which his statement has been made that some correspondence is withheld. For that reason it is not as easy to discuss the subject as if it were an ordinary business affair. Personally, I feel very grateful to the Prime Minister for the information he has given. If I can get just a few more questions answered along the same lines I shall be perfectly satisfied, or, at any rate, I shall not have much further to say. I should like to know whether, at any time after July 15, when it became evident that there was something wrong with the Ross rifle, any person in authority went to Sir Charles Ross, officially or unofficially, and asked him if he would manufacture a different type of rifle from the Ross rifle, and if so whether he demanded a year's notice provided for in the contract, or whether he agreed to manufacture whatever kind of rifle the Government wanted. My reason for asking is found in the newspaper correspondence which took place last month. I have not it before me, but I read it as, I presume, the right hon. the Prime Minister did. We all know what that correspondence was. I think it began because of a statement made by the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) in Montreal. Sir Charles Ross, in his letter, stated in very plain language that he had always been willing to do whatever the Government wished him to do, that he had not stood on the letter of the contract but wished to carry it out in spirit, and had always been ready to make whatever changes and modifications the Government wanted to have made.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have no knowledge of any person having called upon Sir Charles Ross to make such a proposal. I understand that he is under the impression that he spoke to me in 1915 with regard to approaching the British Government with a view to having all the contracts changed into a contract for the Lee-Enfield rifle, possibly to procure a larger contract from the British Government.

I have a good deal of confidential correspondence about some negotiations that he had concerning a proposed large contract with the Russian Government, in which he requested the assistance of the Canadian Government. I have no recollection of his having made that suggestion to me in 1915. If he made any such suggestion to me as he thinks he did, it must have been of a casual character, because I have no recollection whatever of it. Further than that, I have had the correspondence examined and I find no reference in it to any such proposals. I am perfectly satisfied that the proposal is one which would not have been entertained by the British Government, for the reason that they have always adhered to the theory that it would be impossible for him to change his factory so as to produce a new rifle in quantities inside of about two years. I have read two telegrams which indicate that. Sir Charles Ross himself thinks that he would do it in a year, possibly in less than a year. We have to take into account, of course, the views of those whose experience in such matters would make their opinions valuable.

Mr. CARVELL: The Prime Minister says that he will take the opinion of some

official in England in preference to the opinion of Sir Charles Ross.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not say that. I said that in dealing with such a question we would have to take into account the view of experts, whether in Great Britain or in our own department at home. We could not be absolutely sure that the view of the experts of the Ross Rifle Company would be borne out in the end.

Mr. CARVELL: The Prime Minister has a great advantage in discussing this matter, because he has had an opportunity of taking it up, not only with the experts in Great Britain and in the department here, but also with Sir Charles Ross; whereas we on this side of the House have had no opportunity of discussing it with anybody. But it would seem to the ordinary observer that the man who has the most up-to-date rifle factory in America, and who has been able to turn out rifles at the rate of 1,000 a day, ought to have some idea as to how long it would take him to equip his factory. However, I have no knowledge of the matter; I simply accept the statement made by the Prime Minister. Has the Ross rifle factory during the last two years and a half been asked to make any changes in the rifle which they are manufacturing? If so, how many; and have they required a year's time within which to make the change, or have they done it in a much shorter time? If they have done it in a shorter time, how long has it taken to effect the changes?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not want my hon. friend, or the members of the committee, or any one else to misunderstand me. I was not disparaging the ability or experience of Sir Charles Ross, for, as far as the mechanical details of the rifle are concerned, it is universally acknowledged that he is an exceedingly capable man. I only intended to suggest that a government, in the midst of a war, when the question of time is vital, must, in considering such a change, take into consideration the view which is entertained not only by the contractor, but also by their own experts and by the experts of Great Britain, whose experience and knowledge in such matters certainly should command respect. When the question of time is vital, one could not make a plunge into a proposal of that kind without taking the opinion of both sides into pretty careful account. My hon. friend asks me what changes have been made. I have spent a good deal of time in endeavouring to get at the bottom of all these matters from first to last, and to see that the direction of events was in accordance with the best interests of our men at the front, but I certainly am not in a position to-night to give my hon. friend the information he asks, I should imagine that any changes, if any have been made, are of a very minor and trivial character, but I do not desire to commit myself to any statement on the subject unless I am absolutely sure that it is correct. I will get the information in written form from the Master-General of the Ordnance and give it to the committee to-morrow, or whenever the question is next taken up.

Mr. CARVELL: That is entirely satisfactory. I quite understand that the Prime Minister has had many things to take up his attention besides the matter of following up the changes that may have taken place in the Ross rifle. Still, as he seems to have a very complete brief on the case, I thought he might possibly be able to tell us what changes, if any, have been made. There has been an enormous amount of talk throughout Canada during the last year in regard to the Ross rifle. We hear it stated in one place that the company must be allowed a year in which to make any change. I have been told by a member of the House since coming here that changes have been made inside of one or two months. I suppose they would be minor changes, but they would be changes just the same, and some alteration of the machinery would be necessary. I do not forget the fact that this country is at war, nor do I forget that up to a comparatively recent period the question of getting rifles of any kind was a very serious problem for Great Britain and her Allies. But in the light of the report, which the right hon. gentleman has read to-night, of a committee appointed by General French away back in June, 1915, positively recommending that the Canadian troops at the front be not armed with the Ross rifle, it is most remarkable that the matter was allowed to drift along as it did. It could be justified only by the reason given by the Prime Minister to-night: that a rifle of almost any kind was better than no rifle at all. I do not think that the same charitable construction could be placed upon the actions of the Government after the lamentable affairs of May, 1916, as could be placed upon their actions after the occurrences of 1915, because in 1916 the rifle

situation must have been very materially improved. I quite appreciate the fact that the Prime Minister does not wish to state the date when the British Government expect to be entirely independent in the matter of the supply of rifles. He quite properly refused to give that information to-night, and I would suggest that he go over the remarks which he made this afternoon, because it is my impression that he gave that information, perhaps without realizing what he was doing. That was my reason for asking the question. However, in the months of June and July, 1916, the Government must have had some idea that the British Government were not in the straits that they had been in the matter of rifles. The best evidence of that is that on July 11, 1916, this Government was notified by the Secretary of State for the Colonies to send no more Ross rifles to England; that in future the British authorities would provide the Canadian army with Lee-Enfields.

That is a fact which is plainly stated in the correspondence; therefore, there is no reason why we should not discuss it. We start out from the 11th day of July, 1916, with the fact that the British Government were able to furnish the Canadian Army with Lee-Enfield rifles and that they did not want any more Ross rifles brought to Great Britain. The question that occurs to the average business man is, why, if that condition of affairs existed, the Government have gone on manufacturing Ross rifles from the 11th of July to the present time, are asking this Parliament to vote $2,660,000 for the purpose of purchasing more Ross rifles, and are producing 80,000 more rifles which the British Government will not allow upon the firing line and do not want in England at all. I appreciate the fact that these Ross rifles would be useful for instructional purposes, and for drilling purposes; and, as the Prime Minister stated they might be used on the lines of communication, although I think not in France, for I cannot conceive that under present conditions they would be allowed there. But we must remember that at the lowest calculation there must be 100,000 more Ross rifles owned or controlled by the Government of Great Britain than possibly can be required for the troops now in Great Britain for instructional purposes, and it would seem to me that these 100,000 rifles could be brought to Canada. They would more than supply any troops that are in Canada or that are likely to be, for instructional purposes. Therefore, it would seem that if the British Government are furnishing and have been furnishing since July last, all the rifles that are used at the front, the supply of nearly 300,000 Ross rifles—it must be pretty near that number since we started, as 218,000 have been purchased—a supply of that kind, one would think, would be quite sufficient.

The first question I asked this afternoon I repeat now. Why, in view of this state of affairs, have the Government continued manufacturing the Ross rifle and why are they spending so much money for an article which, according to all the evidence, is of no great practical use to Canada in winning this war. I know that the Prime Minister takes the ground that the Ross rifle factory could not be converted into a Lee-Enfield factory within two years. We have not any evidence upon that.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not give any opinion of my own upon it.

Mr. CARVELL: The Prime Minister gave the opinion of some one else, and I have no opinion upon it at all; therefore my opinion would not be as good as the Prime Minister's. But we must remember that we would not have to close down the Ross factory entirely in order to convert it into a factory for making another kind of rifle, for there is an enormous amount of machinery in a rifle factory that would apply to any kind of rifle. After all, about the only difference between the Ross rifle and the Lee-Enfield rifle is in the bolt chamber. All the machinery which would make the stocks, barrels, and bands, and the dozen odd parts of the rifle, would be applicable to another type. We have the evidence given by the Prime Minister himself that it would take only about $500,000 to build over the Ross rifle factory into a Lee-Enfield factory, and that the British Government would agree to furnish the machinery, or a large part of it. That is stated in the communication which the Prime Minister has just read. With these facts in our minds, the thing which I cannot understand, and which, I think, will bother the people of this country, is why the Government have gone on since July, 1916, manufacturing this rifle, and why they are still making it and purchasing 80,000 more when the Prime Minister himself stated this afternoon that after the month of July, 1916, the production of rifles was not a very serious matter. I think I am using almost the exact words which the Prime Minister

used. I think his first idea was that it was hardly worth while bothering their heads about a rifle until the war had ended, or at least until the Empire had decided upon the make of a rifle that would be Empire-wide. There was a communication addressed to the War Office, I think in the month of September, 1916—I have forgotten the exact date, but I think it was in September—asking them if, in their opinion, it was worth while for the Canadian Government to enter into the manufacture of any kind of rifle until the matter had been decided by the Empire at large. The same answer came back that had been coming for four or five months; if you want to manufacture a rifle, take the American ·276. That seemed to be the answer every time. I appreciate the fact that my hon. friend has had some difficulty in getting the specifications and drawings, and, to some extent, in getting a pattern rifle.

Sir SAM HUGHES: When my hon. friend refers to the American ·276 rifle, I suppose he means the British ·276 made in the United States?

Mr. CARVELL: The Prime Minister has been speaking about that this afternoon, and I am only quoting his words. I mean the 1914 Enfield rifle manufactured in the United States. The same answer always came back, and it came back in this case: if you want to make a rifle, make the ·276 according to the American pattern. It seems most remarkable that this thing was allowed to dangle along for months, and that nothing had been done. Now we are down to the point that after the 1st day of February, 1918, the rifles supplied shall be according to this ·276 or American Enfield. I do not know, but I would feel pretty badly to-night if I could bring myself to believe that we would require rifles in any quantity after February, 1918. It may be possible that we will require them, but I sincerely hope not. It seems to me that, in that view of the case, it would be almost a useless expenditure of time and energy, let alone money.

I wish to call my right hon. friend's attention to just one other matter, and it is one which I cannot view in the same light as I have viewed the remainder of the statements which he made this afternoon and evening. It seemed to me that the principal reason given by the Prime Minister for continuing to manufacture the Ross rifle, and for the expenditure of $2,500,000 in the future on a weapon which he himself must admit can be of no very great practical use as a military weapon, is that we are bound by the contract, and that we must carry out that contract. Why, Mr. Chairman, has the right hon. gentleman forgotten that this country is at war? Has he forgotten that you can break a contract, if it is necessary, under the War Measures Act? I do not care if there was no War Measures Act; surely if this nation has agreed with some one to purchase a rifle which is not of any good, we are not going to carry out the contract. I do not believe that we have reached that point. I do not believe that Sir Charles Ross would try to hold the Government for a moment to a contract of that kind. I believe that if the Government asked Sir Charles Ross to-morrow, or put him in the box before a committee of this House, he would tell them that not only is he willing now, but that he has been willing from the beginning to change that rifle to any pattern that the Government wanted. I believe that the Government could cancel that contract if they want to cancel it. I cannot for a moment conceive that any hon. man, with the nation at war, would try to hold the Government to the mere letter of a contract and say: because you have given me a contract to manufacture a certain article, therefore, I am going to have my pound of flesh, and I am going to demand that you carry out that contract to the letter. I would want some further evidence than that which has been produced to make me believe that. There is another thing which I cannot accept; nor do I believe that the Prime Minister himself can accept it or believe it possible, and that is that the Ross rifle factory would demand a full year's time in which to make a change in the class of a rifle.

As far as Sir Charles Ross is personally concerned, I have never seen him more than once or twice in my life, and I do not know anything about him at all, but I cannot conceive of any loyal, British subject standing on a condition of that kind, when the nation is at war, and saying: although I own the only rifle factory which we have in Canada, and notwithstanding the fact that you want these rifles changed in order that they may be of some benefit to this country in the prosecution of the war, I stand on my legal rights and I will not make that change within twelve months. If I were the Prime Minister and a contractor should take that ground, it would not take me very long to put another

man into that factory who would carry out any changes that the nation wanted.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What does my hon. friend mean by that? How could we put another man in charge?

Mr. CARVELL: Do you mean to say that if there is a rifle factory in charge of a man who says that he will not make such a change within a year simply because the contract says he does not have to, that you could not take that factory over and put somebody else in charge?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Do you mean to expropriate it?

Mr. CARVELL: Take it; I do not care what you call it. I would take it and so quickly that he would never know what had happened to him. I do not think that I have to argue that before the Prime Minister. I do not believe that condition of affairs exists at all, and I think the Prime Minister would be much happier arguing that possibly it could not be done than that as he says because of the contract he could not do as he wished to do. However we have the explanation from the Prime Minister. I am very glad that the country has it and I think it would have been more fitting if we had had the facts laid before the public long ago. I realize that much of what has come out to-day has transpired since Parliament adjourned in May last, but there was a good deal which could have been given to the country a year ago. However, the country now has the information. I, for one, still hope that the Government will reconsider the matter and attempt to bring about the manufacture of rifles in Canada. As I said this afternoon, I agreed with that principle in 1904 and I agree with that principle to-day. I do not see any reason why rifles cannot be manufactured in Canada as well as in any other place in the world. I know they can be manufactured because they are being manufactured. A rifle which for sniping purposes, as the Prime Minister admits, is the best rifle in the world, is being made to-day. As he says, this is the best equipped factory on the continent and therefore there is no reason why this factory could not be kept in existence and why they cannot accept the offer of the British Government and convert it into a Lee-Enfield factory. Notwithstanding the opinion of the Prime Minister, I do not think there is any reason why this factory could not, within a reasonably short time, be turning out Lee-Enfield rifles, which we know would be of some benefit in winning this war, instead of spending a year's time and $2,500,000 in turning out a rifle which, I am afraid, will not be of very much value to the Empire and which the British Government do not want at all. I place this view before the Prime Minister, but I do not do so in a controversial spirit. I have tried to discuss the facts, and I do think that even at this late date there is time for the Government to do better than they have done and get much better results for the country than this proposal which they put forward would give.

Just another word and that is to the contractual part of the matter. The Prime Minister tries to make it appear that because this contract was in a sense perpetual they were compelled to go on and manufacture Ross rifles or rifles of some kind. The argument I used a few moments ago applies to this as well. If this country is at war and wants rifles or munitions or materials of any kind, all it has to do is to say so. It may be a question of adjustment later on, there may be some damages to pay, but that is a pretty lame excuse for manufacturing something that this country does not require, that is of no benefit to the country and which does not make for munitions necessary to the winning of the war. There is not much use in notifying the Ross Rifle Company that all rifles to be furnished by them after the first of February, 1918, must be of a certain pattern. Unless the Government makes with the company a contract sufficiently large to make it of some value, there is no object in going on and manufacturing. If you take, say, 12,000 rifles for this year, which, as I understand, is the minimum amount which the Government must take, at $30 apiece, and I believe that is the price for the rifle and the bayonet, that is only $360,000. That is the total cost of the 12,000 rifles. According to the information received this afternoon, it will cost $500,000 to equip the factory so that unless the Government go into this——

Sir SAM HUGHES: How much did the hon. gentleman say it would cost to equip the factory?

Mr. CARVELL: About half a million.

Sir SAM HUGHES: For what?

Mr. CARVELL: For re-equipping the factory.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is only for the change in the gauges.

Mr. CARVELL: That is all. The major portion of the factory would be equally suited to the manufacturing of the Lee-Enfields as the Ross. But there was the statement made this afternoon by the Prime Minister that the factory could be converted into a Lee-Enfield factory for about half a million dollars. If you stand by the letter of the old contract, which means that the company must manufacture, say, 12,000 rifles, which the Government take at $30 apiece, that amounts only to $360,000 while it would cost half a million dollars to change the factory over. That means that the contractor will not carry out the work and you will be doing nothing. If you follow out that contract to its logical conclusion, it means that the factory is closed down. I do not believe that it is in the best interests of Canada, of the militia of Canada, or of the British Empire, that the Ross rifle factory, or any other factory, that can manufacture rifles or anything else that is required for the conduct of the war should be closed down. I can only conclude by expressing the hope that the Government will reconsider this matter and put all the energy which they can into it, accept the offer of the British Government for these jigs and tools, equip the Ross rifle factory and manufacture something which will be of assistance to Canada and the Empire in the winning of the war.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is exactly what we have asked them to do in this order in council which I have read. The hon. gentleman seems to regard the Ross rifle as a particularly fragile article. I do not so regard it at all. The Ross rifle has a more delicate mechanism, it is admittedly a better target rifle, but when it was subjected to the test under conditions of war which prevailed during the past year or two——

Sir SAM HUGHES: Did my right hon. friend say it had a more delicate mechanism?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I thought so.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Not at all.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I bow to the superior knowledge of my hon. friend but I have so understood it from certain authorities which may not be so convincing on the subject as my hon. friend's opinion. But, I think I could give him some testimony to that effect. The despatch from the British Government to which I have alluded states that for certain purposes, although not for service in the field, the Ross rifle is valuable, such as the training of the army, and so on. After grave consideration of the matter we gave this order in February last just as the British Government had given their order in the autumn of 1914. They are continuing their order. They are bound by the contract to have it fulfilled and pay for the rifles on delivery. We gave an order in February 1916, and we are bound by the terms of the contract. We must fulfil the contract and we must pay for the rifles. Sir Charles Ross has accomplished very great things in equipping his rifle factory for war purposes. I would not be disposed to treat him in any harsh or unfair way, and I think when my hon. friend suggests that we should take him by the coat collar and put him out of the factory if he did not do this, that, or the other thing which he was not obliged to do under the contract, he is asking us to adopt a course which would hardly be consistent with fair play. I think it would be unfair not to have regard to the very large expenditure which Sir Charles Ross has made for the purpose of turning out rifles which were of a type approved by the late Administration, and approved also by the present Administration. My hon. friend might realize also that the 1914 Enfield rifle, according to the view of the British Government expressed in the telegrams which I have read, is a better rifle than that which is at present being manufactured in Great Britain. Nevertheless they have not attempted to manufacture that model in Great Britain up to the present time, and that obviously for the reason I have already suggested.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Have they accepted any from the United States?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not know.

Sir SAM HUGHES: None whatever.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not know that they have accepted any; I do not know that they have not. I would suppose that the reason they have carried on the manufacture in the United States, and not in Great Britain, is that in the United States it was necessary to build up a new organization, and therefore that new organization could be built up for the purpose of producing a new rifle, whereas in Great Britain they had their plants and factories all ready for the manufacture of the previous type of Lee-Enfield, and they carried on with that, because to have

attempted to make a change in Great Britain would have involved an unfortunate and unjustifiable delay.

My hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) says that rifles produced after the 1st of February, 1918, may be of no use in this war. That is perfectly true. The war may have ended by that time, and in the way we all hope it will end. But it might also have been in my hon. friend's mind, or in the mind of any reasonable person, in July or August of 1916, that rifles produced after the 1st of September, 1917, would not be of any use in this war; and the outcome of the war may still be such as would justify that anticipation. So it is perfectly idle to suggest that the Government could have taken any other course than that which they did take under the circumstances. My hon. friend has referred to the condition of the Ross rifle in Great Britain, and suggested that the rifles might be brought back, and the present contract cancelled. As I have already explained, there are some negotiations on foot in regard to the Ross rifle in Great Britain, and possibly some announcement may be made to the House later in the session as to the outcome of these negotiations.

Mr. CARVELL: Would the right hon. gentleman let me know whether he found out during the dinner hour who it was that ordered or was responsible for the reduction of the chamber of the Ross rifle from .462 to .457 in 1910?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I stated at the time that my information did not come from the Department of Militia and Defence, but that it was reliable. I have asked the deputy minister to procure absolutely accurate information on that point, which I shall give to the committee.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I understand that it was on the recommendation of Colonel Harkom, the expert adviser to the Militia Department under Sir Frederick Borden. The Standing Committee on Small Arms was never consulted. A mistake arose in this way. The Lee-Enfield rifle for the proof charge had exactly the same chamber as the Ross rifle for the finished charge. I forget the figures, but they are all on Hansard. The proof charge of the Lee-Enfield was, I think, about twenty some odd tons. Then the rifle was fired in proof, the expansion being greater than the tensile strength of the steel, the chamber of the Lee-Enfield rifle was expanded about two-thousandths of an inch. The tensile strength was from forty-eight to fifty-two thousand—fifty-two thousand being the proof charge. The steel after expanding did not contract back to the primary size of the chamber. With the Ross rifle, the proof charge was the same: fifty-two thousand or thereabouts, but the tensile strength of the Ross was from eighty to one hundred thousand pounds to the square inch, and accordingly there was no expansion in the chamber of the Ross; it remained exactly as it was. The chamber of the Ross rifle was therefore the size of the proof charge, two thousandths of an inch less than the chamber of the Lee-Enfield. That was remedied in England and France. I do not want to take any part in this discussion, as I understand it is all about the contract.

The chamber of the Ross rifle was, of course, changed a couple of years ago, but let us take the Ross rifle with the small chamber. I did not hear the reports that were read this afternoon, nor have I seen them, but I challenge the world to produce a report showing a test between the Ross rifle with the small chamber, and the Lee-Enfield, with good ammunition for both rifles, where the Ross has not beaten the Lee Enfield. I go further and take dirt mud, and sand tests, of which we have had scores officially and otherwise, and I challenge any man to produce a report of what we call these official tests, even with the small chamber in the Ross, where the Ross rifle has not beaten the Lee-Enfield. I go further and say that even with defective ammunition, which has been the cause of all this trouble—it was not the rifles at all but the defective ammunition with the soft cartridge case—I will not say that the Lee-Enfield has not stood the fire as well as the small chambered Ross, but I say they are about even. But since we enlarged the chamber of the Ross rifle, I challenge any one to show a report of any tests here or in the British Army, where the Ross rifle, even firing bad ammunition, has not done infinitely better than the Lee-Enfield.

Mr. CARVELL: Was the hon. gentleman present after eight o'clock when the Premier read a report of the committee appointed by Sir John French in the month of June, 1915?

Sir SAM HUGHES: The Ross chamber was not enlarged then. I care not what the report is. There is no such test report in existence that has been made as between the two rifles where the Ross did not beat the Lee-Enfield. I know what has been done.

Mr. CARVELL: The Premier read it.

Sir SAM HUGHES: He did not read a comparative test between the two rifles.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, he did.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I should like to see it. I say that such a test was never made by Sir John French. A hearsay report was made by one of his officers, but no comparative test.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If the report is produced, what will the hon. gentleman say?

Sir SAM HUGHES: It cannot be produced for no comparative tests were made there by any authority whatsoever. I saw one report in a Canadian paper of a test between the two rifles that never occurred. One day they were illustrating to General Carson and Sir Max Aitken the defective cartridges. They took a boy, who was an engine driver and who had never fired more than twenty shots out of a Ross rifle in his life, to handle the Ross rifle, putting him in competition with an expert artillery man who was using the other rifle. As soon as a competent man was put on to handle the Ross rifle, with the defective cartridges it was found that the Lee-Enfield jammed more quickly than the Ross.

Mr. CARVELL: That is not the comparative test referred to by the Prime Minister this evening.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not know to what the right hon. gentleman referred.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It was some test referred to in Sir John French's report made on the 5th of June, 1915.

Sir SAM HUGHES: There was no such test for mud and dirt and all that sort of thing.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not say it was for mud or dirt; it was for defect in jamming.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is the point I am making. The jamming was due to defective ammunition. I had the reports and I presume they should be in the department. I do not know whether they have been read here tonight or not. There was a report of the 28th Regiment of Regina having a mine exploded in front of them and in their attempt to take the trench, twelve of the rifles jammed. The cry immediately went up "Ross rifles jamming." Col. Embury knew from experience that it was the ammunition that was bad because they had been trained in England not to use certain brands of ammunition; but in spite of all the orders that this ammunition was not to be served out to the Canadian troops, it was found bad mixed with good in every regiment that had the Ross rifle and it was not found in a solitary regiment that had the Lee-Enfield rifle. Five thousand rounds of defective ammunition were found in the pouches of one particular regiment after the fighting was over.

Mr. CARVELL: Was it a German conspiracy ?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not know; I was not there. The men were disgusted with the rifle, the consequence being that Colonel Embury took the twelve men with the Lee-Enfield rifle and twelve men with the Ross rifle and made them test their rifles with the defective ammunition, and every man was convinced that defective ammunition jammed in the Lee-Enfield rifle after fifteen or twenty rounds had been fired, and in the Ross rifle only after fifty or sixty rounds had been fired. The Lee-Enfield rifle was put out of action after seventy-five or ninety rounds had been fired, and the Ross rifle only after a hundred to a hundred and twenty-five rounds had been fired. In every instance the Ross rifle proved better than the Lee-Enfield with defective ammunition, but with good ammunition neither rifle jammed, and they could not possibly jam. I could produce officers who are in the city to-night who fought with the Princess Patricias, with the Munster Fusiliers, with the Guards, with practically every British regiment—there are none in the city who fought with the Gordons—and they know that it was the defective ammunition that caused the jamming. There were three brands of it. Soft shells or soft cartridge cases would glue to the sides of the chamber and could not readily be extracted; but the tests are in the department and can be produced, if that has not already been done, showing where in England, France and Belgium these tests were made, and in every solitary instance with good ammunition there was no trouble with either rifle. With the defective ammunition, the Ross rifle would sometimes jam, but always later than the Lee-Enfield, the fault being entirely due to the ammunition. Although the British forces did not seem to be aware of it early in the war, they are aware of it now. The Canadian forces were not aware of it. At

the battle of St. Julien and the second battle of Ypres, a great deal of the ammunition the boys carried was Canadian ammunition that was absolutely perfect, and there was not one case of jamming except where defective ammunition was served out to one of the brigades.

Mr. CARVELL: The Third Brigade?

Sir SAM HUGHES: No, I think it was the brigade under General Currie. The only thing the Canadians had to defend themselves with, with the exception of a few machine guns, was the Ross rifle, whereas the Germans had rifles, machine guns by the hundred and also their artillery and aeroplanes flying over our troops, and yet the Ross rifle firing the good Canadian ammunition carried our soldiers right through. The next day or two after the first three days of the fighting the Durhams and the Yorks were brought up to fill up the gaps on the right of the Third Brigade. When they began to fire with the defective ammunition, they found they could not fire their rifles and many of them were shot down. They threw away their rifles and did the only thing they could do—fell back; they had no other recourse than to retire. Some of our rifles firing the bad English ammunition also jammed and there was considerable trouble, all due to the ammunition. Neither the Lee-Enfield nor the Ross rifle has jammed with good ammunition. Those who are familiar with rifles know the sand and mud test, of getting the rifles and ammunition all dirty and testing them out. Where such tests have been made, with good ammunition or bad ammunition, the Ross rifle with the large chamber has beaten the Lee-Enfield.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Then why was the Ross rifle condemned?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I did not condemn it. You had better ask those who did. It has been pointed out that the Ross rifle is longer than the Lee-Enfield. The Ross rifle is practically the same length as the Mauser rifle and it is the standard length. For trench warfare, of course, it is handier to have a short rifle. The only objection General Turner told me he could find to the Ross rifle was its length. When I pointed out that it was the same length as the Mauser rifle, he said that the soldiers had got the idea that the Lee-Enfield rifle was handier for running through a trench at night. That may have been true, but all that is done away with. Those who make raids on the trenches use bombs and revolvers; only the men who stand out on top of the trenches use rifles. General Turner told me last summer and also previously that the Ross rifle was a little long for work in the trenches. When the decision came this year to change the rifle, I spoke to General Byng about it. The Prime Minister offered to have a competitive test, if I remember aright. I presume it has been produced to-day.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Why was that test not held, may I ask? It was because everyone on either side knew that there would be only one result. We had scores of tests in England and in France, and they knew that if a comparative test was made with good ammunition, the Ross rifle would come out on top for mud tests, and they knew that if there was a comparative test for bad ammunition—and we have had them again and again for each rifle in such a way that no favouritism was shown—the Ross rifle would always stand up a little better than the Lee-Enfield. I have made no fuss about it, because the rifle was gone, and I felt that many of the boys were honestly uncertain about the rifle from the attacks made upon it, and many others were made uncertain. I would say: Don't carry a rifle that you have not confidence in, but if you feel that way about it, change it. It was on that ground that General Byng advocated the change. He said he did not know the merits or demerits of the rifle, but the story was abroad that the Ross rifle jammed. A number of the English soldiers got the idea that our rifles were not what they ought to be, and a lot of Canadians got the idea that maybe our rifle was not as good as the English rifle. Another point. I have reports here, but I do not wish to bother the House with them—for the thing is past—showing the action of some of the regiments when they were ordered to give up the Ross rifle and take the Lee-Enfield. I might mention one case. Colonel Rose, of the Welland regiment, as well as others, entered a most determined protest. He said that he had tried again and again to make scores with the Lee-Enfield without success, but with the Ross rifle the score was 75 per cent for the entire regiment at 600 yards down to 100 yards rapid fire. And that is the sort of shooting that made the Germans hesitate at St. Julien, and caused them to believe that the Canadians were armed with

machine guns. With the Lee-Enfield tried over and over again, Col. Rose's regiment had only been able to make a score of 29 per cent for the whole regiment. He declared that it meant murder to change the rifles; one man with a Ross rifle was equal to two men with the Lee-Enfield, the shooting was so rapid and so accurate, and the sighting so easy. I say I have reports to this effect, but I have not bothered to give them, for the thing has gone by, so let it go.

Mr. CARVELL: While we are cleaning up things and getting information, would the hon. gentleman (Sir Sam Hughes) tell us what took place about the bolt of the Ross rifle? I have seen reference to the fact that enormous sums of money were spent——

Sir SAM HUGHES: Not much money. Well, there was a good deal of it, too. The cam action of the bolt depends upon the lugs, as they are called. These lugs were made soft so that they would stand the recoil without breaking. They were tempered to just the proper consistency. Somebody conceived the idea that these should be hardened, and this was done in the case of a number of the rifles. By whose authority this was done, I do not know, but I believe it was that of some officers at the camp in Kent. We sent over three thousand bolts properly tempered. But these people hardened them again, as we found out afterwards.

Mr. CARVELL: What was the result?

Sir SAM HUGHES: They were made as brittle as a piece of glass, almost; the bolts were practically ruined. It was a piece of meddling on the part of somebody—on whose part I never found out.

Mr. CARVELL: Was this hardening process carried out under instructions of the Canadian Government?

Sir SAM HUGHES: No, we gave no instructions on the subject. I asked half a dozen times, but did not find out definitely on whose authority the thing was done. I heard a variety of stories about it, but I do not wish to mention any names when I am not sure of the facts. It was not done by authority of General Carson. He heard of it and was informed that it was necessary.

Mr. CARVELL: Is it true that over 100,000 rifles were so treated?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I never heard it said that there were that many.

Mr. CARVELL: I have heard all sorts of stories about it—that there were from 75,000 to 150,000 rifles so treated.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I never heard that there were as many as that. The number, as I was informed, was several thousands.

Mr. MURPHY: If the committee and the people of this country could reconcile, in the first place, the opposing positions taken with reference to making a change in the Ross rifle by two members of the Government, and, in the second place, the opposing positions taken by Sir Charles Ross, the contractor, as against both of these gentlemen, the explanation which was given here as to the change would be the more readily accepted. As I understand the right hon. Prime Minister—and his explanation seemed reasonable—the chief objection to making the change was the time that would be consumed in carrying it out. But, speaking in Montreal in December last, the hon. the Solicitor General explained that the difficulty which confronted the Government in this regard was that the Government was bound by the contract made with the former Administration, and being so bound could not make a change. Here are two different positions taken by these two distinguished gentlemen. As against both of them, Sir Charles Ross, in his letter to the Ottawa Citizen of 12th January, 1917, takes an entirely different position. In the first place, he does not seem to regard time as an element containing any difficulty whatever in making the change, and in the second place he makes it quite plain that if at any time the Government desired to make a change his company would not seek to hold them to the terms of the original contract. So that there may be no doubt on this point, let me refer the committee to that letter:—

> You ask whether I made it clear to the Government at any time after the outbreak of war that the Ross Rifle Company would be willing not to stand on the letter of the contract or if Mr. Meighen was right in affirming at Montreal that the Government was "bound" by the contract made by the late Administration.
>
> I am quite willing to reply to your question but to enable me to select the most appropriate extracts from official documents to back up my statement, I should like to know authoritatively, first, just what Mr. Meighen means by the word "bound."
>
> Does he mean to repeat the historical platitude that Governments of Canada keep faith and are as a result bound by agreements made by themselves or their predecessors? Or does he allege that the Government because it was "bound" was, as a result, hampered and prevented from taking the best course in the gen-

eral interest of Canada which was and is fighting for its very existence?

If he does allege that the Government was in some way hampered, will he take us into his confidence and tell us exactly what it was the contract of 1902 prevented the Government from doing?

Meanwhile, I can only repeat that I have always endeavoured to assist the Government to turn out a rifle satisfactory in every respect, not standing upon the letter of the contract, but acting upon the spirit of it.

While I am entirely in accord with what my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) says, that the committee and the country are indebted to the right hon. the Prime Minister for the explanation he has given—it will be obvious to the right hon. gentleman and to the committee that, in view of the specific statements made, the matter is far from being cleared up by the explanations that have been given. I do not know whether anything further can be said in explanation, but I considered it my duty to bring to the attention of the Prime Minister and the committee this position taken by Sir Charles Ross.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have placed the contract in the pages of Hansard to speak for itself. It is obvious that the terms of the contract cannot be modified by a letter written to a newspaper. Sir Charles Ross since the outbreak of the war has used every effort to turn out in the greatest possible numbers and with the least possible delay the rifles which have been ordered by the Government. I have already given him credit for the enterprise, promptness and vigour with which he undertook to discharge that very important task. I am not aware that the terms of the contract have otherwise been modified in any way. However, I will make inquiry and see whether there is any document on record indicating that it was the intention to depart from the terms of the contract as I have placed it before the committee and as it is now in Hansard.

Mr. CARVELL: A few minutes ago the ex-Minister of Militia made a somewhat remarkable statement. He said that the bolts of thousands of rifles had been hardened, so that the lug holding the bolt in position became as brittle as a piece of glass, broke off and in many cases flew out in the men's faces. Certainly there is something about the treatment of these bolts which the country does not know. I know the ex-Minister fairly well; when he skates over a thing like he did over this matter to-night, I always get suspicious. I wish that the Prime Minister, who does not skate, would investigate this matter and give the committee some information when the subject comes up again for discussion.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Probably some information can be obtained on the subject. As I have already said, we have nothing to conceal about this matter; if a mistake has been made in dealing with the bolts it is proper that the committee should be informed of it. I shall be very glad when this matter is taken up in committee again, to give any information that may be available on the subject.

Mr. MARCIL: On the 9th of December the new Minister of Inland Revenue, on his arrival at Quebec the day after he had been sworn in, declared in the presence of a large number of the workmen employed by the Ross rifle factory that he was authorized by his colleagues to state that the removal of the factory from Quebec had never been contemplated and that the factory would remain where it was. Probably the rumour to that effect had been started by the announcement that the construction of a new Dominion arsenal in Lindsay, Ontario, had been commenced. What is the policy of the Government regarding the manufacture of munitions and the manufacture of rifles in Canada?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Minister of Inland Revenue asked me before he went to Quebec whether it was the intention of the Government to remove the Dominion Arsenal from Quebec. I told him that that had not been contemplated, and that it was not the intention of the Government to remove the Dominion Arsenal from Quebec.

Mr. MARCIL: What about the Ross rifle factory?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: He asked me whether there was any intention of doing away with the Ross rifle factory or of removing it from Quebec. I told him that that had not been in contemplation, and that it was not the intention of the Government to remove it. I understand that the declaration which the Minister of Inland Revenue made is in accordance with that.

Mr. MARCIL: What is in contemplation with respect to the arsenal at Lindsay? If my memory serves me correctly, the late Minister of Militia said that Quebec was not a very safe place in which to manufacture munitions—that it was deemed advisable to manufacture munitions on a larger scale at a point more inland.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN. I do not understand how my hon. friend can find anything

inconsistent in the two statements. An arsenal has been established at Lindsay, from which ammunition is now being turned out. It is quite consistent with that that the Dominion Arsenal at Quebec, which has produced ammunition in small quantities in the past, should be continued.

Mr. OLIVER: Is there any provision in this contract with the Ross Rifle Company which gives the company the exclusive right to manufacture rifles for or supply rifles to the Government of Canada?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, the Government are bound to purchase from that company all the rifles that they require, and they are bound also to purchase from them not less than 10,000 rifles every year. I have not the contract before me—it has been sent to Hansard—but, as I recall it, the only qualification is that if the Government, in case of war or emergency, calls upon the company to produce rifles in very large numbers and the company in reply notify the Government that they can produce only a certain smaller number, then the Government would be at liberty to obtain the additional number wherever they might be available.

Mr. OLIVER: Has the Prime Minister any information as to what the cost of the Ross rifle establishment was at the outbreak of war?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, I could not tell my hon. friend just what it was at that time, or, indeed, what it is at present. I know that the factory has been very considerably enlarged by the addition of units, as they call them, since the outbreak of war. It is only in that way that the company has been enabled to produce a greatly increased quantity of rifles during the past two and a half years.

Mr. OLIVER: There is, then, a provision that in case of war, such as did take place, if the company was not able to meet any demand made by the Government, the Government could take other means to meet that demand?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, if it could get the rifles anywhere else. The situation that presented itself to the Government was that we could not get them anywhere else; therefore, we simply had to ask the Ross Rifle Company to do the best that they could. Their best was really beyond the anticipation of any person who knew what their resources were when war broke out.

Mr. OLIVER: What was the capacity of their factory in 1914?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Deputy Minister of Militia informs me that at the outbreak of war their maximum output was 20,000 a year.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I understand the Prime Minister to say that under the contract the Ross Company would be obliged to manufacture any pattern of rifle which the Government would require, the Government being bound to purchase at least 10,000 per year. If the Ross Company were required by the Government to make the necessary changes in plant in order to manufacture the Lee-Enfield instead of the Ross, which would entail a large initial capital expenditure, is the Government supposed to repay to the company part of that capital investment? Would it be fair to expect the Ross Rifle Company to make the necessary changes upon a small order of say 10,000 per year? It seems to me that that would hardly be a fair way of dealing with the company.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I appreciate what my hon. friend says. Of course, we do not intend to take any course which might be regarded as unfair to the company, especially having regard to the great vigour and resourcefulness which the company displayed in increasing its output. I agree entirely with my hon. friend that, possibly, if the contract was strictly enforced in that respect, a result that would not be regarded as quite fair to the company might follow. That is one of the difficulties of the situation which confronts the Government at the present time. We must take into account, on the one hand, the fact that we may have a very large number of Ross rifles, already manufactured, which would be sufficient and well adapted for the training of our troops in time of peace, a larger number probably than would be required in time of peace for that purpose. On the other hand, we have to take into account the fact that it is not advisable, as has been urged by the hon. member for Carleton, to continue the production of the Ross rifle Mark III. Therefore, we have directed the company, by notice under the terms of the contract, to manufacture the Enfield rifle of 1914, adapted for .303 ammunition. So that on the one hand, there is the fact, which faces the Government of the United Kingdom as well, that there will be this large surplus of rifles. On

the other hand, there is the consideration pointed out by my colleague from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) that if we followed out the strict terms of the contract, and simply ordered 10,000 rifles of the new type, the company might be put to an expense for the change of gauges, and for different plant and machinery, which would be greatly in excess of the order for the first year, and might probably equal the price to be paid for two years' orders if they should be restricted to the minimum fixed in the contract. I can only say that we must take all these considerations into account, and that we have no disposition to act in a manner that might be regarded as unfair or harsh towards the Ross Rifle Company. I say that for the reason that I think they have done remarkably well in increasing the output as they have done since the war began.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If the contractors are obliged to make the change in August, 1918, any arrangements to be made between the Government and the contractors should not be left until too late a period. Of course that is quite obvious.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I appreciate that.

Mr. CARVELL: I cannot understand the pessimism of my right hon. friend over the possibilities of making rifles in Canada. It seems to me that we have had an object lesson in Canada during the last two and a half years that ought to lessen all the pessimism—

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What is the pessimism alluded to?

Mr. CARVELL: About the possibility of converting the Ross factory inside of two years in order to make rifles of a new type. He has given us a statement by some official in England who has some doubts about our ability to convert this factory in two years. I would like to carry him back to the time, a little over two years ago, when the same authorities in England cabled over here to know if it would be possible to get 200,000 rounds of shrapnel in America, not in Canada, but in America, and when the ex-Minister of Militia cabled back that he thought they could fill the order in Canada, and they went to work upon it. The ex-Minister of Militia himself stated the other day that $700,000,000 had been expended in Canada by the British Government in the manufacture of munitions during the past two years. The same people who did not believe that shrapnel shells could be made in America two years ago, who wondered if 200,000 rounds could be made in America, possibly honestly believe that you cannot change this rifle factory to enable it to manufacture Lee-Enfields within two years; but if our experience of munition work in the past two years is any criterion as to our abilities, I think that that man, whoever he may be, is incompetent, and that my right hon. friend is deserving of the severest castigation for listening to his opinion. I think he ought to have more faith and more optimism in this country than he has. If he had one-quarter or one-half of the optimism he ought to have, he would not see any lions in his path; he would go on and ask the manufacturers to make these rifles in the way they ought to be made to enable us to do our duty.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am glad to find that my hon. friend is converted to an entirely new view as to the possibilities of manufacturing in Canada.

Mr. CARVELL: Oh, no, I have not changed.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: He is now paying a remarkable tribute to the work of the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence, and to the work of the committee which he organized. It shows a comprehension long delayed on the part of my hon. friend which, I am sure, is an earnest of still better things to come. I should like to point out, however, that the manufacturers of Canada themselves were not very sure about their ability to do anything like what they have done when the proposal was first put before them. We have the testimony of the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence that he found a great deal of difficulty in inducing manufacturers in Canada to undertake the work at first, and that it was only some of them who were willing to undertake it. I am not at all disposed to minimize the resourcefulness and ability of the Canadian people. I do know, however, that there has been, and still is, under present conditions, a good deal of difficulty about getting the plant and machinery of the type alluded to. At least, I have been told that by those who ought to know. But when my hon. friend suggests that he is a better authority as to the time requisite for this purpose than the men who have been devoting their lives to work of this kind—

Mr. CARVELL: I did not say that I knew; I said I would take the opinion of the man who was doing the manufacturing.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is where I would differ from my hon. friend. I would not necessarily take the opinion of either of two persons where opinions were conflicting, and who possessed anything like the same skill and experience. If there was an opinion, on the one hand, that two years were requisite, and an opinion on the other hand that one year would be sufficient, I would be rather inclined to think that perhaps the truth might be found to lie between; but I would not think there was any reason why I should absolutely accept the one as against the other when presumably each party had sufficient knowledge and experience to form a judgment.

Mr. CARVELL: Just one word as to my right hon. friend's reference to my conversion in regard to the possibilities of Canadian manufacture. There has been no conversion on my part. I stated in this House on a great many occasions during last session that I had absolute faith in the manufacturers of Canada to turn out munitions, and I am sure that my right hon. friend, if he will con over the pages of Hansard, will have great difficulty in finding any other opinion expressed by me.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not think that I should take the trouble.

Mr. CARVELL: No, I think you had better not try. As to the tribute which he says I paid to the ex-Minister of Militia and to the work of the committee which he formed, I have heard the ex-Minister of Militia make the same statement in this House as to the wonderful difficulties he experienced in getting manufacturers to go into the manufacture of munitions. I had an opportunity of hearing all those gentlemen in the box under oath within the last eight or nine months.

You can read every statement made by them and you will find no word to show that any man of them had any doubts whatever but, to use an expression which has been used in this House before—and I do not wish to descend to slang—all I could find was that they fought like blazes among themselves to see who would get the most contracts. There was no difference between them as to their ability to manufacture and to such an extent did they carry out that idea that— and I am not now going into that controversy—it will come up later—when the Shell Committee was put out of office and a new, I believe, better order of things was put in its stead, one of these manufacturers whom the ex-minister calls pessimists not only had manufactured some millions of dollars worth of shells for the Shell Committee but he had contracts in his pockets for 100,000 shells which he knew he could not manufacture for a year to come. The first act of the new powers which were placed in control was to cancel that contract.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Who had the contract?

Mr. CARVELL: I did not say. I said one firm. You will find it in the evidence taken by the Royal Commission. I will not go into a discussion of that now, but I want to point out that there has been no change of heart on my part. The fact is that instead of each manufacturer being obliged to go into it, every one of them was simply rushing to get in from the beginning and if there was any difference amongst them it was only to see who would get the biggest contract.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I have listened with a great deal of interest and I have admired the good nature of the Prime Minister and the way he has endeavoured to answer the questions which have come from this side. But, there is one phase of the matter that I have not been able to understand thoroughly. We all understand that the Ross rifle has been condemned and that the Lee-Enfield has been adopted. The vital question is to get the Lee-Enfield and I have not been able to understand why the matter has not been brought to a head by the Government offering Sir Charles Ross an order to make the Lee-Enfield for quick delivery. There should be no mystery about it. He has indicated in his letter that he is able to do it. We want the rifle and instead of speculating and asking people across the water whether it can be done, why not bring it to a head at once by giving an order if he will accept it. Then, we will find out how long it will take him to equip his factory and furnish the Lee-Enfield rifle.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We are obliged under the terms of the contract, to give a year's notice. Of course, if Sir Charles Ross should be prepared to execute an order within a year it might be done. But my hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) will remember that we have to get the actual rifle itself. We were instructed by the British Government that it would not do to go to the

United States and take five or six of the rifles in process of being manufactured there. They advised, and, indeed, instructed us, that if we proposed to adopt the new British rifle as a standard, the rifles must first be inspected and passed by the chief inspector of small arms in Great Britain. When we attempted, in September last, to expedite the matter by procuring half a dozen of these rifles in the United States at one of the factories where they are being produced, we received the telegram which I read this afternoon directing us that these rifles must be first inspected and passed by their chief inspector of small arms, or they could not be recognized as being of the necessary type. The rifles so inspected arrived towards the end of January. That was sufficient for the purpose of directing the Ross Rifle Company to produce a rifle of that type, but it was not sufficient for the purpose of giving an order to the Ross Rifle Company. For that purpose we required the drawings and specifications as well. We asked for these drawings and specifications in September last. We asked for them repeatedly, I think last on the 12th December, but up to the present we have not received them. We cannot give any order in the terms of the contract to the Ross Rifle Company until we do obtain those drawings and specifications; at least I am so advised by my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen), who has examined the contract with care.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: After hearing the opinion of the late Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) this evening as to the great merits of the Ross rifle over the Lee-Enfield, or any other rifle that the world ever heard of, I would think that it would be only frankness on the part of the Prime Minister to say that the ex-Minister of Militia did not encourage haste on the part of the Government in making a change from the Ross rifle to the Lee-Enfield. Apparently it was very difficult for the Government to give a contract for the Lee-Enfield in Canada while the ex-minister was a member of my right hon. friend's Government.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend is entirely mistaken about that and this ought to be said in justice to the late Minister of Militia. There is absolutely no doubt about it.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Mr. MACLEAN: I am not saying that it was wrong.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I would like to make this clear: There is absolutely no doubt about it that he was very confident about the superiority of the Ross rifle over the Lee-Enfield, and I believe he is to-day.

Mr. CARVELL: Nobody doubts that; that is the trouble.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: While that may be, I desire to say that when he and I discussed the matter in the spring and early summer of 1915 and when we discussed the matter again—because naturally it was a subject in which I took the greatest possible interest—in the spring and early summer of 1916, the ex-Minister of Militia interposed no objection to the course we took. That course was to refer the question to the military authorities at the front. He assumed an entirely reasonable attitude on the matter from first to last, although he was profoundly convinced all the time that the Ross rifle was all right if properly handled and properly used. He based his course, as I understand it, upon the consideration that if the troops, or any large number of them, had lost confidence in the rifle, from the various attacks which had been made upon it, or for any other reason, it would not be proper for him to interpose any opposition to the objection which was raised by the authorities on the other side.

Mr. MURPHY: I understood the right hon. gentleman, earlier in the discussion, before dinner, to have mentioned that the notice terminating the contract had been given and the time limited by the notice would expire a year hence?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: On the first of February, 1918.

Mr. MURPHY: Might I inquire whether between now and that time the Ross Company will manufacture solely for the Canadian Government or partly for the Canadian Government and partly for the British Government and if the rifle manufactured will be the Ross rifle?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, they are manufacturing for both Governments; something over 90,000 for the Canadian Government and nearly 60,000 for the British Government are still undelivered. As I pointed out before recess, we suggested to the British Government—I think in July, 1916, I cannot be sure but the documents

will show—that it might be a wise thing for the two Governments to get into negotiation with the Ross Rifle Company, stop the manufacture of Ross rifles altogether, let the factory be equipped as speedily as possible with the plant necessary to turn out the new type of Lee-Enfield and convert the orders still unfilled of both Governments into orders for the new type of Lee-Enfields.

The British Government made reply, in two different telegrams which I have read to the committee, pointing out that from their standpoint they did not think this advisable; that the Ross rifle was of considerable use to them for certain purposes, and that there would be no difficulty if we saw fit to try to make the change, for the Ross Rifle Company to continue during the process of reorganization to supply the Ross rifle Mark III to the British Government under the contract which had been made in December, 1914.

Mr. OLIVER: If I gathered what the Prime Minister said in answer to a question a few minutes ago, the terms of the contract between the Government and the Ross Rifle Company, drawn with a view to the contingency of war arising, did as a matter of fact place the control of the contract in the hands of the Government, and not in the hands of the contractor.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not sure that I caught my hon. friend's point.

Mr. OLIVER: The Ross rifle contract, drawn up with a view to the contingency of war arising, which actually did arise, contained such terms as placed control of the situation in regard to the manufacture of Ross rifles in the hands of the Government.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I would not quite agree in that view. I have not the contract before me, and I am speaking subject to correction upon an examination of its terms, but my recollection is that the contract contains the provision that if the Government by reason of war or emergency require a very largely increased output of rifles in any year, then it shall be the duty of the Government to give notice to the Ross Rifle Company of the number of rifles required, and it shall be the right of the Ross Rifle Company to give notice to the Government that it can not produce more than a certain number of rifles within that period, and then, as to the excess of rifles required, the Government would be at liberty to obtain them elsewhere. Whether that gives control of the situation or not, that is the fact.

Mr. OLIVER: I would certainly say that in effect, if not in letter, it did give the Government control of the situation. In fact, I would say absolute control. In any case it gave the Government absolute control as regards the number of rifles over and above the amount that the Ross Rifle Company could turn out within that period.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If they gave us notice.

Mr. OLIVER: They would have to give notice, if the Government gave them notice.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They would have to give us notice if they were unable to do what we required.

Mr. OLIVER: Therefore the Government was absolutely free of this contract so far as the number of rifles required by the Government was concerned over and above what the Ross Rifle Company could turn out. Now I do not assume for a moment that it was likely that there need be any friction in the matter at all. I assume that the Ross Rifle Company, being a business organization, would be willing to meet the Government, just as the Government would be willing to meet them, with a view to making arrangements for meeting the requirements of the country, if the pressure had been exerted in that way. But the evidence we have from the attitude of the ex-Minister of Militia is that so far from pressure being exerted by the Government upon the Ross Rifle Company, the pressure was from the Ross Rifle Company upon the Government.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In what way?

Mr. OLIVER: In the way that it was the company that dictated the situation, and not the Government.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: How?

Mr. OLIVER: The Government accepted the limitations of the Ross Rifle Company, instead of dictating the limitations. Therefore, my contention is that the plea set up in the first place by the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) and later, though not in such definite terms, by the Prime Minister, as the reason why more energetic and effective action was not taken to equip our troops with an efficient rifle, does not hold good; leaving out of consideration altogether the suggestion of the hon. member

for Carleton (Mr. Carvell), that the Government should have exercised dominant rights, which, after all, is not such an extraordinary exercise of power on the part of the Government in case of war. On several occasions, indeed, notably in the commandeering of wheat a year ago, this right has been exercised by the Canadian Government, and also by the British Government, which went to the extent in one case of taking control of the railway transportation of the United Kingdom. So that there is in fact, as well as in law, no ground for the Government's contention that they were under the dictation of the Ross Rifle Company, instead of the Ross Rifle Company being under their dictation.

I am going to assume that I am one of the plain people, not interested in the Ross Rifle Company, or in the administration of the Government, except in so far as it affects the people of Canada and the winning of the war. It is from that standpoint that I do view, and wish to view this question, and with that view I am not able to begin the criticism that I desire to make, at the point where my hon. friend from Carleton started, namely, the summer of 1916, after it had been demonstrated by all the means that could be brought to bear that the Ross rifle was inefficient for the purpose for which it was required. I begin with August 4, 1914. This Government of Canada is equipped, as other governments are for carrying on the responsibilities of government, and among this equipment there is a Department of Militia and Defence, with a minister at its head. It was not a secret that has now developed after two or three years of war, that the rifle is the chief weapon of modern warfare, and that upon its efficiency and the efficiency in its use of the man who uses it rests success or failure. It was the business of the Government of Canada, and it was the first business that should have concerned them once war broke out, to see that the rifle in the hands of our troops was efficient. They knew that our men were going up against the most thoroughly trained soldiers in the world, possessing the most efficient equipment that the most scientific nation could provide for the men upon whom it depended in its campaign for world-domination. Under these circumstances, even if there had never been any doubts about the rifle, it was the business of the Government of Canada to take stock of the rifle, at any rate from August 4, and not depend upon Sir John French or Sir Douglas Haig or any one else across the water to see that our men had an efficient weapon in their hands. It was the responsibility of Canada to see that that weapon was efficient. As a matter of fact, there had been suspicions in former years against the efficiency of the Ross rifle by the very men who sit on the Government side of the House, so that it cannot be suggested that there was any surprise at the findings of Sir John French or Sir Douglas Haig when those findings at last were made.

If there was one duty that rested upon this Government and upon its Department of Militia more than another it was to follow the troops in the training camp and in the field and be sure that the rifle in their hands was an efficient one. The misfortune of the case appears to be that we had a Minister of Militia who would not and will not believe anything from anybody except that this Ross rifle is the most efficient rifle in the world. The ex-Minister of Militia held that belief and holds it yet, as we have heard here to-night, and the right hon. Premier and his colleagues retained the minister in that responsible position from the beginning until a short time ago. Therefore, the responsibility for the consequences of the failure of the Ross rifle to stand up to the requirements of field service rests absolutely on the heads of the men who lead the Government of to-day. We had no right to wait until Sir John French, on his own responsibility, without the knowledge or consent of this Government, found it necessary, as the result of the terrible experience of the battle of St. Julien, to disarm the Canadian Division taking part in that battle of Ross rifles and place Lee-Enfield rifles in their hands; and, as he says in words that are graphic, he did so, because he was about to send them into action again. The logic is that his conscience did not permit him to send them again into action armed with the rifles that they had when they went through the battle of St. Julien.

The ex-Minister of Militia spoke to-night of fair tests or of unfair tests of the Ross rifle. Could there be any test more definite or more final than the fact stated by General French that when he gave the order to rearm the First Division he found three thousand men of that division who had, as he says, without any authority, armed themselves with Lee-Enfield in the place of the Ross rifles. Surely the man on the firing line, the man in the trench, the man whose

life depends upon the efficiency of the weapon in his hands, is a safe judge as to the respective merits of the rifle that his Government has placed in his hands. His natural loyalty to his country would tend to make him keep it if he could have faith in it. Surely, when he throws that rifle away and picks up the rifle of a dead man lying on the field of battle, there is no further argument or comparison necessary. We do not need to hear from Sir John French or Sir Douglas Haig or any one else: the actions of our own men under stress of circumstance are enough, or should be enough, to settle the question of field efficiency of the Ross rifle. I am at a loss to understand how any set of men charged with the terrible responsibility resting upon the shoulders of the Government of Canada since the 4th August, 1914, could submit to a continuance of such a condition in regard to the armament of our soldiers until the Army Council of Great Britain issued notice to them not to send over any more Ross rifles, and announced to them that they would arm our troops with Lee-Enfield rifles. A more humiliating position Canada could not be placed in, and how desperate the condition must have been when the Government of Great Britain would insist on doing for our men what our Government would not do for them.

I do not know, and no man can tell how many Canadian homes have been rendered desolate as the result of the inefficiency of this weapon placed in the hands of our soldiers by our Government. That was not the immediate concern of the Imperial Government in insisting upon a change of armament. Their interest in the matter was the success or failure of the military endeavours being put forward on the battle front; their interest was in the success or failure of the Allied arms. That was the cause that impelled them to insist upon the re-armament of the Canadian forces with a rifle which our men considered efficient and which they considered efficient.

I cannot agree that even the very lucid and courteous statement made here to-night by the Prime Minister is in any degree an excuse, much less a justification, for the terrible sequence of events of which I have spoken. There must have been some means whereby the application of sufficient directive energy backed by the tremendous capital available from the treasury of Canada, could have put into the hands of our men an efficient weapon from the hands of their own Government, from their own people. It was possible, so the Prime Minister informed the House last session, to increase the output of rifles twenty fold in the year and a half that had elapsed since the outbreak of the war. It was possible to create an Enfield rifle factory in the United States; it has been possible to create ammunition factories in many parts of the United States and Canada handling such enormous quantities of munitions of war that the human mind cannot calculate nor grasp the quantity.

It was not possible for the Government of Canada to manufacture, or to secure the manufacture of, sufficient Lee-Enfield rifles to arm the troops of Canada. But it was possible for the Government of Great Britain to do that—for they have done it. To-day, after two and a half years of war, though we had a rifle factory running in good shape in Canada at the beginning of the war, which factory has increased its output twenty times since then—I use the figure given by the Prime Minister—there is not to-day, of all the Canadian forces at the front, one man armed with a Ross rifle, we are informed, and every rifle with which our troops at the front are armed is made and furnished by the British Government. Such a condition is beyond description, it is beyond justification, it is beyond excuse. It can only be ascribed to the fact that we have had a Minister of Militia who, in the case of the Ross rifle, as in case of other militia equipment, has insisted on his own views as against the views of those who are in control of the army of Great Britain.

Now, I should be the last to admit superiority in ability on the part of any other people over the people of Canada. I should be glad to back the Minister of Militia or any other member of the Government—perhaps I might except the ex-Minister of Militia—but I would be willing to back the members of the Government generally—against an equal number of men of equal rank in any other country. But it is not a question of the respective abilities of the men in control of our affairs and those in control of affairs in Great Britain. The men in control of affairs in Great Britain are the people who are running the thing; it is their say; and if we are going to help to win the war, we must do it by helping them and not by going counter to their ideas. When it pleases them to require a rifle of a certain style, or equipment of a certain style, it is for us to provide that which will conform with their idea, so that we may work with

them harmoniously. We may think that we have as good as they have or better; but so long as they are carrying the big end of the burden, if we are going to be successful in helping them we must co-operate with them and not antagonize them by the equipment, munitions, or armament we bring forward.

This matter is very much more than a question of a contract between our Government and the Ross Rifle Company. It is a matter which, in the eyes of the British Government, was of such a character and of such importance that the winning of the war depended upon that Government taking the matter into their own hands. But if it was important to the British Government in the winning of the war, it was just as important to the people of Canada in the winning of the war. And it was a thousand times more important to the people of Canada in the preservation of the lives and limbs of the men whom they sent to fight the battles of Canada, the Empire and the world. These men came forward and gave themselves freely for the cause, leaving home, and friends, and property, and business, and prospects, to fight for an ideal, to fight for their country, for its honour and its safety; and we place in their hands a weapon upon which they cannot depend, in which they have lost confidence, which means that they have been slaughtered by our enemies because we did not do our duty by them by giving to them the weapon that they should have had to put them on equal terms with our enemies.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I regret that my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) should have made the extraordinary and extravagant statements which have just fallen from his lips. He apparently put out of sight and consideration the fact that those responsible for the administration of public affairs have been as anxious as he or any one else in this country could be to see to it that the men whom Canada has sent to the front were supplied with as good a weapon as possible. Does he realize that he is making this attack upon a weapon for which he himself is responsible? Does he realize that he sat on the Treasury benches, a member of the late Administration in 1908, when serious question arose about this rifle and that his colleague in the Government, speaking words for which he, as a member of the Government, was responsible, took the ground that this was the best rifle that Canada could secure? I wonder if he realizes this, when he makes the most extraordinary statements that have fallen from his lips this evening. The words which I have under my hand are his words, because they were uttered by one of his colleagues in the Government. Why, he even took the ground, through one of his colleagues, that—

> The Ross rifle, in common with all other rifles, military or sporting, may be said to have certain defects, structural weaknesses, or deficiencies. It is not the custom of any government to publish to the world what it considers the weak points of the arms with which its troops are equipped.

This was an absolute denial that the Commons of Canada, the representatives of the people, should be given any knowledge of what the alleged deficiencies of this rifle were. He is responsible also for the statement that this rifle had been sent to the War Office and had been tested, and had been carefully reported upon, and was a good rifle. He is responsible for many other statements which I have under my hand but which I will not take time to quote to-night. I should like to have him understand that when this war broke out in 1914 the military forces of Canada were equipped with a rifle which had been deliberately selected by the hon. gentleman himself. He says that some further test should then have been made. I should like to ask any member of this House, or any other honourable and reasonable man in this country, how, with these statements and many more from hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, it would be possible to test that rifle further except by active service in the field. Will my hon. friend tell me how? Does he know of any means by which it could be tested other than by actual practical experience in the field? I do not know of any

Mr. OLIVER: My complaint is that when it was tested by actual service in the field —which did not happen when the Liberal Government was responsible—my hon. friends did not take notice of the results of those tests.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I deny absolutely the assertion which the hon. gentleman has made. We did take notice of it, and we acquiesced at once in the determination of the military authorities at the front that the first division should be armed with Lee-Enfields, and that the Ross rifle should be put aside for the time being. It then became the duty of the Government to do

what best could be done; we had to consider what was the best course that lay before us. I have already pointed out that the urgent question then was whether any rifle whatever could be obtained for arming the British and Allied troops about to go to the front. That question was so urgent that the British Government were willing to accept, if they could obtain them, rifles of a very antiquated type, and they asked us to co-operate with them for the purpose of obtaining them. The apparent difficulty with the rifle then was the jamming caused by ammunition which was not fitted for the rifle, being somewhat larger than that produced in Canada. The only remedy to be applied, so far as we understood, was to enlarge the chamber of the rifle. My hon. friend himself had taken the responsibility, which rests on him heavily to-day if he has a conscience, of fixing a chamber of .460 for a cartridge of precisely the same calibre. As I pointed out, a little bit of dirt or anything that would adhere to the cartridge would inevitably cause jamming. That was the condition which my hon. friend had created, with the advice of his experts, with regard to the rifle which he put in the hands of the Canadian troops. We were told some time ago that the boots provided by the late Government were never intended for war, but only for peace. Are we to understand that the rifle which my hon. friend put into the hands of the Canadian troops was intended only for peace, not for war? Is that the position which he takes before this committee and before the people? If our troops were not to go without rifles, there was only one thing to do, and that was to enlarge the chamber of the rifle so that the cartridges would be less liable to jam than if the chamber were left as it was. In that regard we took exactly the same course that the British Government took with regard to the Lee-Enfield rifle. They enlarged the chamber; we enlarged our chamber. We proposed at first to enlarge it from .460 to .462; we eventually enlarged it to .464. After the chamber had been enlarged, tests were made, and it was thought that the rifle would be serviceable under these new conditions. The course which we took had been suggested in the report of Sir John French himself, and we carried it out with reasonable belief that it would make the rifle a serviceable one. We had as good reason to come to that conclusion as the British Government had to reach the conclusion that the enlargement of the chamber of the Lee-Enfield rifle would be attended with a like result. When my hon. friend casts these sneers at us and makes these absurd reproaches against the Government, he does not do himself credit. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are as conscientious and inspired with as full a sense of duty towards the people of this country as he ever was or ever will be. It comes ill from my hon. friend, having regard to some of his own administrative experiences, to cast reproaches of this character upon men who are inspired by no desire in this war except that of doing their full duty to the people of Canada and to the men at the front. He has made absurd suggestions—well, I will withdraw that word, it is unparliamentary—he has made suggestions which seem to me very unreasonable. He has suggested that the Ross Rifle Company was dictating to the Government. I take issue with him absolutely. The Ross Rifle Company never attempted to dictate to the Government; if they had attempted to do so, the Government would not have submitted to their dictation. The hon. gentleman misinterpreted my remarks with regard to expropriation. I did not suggest that the Government might not in a proper case expropriate or that they would have consideration for the wishes of the Ross Rifle Company if they thought that expropriation were proper and in the best interests of the people. If the Government expropriated the property, compensation would be made to the Ross Rifle Company, who would have no cause of complaint —nor do I believe that they would have made any complaint. The question was whether the Government, if they took over the Ross Rifle factory, could operate it more efficiently than it was being operated by the company itself. I am bound to tell my hon. friend that I am absolutely unable to follow his reasoning or to understand what he means when he arrives at the curious argumentative conclusion that upon the terms of the contract as they have been placed upon Hansard we had control of the situation in case war should break out or emergency arise. I doubt very much whether he himself understands what he means. How could we have control of the situation? If the Ross Rifle Company were called upon to produce a number of rifles which they were unable to turn out in a given period, they could give us notice and we could go elsewhere. How did that give us any control of the situation, when the British Government

were raking the four corners of the earth trying to get rifles and failing to get them? What advantage would it be to us if the company should give us notice that they could not turn out rifles when we could not get them anywhere else? My hon. friend finds fault with us because we retained the Minister of Militia, who had confidence in the Ross rifle. Surely my hon. friend does not suggest that before the Ross rifle has been pronounced unsuitable by the military authorities at the front, we should have discarded it? What reason would we have for discarding it before actual experience at the front had shown, in the estimation of the military authorities, that it was unsuitable? And when they did pronounce it to be unsuitable, the Minister of Militia and Defence, as I have already declared to the committee, interposed no objection to the course which was taken; he assented at once to the proposed action of the military authorities, both in 1915 and in 1916. When my hon. friend, for some reason unknown to me, suggests this rifle should have been discarded on the outbreak of the war, does he realize that the British Government in the month of December, 1914, ordered 100,000 of these same Ross rifles? That seemed to me to afford fairly reasonable evidence that the rifle was a serviceable rifle; otherwise, for what reason would the British Government have given a large order of that kind, costing $2,500,000 or $3,000,000? We can hardly suppose that they felt themselves to be endowed with such astonishing resources that they could throw to the winds $2,500,000 or $3,000,000 for a rifle which they did not believe to be serviceable. As I said before, the rifle had been approved by the late Government in the form in which we found it when war broke out. The Minister of Militia believed it to be a good rifle. We had no evidence before us that it was not a good rifle until experience in actual warfare, under conditions of the utmost severity, demonstrated, in the opinion of the military authorities at the front, that it ought to be put aside and the Lee-Enfield substituted for it. They made that suggestion to us, and we acquiesced in it. When later on, in the summer of 1916, they made the further suggestion that all Canadian troops at the front should be armed with the Lee-Enfield, instead of the Ross rifle, we again acquiesced. That is the whole situation, and I repeat once more that, in my opinion, it affords no ground whatever for the violent reproaches which my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) has seen fit to level against the Government in this connection.

Mr. OLIVER: I will not delay the House at any great length, and I do not intend to follow the Prime Minister in everything he has said. But his suggestion as to my responsibility for the Ross rifle is really hardly to the point. I was a member of the Government which instituted the making of the Ross rifle, and I have nothing to apologize for in regard to that matter. The contract has been read here to-night. It was a good contract, and the rifle was a good rifle for target and sporting purposes, or for any purpose for which it was used up to the outbreak of war. The Prime Minister adopts the very cheap suggestion that it was a rifle for peace, and not for war; it was a rifle which had been used in peace until the outbreak of war. That was the only use there was for it, and it was found to be absolutely satisfactory, to be not only as good as others, but better than others. There is, therefore, no apology necessary from any member of the Liberal Government which made this contract for the Ross rifle as it was when war broke out. But once war broke out, this Government, and not the late Government, became responsible, and when under war conditions the Ross rifle was found to be not satisfactory, when it was found that the troops using it could not depend upon it, when 3,000 of them threw it away and took Lee-Enfields because they believed that their lives depended on making the change, the responsibility for retaining that rifle was the responsibility of this Government and not of the late Liberal Government. I do not share the responsibility for the retention of the Ross rifles by our troops. My hon. friend spoke of my conscience. I am trying to rid my soul of the blood of the men who died in France because we, the people of Canada, armed them with an inferior weapon. As to the provsion in the contract, which my right hon. friend says he does not understand, and that I do not understand—

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not say that I did not understand.

Mr. OLIVER: Then that I did not understand.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not say that.

Mr. OLIVER: Then I beg the Prime Minister's pardon; I accept his correction.

I would ask him for what purpose can it be imagined that that provision was placed in the contract except to exactly meet such a condition as arose on the outbreak of war, so as to place the Government of the country in a position to provide such rifles as they wished, and as many as they needed for the arming of their troops. There could be no other reason for placing that provision in the contract. That is why I believe the provision was well framed to achieve the purpose that I mention.

To repeat, on this point, the Prime Minister seemed to think that I found fault with the Government because they had taken the rifle to the battlefield. I did not find fault with the Government for that. I do not expect this Government, or any other Government, to be omniscient, to see or know things that have not yet occurred. I absolutely relieve the Government from any responsibility for taking the rifle to the battlefield, and placing it in the hands of the troops for service in France. They had every reason, or at all events, some reason to believe that the rifle was a good rifle; but, as I have already stated, the rifle was under suspicion by the very men who sat around the Prime Minister, and whether it was under suspicion or not, the exigencies of the case were such that it was the business of the Government of Canada to follow events on the battlefield so that on their responsibility, and not on that of British officers, they would be sure that our men had, or had not, in their hands a rifle that was absolutely efficient. I absolutely protest against the responsibility being placed on any other shoulders than those of our own military department, who are charged on our behalf with seeing that our troops are efficient, and that their armament is efficient. It is not the responsibility of the British Government; it is the responsibility of our Government. After experience had shown that the rifle was inefficient, not on the authority of Sir John French, but on the experience of our own men who threw it away, there was no escape from the responsibility of the Government to see that that rifle was replaced as soon as it could be. The Prime Minister has suggested that the Government did everything they could to meet the situation. I recall that on the 17th May last, when the question of the efficiency of the Ross rifle was under consideration in this House, his colleague, the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Rogers) suggested, if he did not absolutely make the threat, that he would imprison any man who questioned the efficiency of the Ross rifle. He stated from his place in the House that on the information which he had, he had no reason to believe other than that the Ross rifle was an absolutely efficient rifle; and yet in the hands of the Prime Minister at that time, on that very day, and for five days previously, there had been a cablegram from the accredited agent of the Militia Department in London saying, "Serious condition has arisen regarding Ross rifle. Show this to the Prime Minister." I do not wish to make this the occasion of an exchange of compliments, but as the Prime Minister has been handing a few bouquets to me, I take the opportunity of handing this to him for his consideration.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am very much obliged to my hon. friend. His bouquets are so frequent and so fragrant that they are always welcome. I do not desire to repeat what I have already said about ten times since three o'clock this afternoon, but which does not yet seem to have reached the inner consciousness of my hon. friend: that when the military authorities at the front, whom we considered the best judges, directed arming of the Canadian troops with the Lee-Enfield rifle, we acquiesced in it. I leave the situation there, but with this further statement: that we then made the best arrangement we found possible, and which we conceived to be a reasonable arrangement, for improving the Ross rifle so that the jamming, the only defect which had been seriously urged against it up to that time, would be remedied. Again in 1916, we took a like course and in taking it we had the engagement of the British Government that all our troops at the front would be armed with the Lee-Enfield rifle If that does not satisfy my hon. friend as to our desire and intention to do our duty in the matter, if it does not satisfy him that we did our reasonable duty in the matter to the best of our ability, or to the best of the ability of any Government that might have been called upon to deal with the situation, why, he and I shall have to be content to differ about the matter. I should say to him with all courtesy and all respect that all that he has urged in so strong, and even so violent, a manner has not in the least disturbed my opinion as to the wisdom of the course which we took. I do not see that we could have taken any other course, nor do I see that any other course would have been open to any government. It is impossible to complete the discussion this

evening; indeed, I made an engagement with the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) that the committee should sit on a subsequent day, and I therefore beg to move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. CARVELL: Will the Prime Minister bear in mind the request which I made to look up in the department—

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In regard to bolts?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, and also the applications made to the company for changes, when they were made, and when they were complied with, if any were complied with.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden the House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

Saturday, February 3, 1917.

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

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Militia Council for the Dominion of Canada for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1916.—Hon. A. E. Kemp.

APPOINTMENT OF MR. HERBERT D. THROOP.

On the motion of Sir Robert Borden, the recommendation of His Honour, the Speaker, laid on the table of the House on the 26th ultimo respecting the appointment of Mr. Herbert D. Throop as a clerk in subdivision B. of the Third Division of the Library of Parliament, was concurred in.

PRIVILEGE.

STATEMENT BY HON. MR. OLIVER.

On the Orders of the Day.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity of giving a very direct contradiction to a statement that appeared on Wednesday, January 24, in L'Evènement, a newspaper published in the city of Quebec. I would have been able to correct this sooner, had I been better acquainted with the language in which the statement was originally printed. The article begins with large headlines:

Hon. Mr. Oliver, late Liberal minister, requests immediate conscription in Canada. This Liberal leader lets the cat out of the bag. He declares that if the Liberal party came back to power, conscription would be enforced at once. Mr. Oliver reproaches Mr. Sevigny for not preaching immediate enlistment to his constituents during the campaign.

The article goes on:

It ill becomes Mr. Cannon to charge the Conservative Government with the intention of enforcing conscription in Canada. It is evident to those who follow the debates at Ottawa that were a Liberal administration in power conscription would come at once. Hon. Mr. Oliver, one of Sir Wilfrid's first lieutenants, let the cat out of the bag when in the warmth of his oratory he stated:

'The true policy to follow, and which the present Government should immediately adopt, would be to enforce conscription throughout Canada. Recruiting is not satisfactory, and this expedient would settle the whole question.'

The left—

That is the Opposition.

—seemed to receive this declaration with marked satisfaction.

Further to confirm Mr. Oliver's remarks we find the following extract in the report of yesterday's sitting, which is very significant. Mr. Oliver criticises the Government for his apparent lack of organization, and the system followed in recruiting men, and declares that, in his opinion, had things been managed differently, Canada could to-day count her 500,000 men. 'We must not forget,' says he, 'that more than 50,000 men who had enlisted since the beginning of the war, have been later rejected for physical unfitness. Our duty is to send to the firing line half a million men absolutely fit from a physical standpoint.' The only possible solution, according to Mr. Oliver, is the establishment of conscription in Canada. Mr. Oliver was particularly aggressive throughout his speech which can be summed up thus: Conscription is necessary in Canada.

Mr. Oliver then alluded to the campaign now being waged in Dorchester, and made it a pretext to attack Mr. Sevigny because he did not choose to make of his electoral campaign a recruiting tour. Here is how Mr. Sevigny addresses his constituents; said he: 'Every one has a duty to perform in the present war. Some have enlisted to go to the firing line, but those who remain have nevertheless a very important duty to fulfil, that of providing for our agricultural needs, and other requirements.' Mr. Oliver felt indignant at such manner of speech, and claimed that Mr. Sevigny ought to have impressed upon his electors the necessity of enlisting for active service. Mr. Oliver judges that the Government has not the question of military enlistment much at heart, and reiterates his request that conscription be enforced.

I desire to say that the assertion contained in this article is absolutely untrue; and if I would be permitted, I would like to read from the speech referred to the only remarks of mine that included the word "conscription" or related in any way to that matter. It will not be very long and I wish to have the matter absolutely settled. On Tuesday, January 23, 1917, on

page 80 of the Unrevised Hansard I am quoted as saying:

Voluntary service has never had a chance in this country under the administration of our friends. For my own part I have said in this House before, and I am prepared to say it again, that in the case of such a world struggle as we are now engaged in National Service is the only logical service; National Service, I say, that will call up the manhood of the nation for military service. But it must be recognized that there are many things that are right in theory that it is not possible to put into practice. I do not challenge the Government because they have not put conscription in force, although they talked it, hinted at it, and tried to get credit for it without doing it. The fault I have to find is that, depending on voluntary service, we never gave voluntary service a fair chance.

$100,000,000 LOAN FOR PUBLIC SERVICE.

On the motion of Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance), Bill No. 19, to authorize the raising, by way of loan, of certain sums of money for the public service, was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon.—Mr. Blain in the Chair.

On the Preamble.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Are the holders of United Kingdom war loans or Anglo-French war loans subject to taxation?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Where?

Mr. LEMIEUX: What I want to make clear is this: Would the holders of those coupons have the same standing as the holders of the Canadian war loans as regards taxation that may be imposed?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In Canada?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend knows that there is a Dominion jurisdiction and a provincial jurisdiction.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am speaking of the Dominion jurisdiction.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We have exempted from taxation proposed under the authority of the Dominion Parliament the securities which we have issued to meet our war expenditures. There is no such exemption in the case of any other securities, so far as I am aware, whether of the United Kingdom or of any other country.

Bill reported.

QUEBEC HARBOUR LOAN.

On the motion of the Hon. J. D. Hazen (Minister of Marine) the House went into Committee to consider the following proposed resolutions, Mr. Blain in the Chair:

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 Quebec Harbour Commissioners, hereinafter called the Corporation, such sums of money, not exceeding in the whole the sum of one and a half million dollars, as are required to enable the Corporation to carry on the construction of such terminal facilities as are necessary to properly equip the port of Quebec.

2. That during the period of construction of the terminal facilities mentioned in these Resolutions, the interest payable on the debentures receivable by the Minister of Finance in exchange for such advances, shall be deemed to be money required to construct and to be part of the cost of construction of the said terminal facilities, and such interest may be paid out of the said sum of one and a half million dollars.

3. That the Corporation shall submit to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for approval, monthly applications for such advances, with statements showing total expenditure on different items in detail, and upon approval, 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 three and one-half 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, assets, tools, rates, dues, penalties and other sources of revenue and income whatsoever, and shall be a charge thereon next after, and have precedence in regard to payment next after, all debentures or bonds issued by the Corporation amounting to the sum of one million one hundred and fifty thousand dollars, under Chapter forty-eight of the Statutes of 1898, Chapter thirty-four of the Statutes of 1899, and Chapter thirty-six of the Statutes of 1907.

On resolution 5:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I desire certain information with respect to this matter which, if not convenient to furnish now, may be given on the second reading of the Bill to be based upon these resolutions. And before the second reading, will the Minister of Marine and Fisheries please lay upon the table a plan showing the works that have been carried out and those now in progress.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What amount of security is already outstanding against Quebec harbour, and what is the financial standing of the corporation of the Quebec Harbour Commission?

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): The amount advanced to the Harbour Commissioners by the Government since these works were undertaken by

authority of the Statute of 1913 is $5,500,000, and in order to complete the plans that have been approved a further expenditure of $1,500,000 is necessary. In addition, there are bonds outstanding in connection with the old scheme of harbour development there, certain of which are held by the public. In all the Acts that have been passed, provision is made that bonds issued by the old commission to private individuals, and still in private hands, shall take precedence over the advances made since 1914. As the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) knows certain other advances were made by the Government in the old days, upon which no interest was paid. I think there is fair reason for believing, in view of the development of the harbour and the increase in the revenue, that the interest on these will be ultimately paid.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What was the amount?

Mr. HAZEN: It was placed on Hansard when the Act of 1913 was introduced, and has been stated several times since, but I have not the information at the moment.

The Bill to be founded upon this resolution—it is practically a copy of the resolution—is in the same terms as the Acts of 1913 and 1914. Since the commencement of the harbour development under the commission, the revenues of the harbour have increased very largely. In the year 1913 the revenue from the harbour was $126,000; during the last year it was $288,000, an increase of $162,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What was the revenue during the intervening years?

Mr. HAZEN: I have not the figures, but the revenue has increased year by year. It is expected that when this work is completed very much more business will be done than has been done in the past. That is why, even under existing conditions, we ask that the work be proceeded with so that at the earliest possible date the harbour will do the very much larger business which is expected upon the completion of the work and obtain the increased revenue which will naturally result. It is anticipated that much larger vessels will in a short time ply on the St. Lawrence river, and owing to the fact that between Montreal and Quebec there the channel is not deeper than thirty feet, vessels of more than that draught will have to make their terminus at Quebec. From the standpoint of common sense and ordinary business prudence, I think it would be a very great mistake not to proceed to finish this work.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What changes have been made in the personnel of the Quebec Harbour Commission?

Mr. HAZEN: Of the $1,500,000, $700,000 will have to be spent during the present year. Probably it will be three years before the total amount is expended. Advances will be made from time to time, probably covering a period of three seasons. The original commission consisted of Sir William Price, chairman; Mr. Gravel, who comes from the south shore, and Mr. Letellier. Sir William Price resigned as chairman of the commission and the other commissioners forwarded their resignations at the same time. The reason given by Sir William for his resignation was that he had very extensive business affairs on his hands; in addition to that he had enlisted for overseas service and, having raised a regiment he expected to go to the front. He would not, therefore, be able to give that attention to the duties of the position which its importance demanded. A new commission was accordingly appointed, consisting of Mr. L'Esperance, formerly member for Montmagny, Mr. Gravel, former commissioner, and Mr. Pennington, a gentleman engaged in the lumber industry in the city of Quebec.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is Captain Murray's position?

Mr. HAZEN: Captain Murray is harbour master. He was appointed by the old commission, of which Sir William Price was chairman.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I suggest that the next time this matter is taken up, a map should be placed upon the table showing the progress of the work.

Mr. HAZEN: That is a proper suggestion; I shall be delighted to comply with it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that work to be executed in the river itself, or will it be necessary to expropriate land?

Mr. HAZEN: I understand that all necessary expropriations have been made. About $127,000 worth of dredging is to be performed. An addition is to be built to the elevator, and the elevator conveyors have to be completed. The two latter items will amount, I believe, to nearly $800,000. These are the principal works to be carried on, though a further work is necessary in connection with the completion of the wharf.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Will my hon. friend arrange with the Minister of Railways to have wheat brought from the West to that station?

Mr. HAZEN: I have no doubt that the harbour commissioners will do their utmost to have wheat brought from the west to that elevator. Wheat did come to the elevator during this year. The commissioners were handicapped, I believe, by a lack of facilities for getting the wheat speedily from the elevator to the ship, a floating elevator being used for that purpose. When the conveyors are built that difficulty will be overcome. They were hampered, also, by the fact that a million bushels of grain had to remain in the elevator a considerable length of time because of difficulty in getting it out, during which time many millions of bushels could have gone through the elevator. The harbour commissioners fully believe that upon the completion of the elevator they will do a very large business in shipping grain from the port of Quebec, particularly in view of the fact that the Grand Trunk Pacific and Canadian Northern railways are now running into that city. I may mention that the revenues of the Montreal harbour commission last year were the largest in the history of the harbour. Besides paying all expenses, outstanding bills, and interest, the Montreal harbour commissioners had a surplus of something like $25,000 or $30,000. A very large grain business was done last year in the city of Montreal, and it is reasonable to expect that as the Canadian west grows and as its production of grain increases more ships will go to Montreal and Quebec. Moreover, as the harbour facilities at these ports are perfected, there will be larger shipments from Canadian ports and not so much through American ports.

Mr. LEMIEUX: From information that I had from a colonization agent last fall, the business done by the Grand Trunk Pacific railway between Cochrane and Quebec and Amos was excellent. The road was very much encouraged by the support given to it.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I notice that the loan is secured by debentures of the corporation repayable in twenty-five years and bearing interest at 3½ per cent. Does the minister expect to secure money at that rate for these bonds, or is that the rate that is asked from other corporations of a similar nature?

Mr. HAZEN: It is not believed for a moment that the Government can borrow money at 3½ per cent. Authority is given to the Government by Parliament to make advances from time to time to the harbour commissioners of Montreal, and, in this case, to the harbour commissioners of Quebec, for the carrying on of work that is approved by the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. This money the Government of Canada advances to the harbour commissioners who pay interest at the rate of 3½ per cent. It is a rate which, at the time this policy was first embarked on, when financial conditions were very different from what they are at present and the country could borrow money at a rate pretty close to three and one-half per cent, involved little or no charge upon the country. Under existing conditions, of course, the country cannot borrow money at three and one-half per cent. But at the same time, in view of the fact that this is a splendid public work, that the work that is being done by the harbour commissioners at Montreal, is in the interest of the West and of every part of the country that the very best facilities should be afforded for the handling of the freight and traffic of the country during the summer from the ports of Montreal and Quebec, it has not been thought desirable to increase that rate of interest. As a matter of fact, to the extent of the difference between the rate of interest paid by the commissioners and the rate paid by the Government on money it borrows, the country does assist the harbour commissioners. But it is fair to remember that in other parts of the country very large sums of money are spent for the development of the harbours by the Public Works Department upon which no interest at all is charged to the local authorities. It is true that from those harbours that are under the jurisdiction of the Public Works Department certain revenues are derived in the shape of fees; but, as a rule, I do not think the revenue received at any of those harbours would, under normal conditions, pay three and one-half per cent interest on the public money that has been expended to develop them. I refer to harbours like Port Arthur, Toronto, St. John, Halifax, Victoria, Vancouver and others.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The commissioners at Quebec seem to have made a great mistake in not going to the Public Works Department instead of to my hon. friend because apparently had they done so they would have got off without paying any interest.

In looking over the Estimates I find four or five millions of dollars proposed to be voted by the Public Works Department for improvements at Toronto, Port Arthur, and other harbours; and there is no reason that I can see why Quebec should not be treated in the same way as Toronto. I think the Government ought to state what their policy is in regard to harbour improvements throughout the Dominion, and that one system should be adopted for all harbours of this kind, instead of allowing large sums to be spent on certain harbours without any interest being paid, while in other cases interest is charged.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time and agreed to.

Mr. HAZEN moved for leave to introduce Bill 23 to provide for further advances to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Sinclair.—For a copy of all orders in council bearing date after the declaration of war limiting the authority or administrative scope of the Minister of Militia and Defence.

Mr. Sinclair.—For a return showing the names and post office addresses of all purchasers of fish scrap from the reduction works at Canso in 1916, showing the price paid by each of said purchasers.

Mr. J. J. Hughes.—For a copy of all letters, telegrams, reports and other documents received by the Government during the years 1915 and 1916, relative to the repairs required on the breakwater at Souris, P.E.I.

Mr. Lemieux.—For a tabulated statement showing the number of printing contracts given to private firms between 1911 and 1917, including the name of each firm and the amount paid yearly.

Mr. Gauvreau.—For a copy of all correspondence, notes, memoranda and other documents addressed to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Trade and Commerce or to their respective departments, concerning the ferry between River du Loup, Tadoussac, St. Simeon, St. Catherine and Escoumains, from January, 1912, to December, 1916, and respecting the contracts with the Trans-St. Laurent Company, the Quebec and Levis Ferry Company, and also regarding the steamers Mahone, Pilot and Queen.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a return showing the quantity and value of exports in following commodities for the first nine months of present fiscal year:—

Horses; brass and manufactures of same; wheat; breadstuffs; oats and grain other than wheat; automobiles, bicycles, motorcycles and parts of same, including engines and tires; railway cars and parts; chemicals; copper and manufactures of same; cotton manufactures; explosives; iron and steel and manufactures of same; firearms and munitions; leather and manufactures of same; meat and dairy products; alcohol; vegetables, dried and canned; lead; wearing apparel of all kinds; zinc and manufactures of same; paper and manufactures of same.

Mr. Fortier.—For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents concerning the cancelling by the Post Office Department of the rural mail contract granted to Hyppolite Lambert of St. Antoine, in the county of Lotbinière, Que.

DISMISSAL OF COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT MIDDLETON, N.S.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN moved:

For a copy of all papers, telegrams, orders in council, etc., with reference to the dismissal of Mr. Schaffner, late Collector of Customs at Middleton, N.S.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving this motion I desire to say just a word or two, but I hope that I shall be able to advert to the matter later on in the session when the papers have been brought down. The motion asks for a copy of all papers, telegrams and orders in council in reference to the dismissal of Mr. Schaffner, Collector of Customs at Middleton, in the county of Annapolis. Mr. Schaffner, I am informed, was the Collector of Customs at the port of Middleton for a great number of years, and on the 27th December last he was dismissed under the following notice from the Commissioner of Customs:

Ottawa, December 27, 1916.

L. P. Schaffner, Esq.,
Middleton, N.S.

Sir,—I am directed to inform you that under order in council of 22nd December, 1916, you are dismissed from office as Collector of Customs of the port of Middleton, Nova Scotia, on account of political partisanship.

Under the direction of the department, Mr. Schaffner was removed from office. I am informed, whether accurately or not I cannot say, but I believe my information to be accurate, that he was not a political partisan and had not been guilty of any conduct which might be strictly termed partisan for a great number of years at least. I am prepared to assume that he was guilty of no partisan act, at least since 1911, and I submit that if his head were to fall for such a reason, he should have been removed a very long while ago. Mr. Schaffner is an elderly gentleman, not enjoying good health, and his only son, I believe—I may not be correct as to that—has been fighting overseas in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, was wounded, and is at the present time in a hospital in England. The man appointed in his stead was

a young man eligible for service abroad and twenty-five years of age.

I ask the attention of the House just for a moment or two to point out one or two objections to the action of the department in dismissing Mr. Schaffner. It has been pointed out already that the present Administration occupy the Treasury Benches by grace of the Opposition, or of Parliament, and not by the consent of the people of this country. I think it is a fair statement for me to make that since October last, unless for very well founded and serious cause, the Government should have done nothing except carry on the war and such other things as were necessary in the administration of the civil affairs of this country. Whether or not Mr. Schaffner was guilty of political partisanship during the last two or three months, at least since the expiration of this present Parliament, which was, I think, on October 7, 1916, he should not have been removed from office for such a cause. The Government have given notice of their intention to apply to Parliament for an extension of the Parliamentary term. That question will come up later for consideration by Parliament, and I assume that every hon. gentleman will be prepared to deal with it upon the then existing facts. But they can hardly expect a fair and absolutely non-partisan consideration of that proposal by Parliament, or the country, if they continue carrying on a partisan government during the extended term, the term which was given them purely and solely for the purpose of carrying on affairs relating to the war. On November 27, 1915, an order in council was passed by the Government which I would like to read to the House. I have not a copy of the order, but I am reading it from a publication known as the Military Hospitals Commission Bulletin, and it is as follows:—

> That in making appointments to the Government Civil Service, preference be given to the returned members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, especially those who through disability caused by active military service are unable to fill their previous occupations; such appointments to be subject to the provision of the Civil Service Acts and to be made with due regard to the capacity of any applicant to discharge the duties of the position to which it is proposed to appoint him.

I submit that under that order in council, if this Government deemed it proper to dismiss Mr. Schaffner, they were in honour bound to fill that position by the appointment of a returned soldier. If Mr. Schaffner had been guilty of any reprehensible conduct what could be more proper and correct than the appointment to the office of his son, who has actually served at the front, and who is to-day in hospital? Then, if that courtesy would not be extended to the dismissed official, there are, I submit, in Nova Scotia, many returned soldiers who are quite capable of filling such a position. That order in council, which I have just read to the House, I understand, was intended to apply to the inside service; at least it was subject to that narrow interpretation and in order to make sure that it applied to the outside service as well, another order in council was passed on October 12, 1916. I have not a copy of that order in council, but the publication which I am reading summarizes it in the following language:—

> Both in the Inside and Outside Services preference will be given to men who have served overseas and been honourably discharged, especially to those unable to fill their previous occupations owing to disability caused by active military service, and no examination fee will be required. During the war, no male of military age without a badge shall be appointed.

The objections which I wish to urge against the removal of Mr. Schaffner from office are, first, that he should not have been dismissed at all. I say that he was not guilty of partisan conduct. But if he was, the offence was committed many years ago, and the friends of the Administration if they wished to exercise their right to demand his dismissal on that ground, should have done so long ago, or at all events before the expiration of the Parliamentary term on October 7, 1916. I say that the Government have no right now to exercise their power of dismissal of civil servants for an offence of political partisanship committed long before October 7, 1916. Acts of this nature are not calculated to secure from Parliament or from the country proper and fair consideration of the proposals which the Government have presented to Parliament for the extension of the present parliamentary term, and which proposals naturally find considerable support in Canada. I say further that the Government, having decided upon the removal of Mr. Schaffner, should have observed the terms of their own order in council passed in October, 1916, to the effect that in future appointments to the Civil Service, both Inside and Outside, preference should be given to returned soldiers.

The Government, in this case have openly disregarded their own order in council of

4 p.m.

October, 1915, and the supplementary order in council passed on October 12, 1916, which latter states that "during the war no male of military age without a badge shall be appointed." Surely the Government meant that this order in council should be enforced. At least, I should not like to believe that they were attempting to deceive the public, and had no intention of adhering to the principle laid down in their order in council. In view of all the circumstances, I submit that Mr. Schaffner should be restored to office, and the Government should not be content to rest under the imputation of having made an appointment in contravention of their own order in council. If Mr. Schaffner is not restored to office, the new appointee of the Government should be removed, and a man appointed whose qualifications come within the terms of the order in council which I have quoted.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Customs): I have no objection at all to the papers being brought down. I should like to say a word on the motion. The hon. gentleman knows that there has been a standing rule for a great many years that any official who takes part in a political campaign or interferes in politics in any way shall be liable to dismissal, a statement to that effect by a member of the House of Commons to the head of the department being considered sufficient evidence on which to dismiss the official. That has been the practice not only since 1911, but during the time the hon. gentleman was sitting on this side of the House, when many dismissals took place by the Liberal Government simply on the word of the member representing the constituency concerned. In the present case, Mr. Schaffner had evidently been interfering in politics. I was so advised by the member representing that constituency, and I acted on the rule which has been followed for the last fifteen or twenty years. Personally, I dislike to dismiss an official, but at the same time I think we all agree that when a person accepts a Government position it is much better that so long as he occupies that position he would not interfere in politics, no matter which side he supports. This official certainly knew the rule, and that he was liable to dismissal. With reference to the young man who took the place of Mr. Schaffner, I understand that he had offered his services for overseas, but had been rejected. The statement, therefore, of the hon. member that this man was fit for overseas service and should have gone to the front falls to the ground.

With reference to the orders in council which the hon. member has referred to, I believe that the Government are acting on them right up to the very letter. So far as my own department is concerned, since these orders in council were passed, we have done everything in our power to have every vacant position filled by a returned soldier. I have done that in many cases, and am still doing so. Whenever a vacancy occurs in any constituency I make every possible effort to get a returned soldier to fill it, and if there is no returned soldier available in the locality, I get a returned soldier from some other locality to fill the position temporarily, until a returned soldier from that particular district returns home and will accept the position.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Do I understand the minister to say that before he made the new appointment he had evidence that the appointee had been rejected for overseas service, or has the minister obtained that information just lately?

Mr. REID: I had evidence at the time we appointed him that he had been rejected for overseas service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I suppose the records will show that.

Mr. REID: I do not know whether it is in writing or not, but at all events that is the information I obtained.

Mr. MACDONALD: In filling these positions does the minister regard a man who has been rejected for overseas service, as on the same footing as a man who has returned from the front.

Mr. REID: Not at all. I insist on filling the positions with men who have been injured at the front.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Were there not many men in Nova Scotia who had returned injured from the front and were available for appointment for the position of Collector of Customs in Middleton?

Mr. REID: There was none I knew of in that particular county. Furthermore, the salary is very small, and on that account it is often difficult to get a returned soldier to accept these positions.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What is the salary?

Mr. REID: I do not remember just now.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I suppose about $800 or $900?

Mr. REID: We are having difficulty even at the present time in getting returned soldiers to fill some of these positions in the Customs. I am adhering strictly to the rule that every position must be filled by a returned soldier who has come back home injured. In cases where we cannot get a returned soldier we get some man to fill the position temporarily either one who has been rejected for overseas service, or perhaps the son or brother of a soldier at the front until one of that family returns from the front.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Then I assume that the minister will treat this appointment as a temporary one only.

Mr. REID: This is a temporary appointment. There are in the service to-day men whom, if I can get returned soldiers to fill their places, I shall make retire when the time comes. I may also say, for the information of my hon. friend, that I have received a number of letters written by officers in the Customs Department in different parts of this country offering, at any time that soldiers return who are qualified to take their positions and who need positions, to give up their positions to them. In that way I shall be able to fill a good many positions. I have already taken on a very large number of returned soldiers and I am taking them on every day, and I am satisfied that every member in this House in whose constituency there has been any vacancy in my department, will be able to confirm what I say. I have always requested that the name of a returned soldier be given for the vacancy, and if there is none, I send one from the outside temporarily until one from that particular locality returns.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Was the hon. minister informed, before dismissing Mr. Schaffner, that he had a son fighting in the Canadian forces who was wounded and in a hospital at the time Mr. Schaffner was dismissed?

Mr. REID: No, I was not informed; but I was informed later on that this gentleman had a son at the front who was slightly wounded, and if this son comes back and is wounded, he will have an opportunity, if he so desires, of getting a position in the Customs Department. Whenever any vacancies occur, returned soldiers are taken on irrespective of politics and locality. So far as those who have been taken on are concerned, I do not know what their politics are nor what part of the country they come from. That is the policy I have been following and that, I believe, every other member of the government has been following.

Mr. MACDONALD: You are not joking about that?

Mr. REID: I am not joking at all. The hon. member cannot refer to a single instance where we have not taken on returned soldiers irrespective of politics, creed or locality.

Mr. MACDONALD: Who recommends them?

Mr. REID: What we do is this——

Mr. MACDONALD: The district patronage committee.

Mr. REID: We get their names from the Militiary Hospitals Commission, the Pensions Board, the different soldiers' organizations and from members. Their names are taken down, and after the men are examined, they are given positions in some department wherever a vacancy occurs.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is that the way in which the Minister of Railways is running his department?

Mr. REID: I am running my department and he is running his, and I am satisfied he is giving the returned soldiers every possible opportunity. I defy any hon. member opposite to point to any case where that course has not been followed in the Customs Department since the order in council was passed.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Mr. Speaker, as the member making the recommendation upon which this dismissal was made, I desire to say a word or two before the resolution passes. With the manner of bringing this matter before the House to-day by the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean), I have no complaint to make, but I am bound to think that had the hon. gentleman been fully seized of the facts, he would not have made the speech which he did. I am also bound to think that the friends of the dismissed officer and perhaps the dismissed officer himself, who exerted themselves to have the hon. gentleman bring this matter up, were not serving the best interest of that official; because it is incumbent upon me to make certain statements which I

would not have made of my own free will, but which in self defence I must refer to in public. I am free to admit that in connection with this matter I have erred, but my fault, as I see it to-day, does not lie in the fact that a few months ago I made the recommendation for the dismissal of Mr. L. P. Schaffner of Middleton, but rather in the fact that I did not make the recommendation shortly after the election in 1911, because, as my hon. friend has intimated, this Mr. Schaffner, before the Dominion election of 1911, was an exceedingly offensive, active and obnoxious partisan. He was one of the individuals who frequented every loafing place in the town attacking myself, attacking the Liberal-Conservative party and rendering himself obnoxious in every respect to the members of the Liberal-Conservative party. Of course, had I been so minded, I could, immediately after the election of 1911, have made a recommendation to the minister and procured his dismissal. I was, however, seized with compassion for the individual. While I have made some recommendations for dismissal in various parts of my constituency which I represent, Mr. Schaffner is the first resident of my own town who has lost office by reason of the change of Government, and it was because of sympathy and not because of my expecting to gain any political advantage that he was allowed to remain in office as long as he was. I well remember meeting Mr. Schaffner on the day following the Dominion election, and I well remember the look of distress and woe upon his countenance on that occasion, a look somewhat similar to the expressions on the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite since the Dorchester election, and I was struck with pity.

Mr. MARCIL: Easy. You have not heard the full story of the Dorchester election yet.

Mr. DAVIDSON: No, I have not heard it, but I have seen it depicted on the hon. gentleman's face. We have nothing to fear from the story of the Dorchester election. The Conservative party can hear the full report with considerably more pride and satisfaction than the Liberal party can hear it.

I told Mr. Schaffner on that occasion, being struck with sympathy, that, notwithstanding his offences in the past, he had nothing to fear; all he had to do was to go and sin no more. But Mr. Schaffner did not see fit to do that. From that time to the time of his dismissal he kept up the same old practice. Some time afterwards I heard of Mr. Schaffner attending a caucus of the Liberal party in the town of Middleton, a meeting at which candidates to represent the party were nominated, a meeting when work on the revision of voters' lists was done. I went to some of Mr. Schaffner's friends after that and I asked them to point out to Mr. Schaffner that if this thing continued he could not expect to retain his position. I believe, and, in fact, I have been informed that Liberals on that occasion, and on various occasions since at my request, have gone to him and pointed out to him how unwise it was for him to do anything of the kind. That, however, did not prevent him from going on with this kind of thing, until last summer, an offence of what I regarded as an intolerable character was committed by him. No doubt Mr. Schaffner has heard the words uttered by my hon. friend from Halifax imputing crimes and misdemeanors against this Government, charging the Government with dishonesty and with misappropriating funds; but unlike the hon. members of this House, Mr. Schaffner evidently took those words seriously and believed them; and so I found that last summer, when Americans were coming over to get goods out of the customs house, they were gravely informed by this man that the money he was collecting by way of duty was going to Ottawa to be stolen and that there was a corrupt Government in power. I could not countenance anything of that kind, and I did not think it was just that an officer of that character should be retained in office. Mr. Schaffner was not only guilty of acts of offensive partisanship, but he was guilty of gross irregularities in the conduct of his own office.

Matters were brought to me which, if I had reported them to the department, would have led to an investigation; but, out of consideration for Mr. Schaffner, I put the offence on a milder basis and made the recommendaion I did. I am ready to stand before my constituents and justify to the limit the action I have taken.

What the hon. minister has stated in reference to the appointment of a successor to this man is absolutely correct. The person appointed temporarily to fill the office is a young man of excellent habits and ability. At the very opening of the war he offered himself for service abroad, and it was with great disappointment that he found himself turned down. His rejection

was followed by a long illness, from which he has just recovered. He is not now in a condition of health to engage in anything like strenuous work. In the absence of any returned soldier in the constituency, I thought he should have this position temporarily. I went over the list of those from the county of Annapolis who had returned from the front, but found none who would be eligible for this position. Had I found one eligible it is quite likely I should have regarded his claims upon the office as higher than those of the gentleman who received it.

The complaint is made that this officer, Mr. Schaffner, has been dismissed, notwithstanding the fact that he has a son serving at the front, a son who has been wounded. I believe that Mr. Schaffner has a son at the front who is doing good service for his country, and that he has received some slight wounds, because of which he has been in the hospital for a short time. But I understand it is nothing very serious, and that he will return to the front shortly.

I congratulate hon. gentlemen opposite on their new-found concern for the soldiers at the front and even for the relatives of those soldiers. Last session my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) and other hon. gentlemen from Nova Scotia seriously attacked, not a relative of a soldier at the front, but actually a gallant soldier himself, who was doing sterling service for his country at that time, and who has since made the supreme sacrifice, has given his life for his country. I refer to the late Mr. Gore Foster, of Halifax. At that time it was incumbent upon me to maintain the cause of a gallant soldier against the very violent attacks of these hon. gentlemen. I am glad their attitude towards the soldier has changed and that, while last session they were ready to attack an absent soldier who was fighting for his country and his flag, and to attack him on very paltry grounds, they now hold that even the relatives of soldiers are sacred and shall not be touched, no matter what they do. If the party to which the hon. member for Halifax belongs is sincere, it has an excellent opportunity to show it. At this time there is vacant in the county of Annapolis a position very much better than that which Mr. Schaffner has lost, the position of Registrar of Deeds for the county.

If the hon. gentleman is so concerned for Mr. Schaffner, he could show that concern by having him appointed to this vacant position. A position in the gift of the Liberal provincial Government. We will wait to see how sincere these hon. gentlemen are in this matter.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): I confess to a feeling of surprise when I heard the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) present facts to show that, even in this time of war, civil servants are dismissed for offences which evidently are hoary with age. I say I was surprised that this should be done at this time, when I myself and every other member of this House holds his seat not by the voice of the people but by the voices of himself and his fellow-members. I concur in everything that was said by the hon. member for Halifax on that subject and hold with him that in view of our present tenure of office we should be very careful as to the scope we give ourselves, and should devote our efforts simply to the accomplishment of those purposes for which this extension of time was given us. But in his zeal for dismissals the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Davidson) is only following the example of his party in the province of Nova Scotia. I think the most conspicious case of dismissal in the province of Nova Scotia was the practical dismissal of our lieutenant governor. When war broke out, we had as lieutenant governor of Nova Scotia a distinguished gentleman who was well qualified for his position and who had taken a particularly active part in providing for the soldiers at the front and those going to the front. Now, if any officers should be continued in their positions during the period of the war, those officers are the lieutenant governors, and this is particularly true of the lieutenant governor of Nova Scotia. But we had those who desired his dismissal sitting, as it were, on the steps of Government House at Halifax, watching not merely the calendar but the clock, yes the chronometer, to determine exactly when the lieutenant governor's term expired, according to London time. They would not even wait until business hours of that day in Nova Scotia, but they dismissed him by meridian time at Greenwich. This shows the extreme desire for dismissals in Nova Scotia even in the case of a lieutenant governor the special representative in the province of His Majesty the King. For their action in this case, I assume, the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) himself, is particularly responsible. And with this as expressive of the gospel of the Tory party in Nova Scotia, we need hardly won-

der at what they may do in the case of a mere custom house officer.

But is it not surprising to see the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Davidson) descend to such minor things as these? Very few hon. gentlemen in this House hold the high distinction that he holds as a Canadian statesman. Most of us are ordinary politicians, obliged to give attention to political matters and to look after such things as electoral lists, so that we shall not make any bad friends among the people. But another and higher plane upon which the politician finds no place or standing is that occupied by statesmen. In support of the claim which I make for the hon. member for Annapolis, we have sworn testimony on the records of the High Court in the province of Nova Scotia. That being the case, we expect of him conduct becoming a statesman. Of course, if this evidence went to a jury they might measure it more closely and weigh it more carefully when they were told that this sworn testimony was the evidence of the hon. gentleman himself. But it could not be said that the hon. gentleman, when he solemnly swore that he himself was a statesman, was an independent witness. I well remember meeting the hon. gentleman in my county at a court session, which was largely brought about by the manoeuvering and manipulations of the hon. gentleman when he was attending a local election. While going through my county on that occasion he had a happy faculty of talking glibly about dismissals. His methods were very shrewd. He would go to a postmaster, say, on the north shore in Victoria county and say: You have a post office; you had better vote for our man, and you will hold your office.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has absolutely misrepresented me, and he has done so after having listened to evidence taken in court in which he tried to establish these facts—evidence which was absolutely and entirely contrary in every particular to the statement which the hon. gentleman has made.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not think I am out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for North Cape Breton must accept the statement of the hon. member for Annapolis.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not quite understand what the hon. gentleman says.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Mr. DAVIDSON: Does the hon. gentleman desire me to repeat what I have said?

Mr. McKENZIE: I am up against just what I expected.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I ask the hon. gentleman to take back his assertion to the effect that I had gone to office-holders and advised them not to vote, on the assurance that they would hold their offices, or words to that effect.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member would be well advised to accept the statement of the hon. member for Annapolis as to what was done.

Mr. McKENZIE: I will comply with your ruling, Sir, if we understand each other as to what the ruling is upon. I understand the hon. member for Annapolis to be referring this House to certain evidence that was given before a judge in the county of Victoria.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. gentleman says that I failed to prove certain things in that court. I submit that that is not the kind of statement upon which I am bound to accept anything he may say in this House.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I rise to a point of order. I do not think there can be any doubt in this matter. The hon. gentleman has said that I went to certain office-holders in the county of Victoria and assured them that if they were to stay home from the polls they would hold their offices. That statement is absolutely false. Furthermore, as I have said, it ought to be within the knowledge of the hon. gentleman that the statement is false, because he tried to establish something of that kind and dismally failed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for North Cape Breton must accept the statement of the member for Annapolis—that is very clear. No action outside of the House would qualify that rule. I may point out to the hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria that the motion under consideration is with respect to the production of certain papers. I do not think that the address which the hon. gentleman was making with respect to the hon. member for Annapolis has any bearing upon the matter before the House. I hope, therefore, that the hon. gentleman will bring his remarks

to bear more closely upon the question which is under consideration.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have for a long time had the privilege of addressing this House, and I am aware of my responsibilities and the scope of my power in addressing the Chair. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I will at all events keep as close to the line as did the hon. gentleman to whom I have referred. He went far afield; he covered all these grounds, and so did the hon. Minister of Customs. They dealt with our conduct—what we used to do, what we did and what we did not do. In coming to the point that I purpose making, I have the right to deal in a general way with the conduct of the hon. gentleman who represents the county of Annapolis in respect to the matter of dismissals. Beyond that I shall not go. While I may not come to the point as directly as you, Mr. Speaker, might think proper, I will get there, if you permit me, even if by a somewhat circuitous route.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. Minister of Customs and the hon. member for Annapolis were not, I think, out of order in referring to a matter of policy. That is an entirely different matter from dealing with the personal actions of an hon. gentleman who makes a speech in the House. The hon. gentleman would be well advised to confine his remarks to the subject before the Chair.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman has not withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. While the hon. member for North Cape Breton has the floor it is not in order for any hon. gentleman to interrupt, except on a point of order.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Then I rise to a point of order to remind you that the hon. gentleman has not withdrawn the statement to which I objected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. McKENZIE: If I heard the hon. member for Annapolis properly, he complained that I said that in the county of Victoria he was asking people to remain home from voting, on the promise of their getting offices, or on the threat that they would lose their position. I said nothing of the kind. Unless a guilty conscience accused him, I do not see how that came to the hon. gentleman's mind. I think it is open to members of the House, even jocularly, if you like, to say something about our friends in the House who are zealous in the discharge of their duties, particularly in the matter of dismissals. I was simply observing that my hon. friend had put himself on the pedestal of a statesman, and that the dismissal of a poor old man in the county of Annapolis, after his having been left in office nearly six years after the change of government in 1911, was not the act of a statesman. I was pointing out that my learned friend was not living up to his old oath, when he swore that he was a statesman in the court of Mr. Justice Russell in the province of Nova Scotia. He was asked: Are you a politician?—asked by Mr. Lovett, a gentleman well known to you Mr. Speaker—are you a politician Mr. Davidson? And he answered: no sir, I am a statesman. I am looking for great things from great sources; and you will pardon me also when I point out that this proud bird, the eagle, which is supposed to deal with this thing, that this great bird, the statesman-eagle of Annapolis, has fallen on such poor, small prey as this poor man who was dismissed from office. After all we shall come to this conclusion that an insect is still but an insect at most, though it crawl on the head of a queen, and after this, notwithstanding the records of Mr. Justice Russel's court and the sworn testimony, we shall have to deal with the member of Annapolis, knowing that he has the same old feet of clay we were accustomed to in the days gone by. We were told that this man Schaffner had on the morning of the election a woe-begone look on his face. That is the statement made by the hon. member for Annapolis. He had a visage that was simply frightful. Well, I should like to have a snapshot of the two visages on that morning, because up to that time and for several days afterwards the position of the hon. member was very insecure indeed; he held on by a single thread; there were only thirteen very doubtful votes between him and the cold shades of outside, and it was only by a compromise, not by the will of the people of Annapolis, that the hon. member has a seat in this House.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Not nearly as insecure as—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. DAVIDSON—the hon. gentleman's was six years ago when a judge helped him in.

Mr. McKENZIE: There are some people in this House who can break in from a certain side of the House absolutely regardless of the rules, and they do it with full

impunity, for what reason I do not know. I was saying that if the visage of the hon. member was held up to us with the visage of this poor man who was dismissed from office, I think there would be some difficulty for hon. gentlemen in this House to discern which was the most woe-begone. I hope and I believe that the expression of my learned and hon. friend to this man when he met him that morning was: "Alas, my poor brother!"

We are told that this man was to hold his peace for a number of years, that he was to express no opinion, forsooth, because, according to the Minister of Customs, he held an office, the salary of which is so small that not even a limping, crippled returned soldier would take it. That, Sir, is the policy of the high-minded men of the Government and those supporting them; no matter how small the salary was, even if it was so small that nobody would bother taking it who could expect to make a living in any other way—that he has got to go about mum, absolutely tied to the chariot wheels of this party and never express an opinion of his own. I would say to the Minister of Customs, if he were here, and to other members of the Government, that if ever there was a case where there should have been an inquiry before dismissing a man, it was in this case. There is not a word of direct evidence against him, according to the hon. member himself. Every word the hon. member stated against Schaffner is based on hearsay evidence. He travelled on the hearsay evidence of men who came over from the United States, who went to the customs house, and my hon. friend heard them saying that this officer was telling them there were some crooked dealings by this Government, and that money paid for duties might go in that direction. That is absolutely hearsay, and everything else that was laid to the charge of this man is in the same position. I submit that there should have been an investigation. Schaffner is not in the happy position of my hon. friend who can come here and, in the high court of Parliament, state his case and justify this dismissal. This man is a poor man, but he has a right under British justice and under our rules to be heard and have his case put before this House and the authorities of this country, and let them pass judgment upon it. But we have the one-sided partial, statement of the member for Annapolis, without the slightest opportunity being given to this man to state his case. The Government of this country, during war time, when they ought to be dealing with mighty things, take the sword in their hands—it is the only sword any of them ever took—and cut the head off this poor man. I congratulate them upon the high position they have taken, and the kind of slaughter they are making in these war times among the enemies of the Tory party.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Just a word more. The hon. member for Annapolis doubtless has the advantage over me and hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in his statements about the conduct of the dismissed official. I suppose we are bound to accept his statements because we are not acquainted with the facts. But, nevertheless, it is a very suspicious circumstance that the official records disclose that Mr. Schaffner was dismissed upon the ground of political partisanship, whereas the hon. member for Annapolis justifies the dismissal upon the ground of gross official irregularity on the part of this dismissed official.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I think my hon. friend misunderstood me. If I said anything of that kind I did not intend to. What I did say was that he was entitled to dismissal on account of offensive partisanship; but he was also entitled to dismissal on the ground of irregularities. Out of deference to his feelings I advanced the lesser evil.

Mr. MACLEAN: I accept the statement of the hon. member for Annapolis upon that point. But I do say that if the hon. member did not see fit to justify his recommendation for dismissal upon the ground of official irregularity, he should not resort to that defence here to-day. If that official was guilty of official irregularity, it was only fitting and proper that he should be dismissed. But if my hon. friend had knowledge of these facts, he should have communicated them to the Minister of Customs; an investigation should have been held, and upon such grounds the man should have been dismissed. Personally I am not interested in the welfare of Mr. Schaffner. He is absolutely unknown to me.

I made a few observations upon this motion for the purpose of calling to the attention of the House one or two principles that were involved. I say this, that the Government had no right to dismiss an official now or since last October upon the ground of political partisanship unless it was grossly offensive, because the official is in the same position as a member of Parliament, and there has been an under-

standing that when even a vacancy occurs in Parliament to-day the political party holding that seat shall have it filled by another gentleman supporting that party, if the seat is filled at all. I should like to point ont to the hon. gentleman again that the Government is in power to-day, I assume, with limited powers.

I take it that the extension granted last year was upon the assumption that there should not be an exercise of many of the powers usually exercised during peace time and within the ordinary parliamentary term. I do not find any fault with the statement of the Minister of Customs with respect to what should be the conduct of officials. I think all civil servants should abstain from active political interference. I have always advised any of my own political friends whom I have recommended to office to abstain from political activity, first, because I do not believe in it, and, in the next place, because I have never found their influence of any great value to me. Nor, have I ever observed them to be influential when active for the body who appointed them.

The other principle I wished to impress upon hon. gentlemen was in reference to the fulfilment of their pledges as contained in the orders in council of November, 1915, as amended by the subsequent order in council of October, 1916. The Minister of Customs states that it was not called to his attention that the gentleman appointed had been rejected upon offering to enlist and I am bound to assume that the hon. member for Annapolis never called the attention of the Minister of Customs to this fact.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I am quite certain I did advise the minister that this individual had been rejected when he offered for military service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I understood the minister to say that he did not have that information.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I do not think the minister spoke with certainty as to that.

Mr. MACLEAN: Perhaps I am wrong. I want to close by asking the hon. member for Annapolis a question. He heard the Minister of Customs say that he regarded this appointment as temporary and that as soon as he could learn of a returned soldier who was an applicant for the office and who would be fitted for it, the present occupant would be removed and such applicant be put in his place. Do I understand the hon. member for Annapolis to agree with that statement?

Mr. DAVIDSON: I understand that the position is just filled temporarily and that if for any reason it should be found advisable not to make the appointment permanent, that the present incumbent should prove incompetent, and there should be any soldier found who would be eligible, I think it very likely he might get it.

Motion agreed to.

IMMIGRATION REGULATIONS.

Mr. MACDONALD moved:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the exclusion at St. John, N.B., from Canada, of Mr. Corsbie, son of Jacob Corsbie, of Trinidad, a British subject, on the alleged ground of his being of Chinese extraction, and in regard to the deportation of said Corsbie.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am making this motion for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to what I think was very objectionable and ill-considered treatment of a young man belonging to the Island of Trinidad and who was endeavouring to come to Canada in the month of August, 1916, for the purpose of being educated. The circumstances in connection with the matter have received a great deal of attention in that sister Dominion of ours and have caused a great deal of ill-feeling. For a number of years the Presbyterian body in Canada have maintained an organization in Trinidad. The matter was brought to my notice and I have been asked to call the attention of the House to it by representatives of the church resident in the Island of Trinidad. The circumstances will be explained perhaps more clearly in the correspondence which I will read than if I attempted to state them. First, I will read from a letter written by the Rev. Dr. Coffin, formerly of Prince Edward Island, but who is now located at San Farnando, Trinidad. He writes on October 14 to a friend of his, a clergyman, in the province of Nova Scotia, as follows:

San Fernando, Trinidad,
October 13, 1916.

Dear Mr. Thomson:

I am enclosing you a statement from Jacob Corsbie in regard to his son. His statement will explain the case. His return has caused a great amount of talk and bad feeling. Personally, I do not believe that he was treated fairly, but according to a rule of thumb method of interpreting the Immigration Act. Canadians can hardly be respected abroad if this is a sample of our laws and their working.

The boy was harshly treated after the manner of a criminal. His brother in Halifax could not see him except under escort of police. His father as you knew is our representative elder and has a seat if elected in the Canadian General Assembly. Just think of him going up and being treated as a criminal practically.

The boy does not know a word of Chinese and is a westerner to all intents and purposes, with almost as much Scotch blood in him as Chinese and in every other respect much more Scotch than Chinese. With all good wishes.

Yours, &c.,

F. J. Coffin.

He encloses a letter written by Mr. Corsbie, father of the young man, which is as follows:

Prince of Wales Street,
San Fernando, Trinidad, B.W.I.,
October 7, 1916.

Dear Sir,—

In reference to our conversation relative to my son, I now write you and ask you to interest yourself in the matter, as I consider this treatment was very unjust to a British subject, and for this purpose I give you the following facts:

1. On the 19th August last, my son, Clement Russell Corsbie, age 14, sailed by the Royal Mail SS. Caraquet for Halifax, N.S., Canada, and has come back yesterday by the same steamer, as the Canadian Government forbade his landing.

2. I came to Trinidad from China in my childhood, and have lived here for over 50 years, formerly as a teacher in connection with the Canadian Mission here, then as bailiff and commissioner of assessments for the borough of San Fernando, and latterly as a Peasant Cocoa proprietor.

3. I received part of my education in Canada at the Galt Collegiate Institute, Ontario, under the late Dr. William Tassie, M.A., LL.D.

4. My wife, the mother of the boy, is a creole of the Island (coloured, not black), and her ancestors for generations have been British subjects. Her grandfather was a Scotchman from Scotland.

5. My son was educated at the Canadian Presbyterian Mission School, San Fernando, and his object in going to Canada was to further his studies under his brother Wilfred (Fred) Corsbie, druggist with E. M. Macleod, Esq., of Halifax, N.S., who has been so employed for the past 8 years.

6. My son had with him a passport from the Government of this colony, stating and certifying that he was a British subject, and required in the name of His Majesty all those whom it may concern to allow Clement Russell Corsbie to pass freely without let or hindrance, and to afford him every assistance and protection of which he may stand in need. Signed by "J. R. Chancellor, R.E., K.C.M.G., D.S.O.", the Governor of the colony, on the 16th day of August, 1916.

7. In the face of this, the Canadian Government flatly declined to admit him unless he deposited £100, and as he and his brother had not this amount, he was . . . transported, and I had to stand the expenses of his being sent back.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

I venture to assert that this is a case of extreme hardship and unjust treatment to a British subject, for my son is a born British subject, and the object he had in view was education. Before leaving here he had complied with all the regulations and requirements. He was going there to be with his brother, who is employed and who would help to maintain him, and my intention was to remit an allowance regularly for his maintenance so he would not be under any charge to the Government there.

Canada claims to be very anxious to promote closer relationship with the West Indies, and to aid in this a trade preference exists between us, but these efforts are wholly offset if the treatment above described is to be meted out to His Majesty's subjects from the West Indies.

Thanking you in anticipation for your kind assistance. I am,

Yours faithfully,

J. W. Corsbie.

Rev. F. J. Coffin, Ph.D.

The boy's mother's relatives are a well known and distinguished family of West Indians. One of them is a solicitor, who occupies a high position in his profession. When this young man arrived at St. John the Government detained him on the ground that he was of Chinese origin. The Rev. Mr. Morton, who was at one time a prominent Presbyterian minister in Trinidad, happened to be in St. John at the time, and obtained the good offices of a gentleman who is well known to my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). I refer to Judge Forbes. These two gentlemen, I am informed, laid before the Government the facts of the case, which has created a very bad feeling, not only in the island, as shown by these letters and certain other evidence that has come to our people in Nova Scotia, but the subject has also been discussed at very great length in the Presbyterian Church in Nova Scotia generally and with considerable energy in the Presbyterian papers of the province.

I know that the statute is not very broad with reference to the exclusion of persons of Chinese origin, but it does seem to me that in a case like this, where the young man was highly spoken of, there should be such an interpretation of the Act as would avoid such a situation as has occurred. There are certain exemptions from the operations of the Chinese Exclusion Act, which was passed at a time when the feeling in this country in regard to the entry of Chinese was very much stronger than it is now. The exemptions include:—

(a) Members of diplomatic staff, consuls and their servants.

(b) The children born in Canada of parents of Chinese origin and who have left Canada

for education or other purposes on substantiating their identity to the satisfaction of the controller of the port or place where they seek to enter on their return.

(c) 1. Merchants, their wives and minor children.
2. The wives and minor children of clergymen.
3. Tourists.
4. Men of science.
5. Subject to regulations made from time to time by Governor in Council, duly certified teachers who shall substantiate their status to the satisfaction of the Controller.

In this particular case this young man is a minor, the son of a merchant in Trinidad. This Chinese Exclusion Act was manifestly intended to exclude those who are not included in the list of exceptions I have read. It was not intended to exclude such a person as young Corsbie. I am not going to argue whether the Government were acting on the strict letter of the law or not. This young man, according to the strict letter of the law, may possibly be subject to exclusion. But I submit that it was quite within the power of the department, more particularly as power had been given to pass orders in council dealing with certain classes of people whom it was thought desirable to exclude, to have allowed this young man to come into the country, as his identity had been vouched for and his character and status commended to the Government by the gentleman I have mentioned. I think the Government should have had regard to those facts, and should now formally express regret to the Governor of Trinidad for the mistake which they made in excluding this young man, and express their willingness to provide for his admission. One class that are exempt from the operation of the Chinese Immigration Act, subject to regulations made from time to time by the Governor in Council, are duly certified teachers. Now this young man is the son of a teacher, a Canadian graduate. One can well understand what a very real and injurious blow must have been struck at the good feeling which we are so anxious to maintain and develop with our British fellow-citizens in Trinidad, who naturally look to us, as we would desire them to look, in matters of trade and intimacy of all kinds, rather than to the United States—what a deterrent to that good feeling must have arisen when the word reached them that this young man was not allowed to enter Canada to complete his education. The facts that have come to me are from a source that is unquestioned, and I think the Government, now they are brought to their attention, should at once provide for the admission of this young gentleman.

I want to say a word or two generally with reference to the law excluding Chinese. In the United States, at their great universities, one finds quite a number of Chinese who have gone there from China to complete their education, and that ought to be our policy in this country. If the Act, and the regulations made under the Act, are not sufficiently wide to admit these people from China who wish to come here to complete their educational training they should be amended so that there would be no question about the admission of Chinese coming here for that purpose.

I have brought the case of this young man to the attention of the House at the request of some very well-known clergymen in the province of Nova Scotia, who have been connected with the Island of Trinidad The facts are as I have stated, and unless the department has other information justifying their course in this case I submit that some action should be taken by the Government, in order to remove the bad impression which unquestionably exists and will continue to exist in Trinidad in regard to the treatment of this young man.

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Minister of the Interior): This case has been dealt with departmentally. Although I am not conversant with all the facts, I had a short memorandum placed in my hands this morning regarding the motion of my hon. friend. I think some of the statements in the correspondence which he has read are grossly exaggerated. When all the facts are brought down I do not think they will substantiate the statements that were read, that this young man has been treated like a criminal. I cannot quite take the hon. gentleman's view that, because certain respectable gentlemen had vouched for this young man and asked for his admission, the Government should therefore have acceded to their request. We frequently get very strong letters asking us to admit certain people who would be barred by the Immigration Act. In regard to this particular case, the reason why this young man was excluded by the officials of the department was that, according to their interpretation of the Act, he did not come within the exemptions. He was of Chinese origin and therefore was excluded under the Chinese Immigration Act. I will read the short memorandum

dealing with this question supplied to me by the Superintendent of Immigration:

Clement Russell Corsbie arrived at St. John, N.B., in September, 1916. While of British nationality, he is of Chinese descent and, not belonging to the exempt classes, could have been legally admitted only upon payment of the $500 head tax. Representations were made to the department by a large number of persons, but as there is no provision in the Chinese Immigration Act for any departure from the terms of same, the department took the stand that admission could be only upon payment of the $500 head tax, and as Corsbie was unable to pay, he was deported. Objection to the department's action was made by his father and a rather severe criticism was made in the Presbyterian Witness, published at Halifax. It was pointed out to this paper that in their views they should criticize the law, not the administration of the law.

(Sgd.) W. D. Scott,
Superintendent of Immigration.

That is the only report that has been placed in my hands. I may say that there has been some correspondence with the Governor of Trinidad and a courteous letter was sent to him pointing out that owing to the Chinese Immigration Act this young man was refused admission. I quite agree with the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) that the admission of young Chinese students into the United States under their immigration law for the purpose of attending any of their universities is more liberal than our law in Canada has been up to the present time. For the last two years I have been discussing the question with those who have brought the matter to my attention, and I have already prepared an amendment to the Chinese Immigration Act to be submitted this session, to place the admission of these young Chinese students who desire to attend our schools and colleges, on the same footing as in the United States. This was a case where the young man, according to the interpretation of the officials of the department, did not come under any of the exempt classes, and as he did not have the $500 head tax, he was not admitted. Had he paid the $500 head tax, he would have been admitted and he could have attended any of our universities for one year, and on leaving the country afterwards he would have had that head tax refunded. We do that right along. Any young man of Chinese origin who comes to Canada and attends our universities pays the head tax upon admission, and when he leaves the country, the head tax is refunded. That is the difference between the United States law and ours. The United States do not impose the head tax.

[Mr. Roche.]

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is the wording in the Chinese Immigration Act: "Of Chinese origin"?

Mr. ROCHE: I have not the Act here.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would not that mean a man born in China, originating in China? The son of a man who has been a British subject for fifty years is surely not of Chinese origin.

Mr. ROCHE: The Superintendent of Immigration uses the expression "of Chinese descent". The interpretation which the department has placed on the matter—and I think the matter has engaged the particular attention of the department—is that he did not come within any of the exempt classes. That may be wrong and I will have the matter looked into more critically, but I feel sure that no similar case will arise in the future. The Act has not been changed since this Government came into power; this is the manner in which the Act has been administered since it was placed upon the Statute-book, and the same officials are still administering the Act. I quite agree, however, that the Act should be amended and, as I stated before, I have prepared an amendment to be submitted this session.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think the word in the Act is "origin," and that must mean a man who has been born in China, who is a Chinaman. If the minister is sound in his views, then a man whose great-grandfather happened to be a Chinaman and whose blood might be only about one-tenth Chinese, would be excluded. The Statute surely cannot mean that. In this case the boy was the son of a British subject, a man who had left China when a boy, who had lived in a British colony and who had become a British subject. This boy is a British subject; his mother is not a Chinese woman, and his mother's blood must count in considering the question. If the word is "origin," as the minister seems to think it is, it is clear that this boy ought to have been admitted.

Mr. MACDONALD: The statements that I made in regard to this matter were not comments by myself with reference to anything that occurred at St. John, but were contained in letters which came from Trinidad, and the mention of the manner in which the young man was treated was contained in a letter from the boy's father.

On account of the situation of the library it is difficult to get books outside of those in general use, but my recollection of the

Statute is that a person excluded is a person of Chinese origin, and it seems to me a very fine distinction, when you are dealing with a British subject coming from Trinidad, whose status has been certified to by the Government of that colony, to put him within the terms of the Statute. I would like to know what interpretation would be put upon the right to enter Canada of a person for instance, who had been born of a British father but whose mother happened to be born in China, and who therefore had some Chinese blood in him. Could he be exc'uded under that Statute? He could not be, and if you reverse that condition I think that the same reasoning would apply.

I am glad to hear that the minister recognizes that the law requires to be amended. I would suggest, in order to avoid the feeling of resentment which this matter has caused in Trinidad, on account of the notoriety that has been given to this case, that steps be taken to satisfy the authorities there, in so far as it is possible to do so, as to the regret this country has over the exclusion that has been made.

Motion agreed to.

On the motion of Sir George Foster for the adjournment of the House:

Mr. MACDONALD: Before the House adjourns I would like to ask the hon. gentleman leading the House to call the attention of the Premier to the fact that some information is to be brought down before the War Appropriation Bill comes on. First, I desire to obtain information as to the number of unfit men among the troops taken across the Atlantic, and the cost to the country by reason of these men being enlisted. Then I should like a report on No. 7 and No. 8 hospitals in France, carried on under Canadian auspices. Also, I desire a list of the unmarried men, with their rank and amount of their pay, who are in England and physically fit, and are occupying clerical or staff positions.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) will let me have a memorandum of what he desires, I will bring the matter to the attention of the proper authorities.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 5.15 p.m.

Monday, February 5, 1917.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES FOR 1916-17.

A message from His Excellency the Governor General, transmitting a Supplementary Estimate for the year ending March 31, 1917, was presented by Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance) and read by Mr. Speaker to the House.

On motion of Sir Thomas White, the message from His Excellency the Governor General, with accompanying Estimates, was referred to the Committee of Supply.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

With reference to the Hansard of the British House of Commons, July 8, 1915, showing that Sir Arthur Markam asked Mr. Tennant, the Under Secretary for War, the following questions:—

Whether within the past few days the greater part of the Canadian Division at the front had been armed with the Lee-Enfield rifle, and whether the Canadian Government had been asked to discontinue the manufacture of the Ross rifle?

The Under-Secretary replied as follows:—

"The Ross rifle has been the subject of trial and report by the military authorities in France. The results are now before the Canadian Government. In the light of information received, the situation regarding the War Office contract with reference to this rifle is now being reviewed."

1. Did the Canadian Government receive the report referred to in the reply of the Under Secretary for War.
2. If so, on what date was the report received?
3. What action if any, did the Government take after the receipt of said report, and when was such action taken?
4. Has the manufacture of the Ross rifle on Government account been discontinued?
5. If so, when?

Mr. KEMP:

1. Yes.
2. 19th July, 1915.
3. Action on this matter, i.e., enlargement of chambers, had been taken by the Department of Militia and Defence prior to the receipt of this report.

The Militia Council as a body approved of the enlargement of the chambers in the Ross rifle on the 9th July, 1915, and instructions were issued to the Ross Rifle Co. on that date.

4. No, nor on War Office contract. The Ross rifle contract of 1902 with the Government of Canada contains no proviso permitting of the cancellation of orders founded thereon.

5. Answered by No. 4.

RIVIERE DU LOUP—TADOUSSAC FERRY.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Has the ferry service been discontinued between River du Loup and Tadoussac during the winter season?
2. If so, why has this service been discontinued?
3. Is the contract still in existence?
4. If so, what company holds same?
5. If not, when did the contract expire?
6. What amount has been paid to the said company during the summer season of 1916, and what amount has been paid during the winter season up to the time of the wreck of the steamer Queen?
7. Is it the intention of the Government to continue such service this winter between River du Loup and Tadoussac?
8. If not, why not?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. Yes.

2. Tenders were called for, but only two proposals were received. The subsidy asked for in one was much too high, and the other tenderer was unable to put a boat on the route during the winter of 1916-17.

3. No.

4. Answered by No. 3.

5. April 30, 1916.

6. No amount has been paid to any one either for the summer of 1916 or the winter of 1916-17.

7. No arrangements have been made.

8. No satisfactory arrangements could be made.

BALLOTS FOR OVERSEAS FORCES.

Mr. KAY:

1. Did the Government send to England in 1915, ballots for the purpose of taking the votes of the soldiers overseas?
2. If so, where are these ballots at the present time?
3. Are they available for use if a general election were held during the present year?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1 and 2. These questions are covered by the answer given to similar questions on the 10th February, 1916. (See Hansard, 1916, vol. 1, p. 673.)

3. The ballots in question are ready, in accordance with the Act, for a general election whenever held.

ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

To whom were subsidies paid in the calendar year 1916, if any, for trans-Atlantic mail service, in what amounts and upon what basis?

[Mr. Kemp.]

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Canadian Pacific Ocean Services, Ltd.: winter service at $11,363.63 per round trip, $159,090.82; summer service, at $5,291 per round trip, $100,529; a total for this company of $259,619.82; White Star-Dominion line, half trip, $2,645.50. The subsidy claim for December quarter has not been received.

MACHINE GUNS.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

1. What amount of money has been subscribed by the people of Canada since the outbreak of the war for the purchase of machine guns?
2. What amount was used for the purchase of such guns and what amount, if any, was used for other purposes?
3. If any was expended for other purposes, when, where and for what other purposes was such expenditure made?

Mr. KEMP:

1. $1,271,257.04.

2. $3,527,894.86 has been expended by the Dominion Government on machine guns and spare parts since the outbreak of the war. It is the intention of the Government to credit the amount subscribed by the people of Canada since the outbreak of the war, to this account.

3. None has been expended for any other purpose.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—EMPLOYEES MAGAZINE.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. When was the Canadian Government Railway Employees Magazine started?
2. Who is its editor?
3. What salary is paid him?
4. What is the cost per month, to the railway, of publishing the magazine?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. November 1, 1914.
2. Safety Engineer J. E. Long.
3. Receives no salary.
4. Nil.

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL COMMISSION.

Mr. PARDEE:

1. Who compose what is known as the Georgian Bay Canal Commission?
2. How much has it cost to date?
3. When will it conclude its labours?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Messrs. W. Sanford Evans, Frank S. Meighen and Edouard Gohier.

2. To December 31, 1916, $46,164.06.

3. The Commission cannot conclude its labours until conditions are such that full public hearings can with propriety be held, and the public mind is free to give this important subject the necessary attention. The

special preliminary investigation now being carried on will be continued only as long as in the judgment of the Government the results justify the expenditure. It is expected that a second interim report will be laid upon the table before the close of the present session, containing further studies of the movement of agricultural products, while certain detailed investigations of traffic between Canada and Europe are already well advanced.

MR. JAMES LOVETT.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Was Mr. James Lovett, of the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Halifax, dismissed in the month of November last?
2. If so, upon what grounds was the dismissal made?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.
2. On the ground of political partisanship.

WAR SUPPLIES—HORSES.

Mr. ROSS:

1. Is the Government of Canada purchasing horses for use of either the Canadian or British Forces at the present time?
2. Is the British Government, or its representatives, purchasing any horses in Canada at the present time?
3. Has the British Government purchased any horses in Canada since December 1 last? If so, how many?
4. Is this Government aware as to whether or not the British Government, through Sir Charles Gunning, its representative in Canada, is now purchasing about 3,000 horses per week from the firm of Guyton & Harrington, of Kansas City, Mo., with offices at Lathrop, Mo., DesMoines, Iowa, and Indianapolis, Indiana?
5. Is the Government aware as to whether or not the farmers of Ontario have thousands of horses fit for military purposes, of which they are unable to dispose?
6. If so, has this Government called the attention of the British Government or its representative in Canada, Sir Charles Gunning, to this condition of affairs?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. A certain number of horses have been purchased by the Department of Militia and Defence during the past year for use in Canada. As stated in answer to a question by the hon. member for Kings (P. E. I.) (Mr. J. J. Hughes) on February 14, 1916, (See Hansard, 1916, volume 1, page 759), the Canadian Government has not been purchasing horses for military purposes overseas since the summer of 1915, for the reason that in August of that year an arrangement was made whereby the British Government undertook the purchasing of whatever horses might be necessary, not only for the British forces but for the Canadian forces overseas as well.

2, 3 and 4. This information could not be given at an earlier date, because, when I applied for it, I was informed by Sir Charles Gunning, British Remount Commissioner, Montreal, that it was confidential until the assent of the War Office could be obtained. The assent has now been obtained, and I therefore give the text of a telegram from Sir Charles Gunning as follows:

Am not purchasing horses in Canada at present time. No horses purchased in Canada since December first. Average number per week of horses now being purchased in United States nineteen hundred. No horses being purchased at DesMoines or Indianapolis. Number of horses purchased in Canada between March and November, 1916, six thousand and seventy-nine. Number of horses shipped from Canadian ports during 1916, thirteen thousand three hundred and ninety-six. I do not purchase in Canada during winter months as climatic conditions are such that it is impossible to keep horses in the open, which it is necessary to do for about five weeks to ensure being fit for shipment. It is my intention to resume purchasing in Canada in the spring. The British Remount Officers are in Montreal.

5. The Government have no official information on this subject.

6. The Government has on repeated occasions brought to the attention of the British Government, and also of the British remount commission, the opportunity that exists in Canada to purchase horses suitable for military purposes. These representations are repeated from time to time whenever it seems desirable to do so.

NORTH BATTLEFORD GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. What are the names and salaries of the following employees of the Dominion Government in the electoral district of North Battleford, fire rangers, timber inspectors, homestead inspectors, and fishery guardians?

Mr. ROCHE:

As far as the Department of the Interior is concerned:—

1. Fire rangers, Battleford district, season 1916, H. Lockhart, chief fire ranger, permanent, recently resigned, $108.33 per month. The following are temporary rangers employed during the dangerous season at $100 per month: H. F. Jordan, E. R. Barbour, F. Croft, F. Handle, E. Jepson, A. Morrison (to July 31), J. F. Johnston (from August 1), J. W. Murray, A. B. McKay, J. Sinclair, S. H. H. Ashford and I. Trainor.

The following assistant rangers are employed at $50 per month: P. Morin (to August 20), J. Fielder (from August 23), J. Brown, A. W. Cooper.

Timber inspector: J. F. MacKenzie, $1,200 per annum; homestead inspectors, D. Anderson, A. C. Elliott and A. C. Dewar; salary in each case, $1,300 per annum.

NEW PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS.

* Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has a contract been entered into for the construction of the Parliament Buildings?
2. If so, (a) what is its date, and (b) what are the names of the parties who have signed the contract?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.

2. (a) 29th September, 1916; (b) P. Lyall & Sons Construction Company, Limited, by William Lyall for the contractors, and by R. Rogers, Minister of Public Works, and R. C. Desrochers, Secretary of the Department of Public Works, for the Government.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—SOLICITOR'S COSTS.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT:

What amount was paid by the Board of Railway Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway Commission to the Hon. Thomas H. Johnson, in connection with examining certain titles on railway line between Winnipeg and Transcona?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. A flat rate of $30 was agreed on between the commissioners and Mr. Johnson for putting through all titles for lands taken for right of way in rural districts. This included examination of title, abstract, preparing deed, attendance for execution, fee on title and sundry small items. For lands taken in St. Boniface and Winnipeg itemized bills were rendered and paid after taxation. As far as can be ascertained from the bills, the sum of $2,242.43 was paid for services as above enumerated between Winnipeg and Transcona. Statement of all payments made to Mr. Johnson or his legal firm, as per this agreement, is tabled.

DALHOUSIE MILITIA BUILDINGS.

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. What amount was paid by Militia Department for the use of drill halls and other buildings at Dalhousie, N.B., during the year 1915-16?
2. To whom was the rent for said buildings paid?

Mr. KEMP:

1 and 2. None.

IMMIGRATION REGULATIONS.

Mr. MICHAUD:

How many persons were refused admission to Canada, as undesirable subjects, during the year 1916, through the ports of St. Leonard, Green River, Edmundston, St. Hilaire and Clair, county of Madawaska, N.B.?

[Mr. Roche.]

Mr. ROCHE:

During 1916 there were rejected as undesirable: At St. Leonard, 5 persons; Green River, no rejections; Edmundston, 10 persons; Clair, 3 persons.

There is no immigration officer at St. Hilaire, N.B.

EXPORT OF FISH.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How many tons of fresh or frozen fish were entered for export by the Canadian Customs during each month since May, 1916?

Mr. REID:

1. May, 1,684 tons; June, 4,225 tons; July, 2,480 tons; August, 3,193 tons; September, 4,207 tons; October, 5,188 tons; November, 5,785 tons; December, 5,222 tons.

POLLUTION OF STREAMS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Were any parties prosecuted during the year 1916, in Fishery District No. 2, Nova Scotia, for pollution of streams by sawdust?
2. If so, what were the names of such parties and the fines imposed, respectively?
3. How many fines were collected, and what were the names of parties they were collected from?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.

2. Names of parties with amount of fine in each case as follows:—

George King, $20; Edward Brown and Banford Brown, $20; George Hooper, $20; Gesner Kerr, $20; George L. Monk, $20; (case appealed); Wilson Smith, suspended sentence.

3. Four; George King, Edward and Banford Brown, George Hooper, Gesner Kerr.

TORONTO WATER-BORNE TRAFFIC.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

How many tons of merchandise, water borne, entered Toronto during the year 1916, and what was the water-borne traffic outward during the same year?

Mr. REID: Number and tonnage of vessels arrived and departed during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1916; Number arrived, 2,771, total 1,636,620 tons register; Number departed, 2,722, total 1,366,723 tons register. There is no Customs record of the tonnage of freight carried by the above vessels.

PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Is it the intention of the Government at the present session of Parliament to introduce

legislation prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Representations made to the Government in regard to this matter are being considered. Any necessary announcement will be made in due course.

AGRICULTURAL INSTRUCTION ACT.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

1. What amounts were paid under the provisions of the Agricultural Instruction Act to the province of Prince Edward Island for the years ending March 31, 1915, and March 31, 1916?
2. When, and in what sums were the payments made?
3. To what provincial official are, or were, such cheques made payable?
4. Before the cheques are issued, what steps, if any, does the department take to ascertain the objects and purposes for which the money is to be applied?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. $27,832.81 and $29,138.28 respectively.

2. For the year ending March 31, 1915, as follows:—

July 7, 1914, $13,916.40; January 12, 1915, $6,000; January 30, 1915, $7,916.41.

For the year ending March 31, 1916, as follows:—

January 11, 1915, $14,569.14; February 17, 1916, $8,000; March 24, 1916, $6,569.14.

3. The honourable the Commissioner of Agriculture for Prince Edward Island.

4. After investigating through the Commissioner appointed for the administration of the Agricultural Instruction Act the agricultural conditions of the province concerned, the minister enters into a formal agreement with the minister or commissioner of agriculture for the province, in which the terms and purposes for which the money is to be applied, are determined.

MILITARY DISTRICTS No. 3 AND No. 10.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. What part of Quebec is included in Military District No. 3?
2. (a) What is the population of the part referred to, and (b) how many men have enlisted from there to the end of 1916 for active military or naval service?
3. What part of Ontario is included in Military District No. 10?
No. 4. (a) What is the population of the part so included, and (b) how many men have enlisted from there to the end of 1916 for active military or naval service?

Mr. KEMP:

1. The counties of Wright, Labelle and Pontiac, Quebec, are included in Military District No. 3.

2. (a) The population of these counties, according to the 1911 census, was 84,427.

(b) No official record is kept of recruits enlisted by counties. The only record kept is by districts. Information is, therefore, not available in this case.

3. The districts of Rainy River and Thunder Bay, Ont., are included in Military District No. 10.

4. (a) The population of these districts, according to the 1911 census, was 67,249.

(b) The approximate number recruited was 3,500.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—PURCHASE OF TIES.

Mr. WEICHEL:

1. Were any ties purchased by the Board of Railway Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway Commission from the Rat Portage Lumber Company of Kenora in 1907?
2. If so, what quantity, and were they purchased without tender?
3. If so, at what price?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.

2. 93,121. Yes.

3. 25 per cent first class, delivered at St. Boniface, 80c.; 25 per cent second class, delivered at St. Boniface, 70c.; 25 per cent first class, delivered at Rennie Station, 78c.; 25 per cent second class, delivered at Rennie Station, 68c.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—YARD AT FITZPATRICK.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. Did the Government purchase the land on which the railway yard at Fitzpatrick is situated?
2. If so, from whom?
3. What price was paid for such land?
4. Why was the said yard located at Fitzpatrick and not at La Tuque?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The land was expropriated for the National Transcontinental railway by the Government.

2. Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company.

3. Agreed at $100 per acre; nothing has yet been paid.

4. On account of the grade.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—RESIDENCE AT FITZPATRICK.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. What has been the cost of the residence built by the civil engineers of the Transcontinental railway at Fitzpatrick?
2. Does the Government own this building now?
3. If not, has it been sold; and to whom?
4. Does the Government own the land on which said building is situated?
5. If not, who owns same?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No such residence was built.

2, 3, 4 and 5 answered by No. 1.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—ENGINEERS' RESIDENCES.

Mr. BOULAY:

What was the cost of the civil engineers' residences during the construction of the Transcontinental between La Tuque and Parent?

Mr. COCHRANE: The average price of each set of buildings was $1,450.

RECRUITING OFFICERS IN RIMOUSKI.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. Who recommended the appointment of the recruiting officers who have worked in Rimouski in 1915 and 1916?

2. What is the name and salary of each of them?

Mr. KEMP:

1. The officers who have been recruiting in the Rimouski District in 1915 and 1916 were recommended by Lieut.-Col. Chauveau, until lately officer in charge of recruiting, Military District No. 5.

2. The following officers of the 89th Regiment were appointed to recruit in Rimouski:

Officer.	Pay.	Subsistence Allowance.	Field Allowance.
Capt. J. W. Begin..	$3.00	$1.50	.75
Capt. J. H. Michaud	3.00	1.50	.75
Lt. J. A. Brillant..	2.00	1.50	.60
Lt. L. G. Morrisette	2.00	1.50	.60
Lt. A. St. Pierre ..	2.00	1.50	.60
Lt. J. L. Freve	2.00	1.50	.60
Lt. J. Pinault	2.00	1.50	.60

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—TELEGRAPH LINE.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. Who owns the telegraph line on the Transcontinental Railway from Quebec to Winnipeg?

2. Who had the contract for erecting the posts on this line?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The Dominion Government.

2. The respective grading contractors.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAY—IMPROVING GRADES.

Mr. KYTE:

1. What amount of money has been expended upon the Intercolonial Railway from Pt. Tupper to Sydney since January 1, 1915, for improving the grades and alignment?

2. What amount has been expended for the building of heavier bridges and culverts, and for strengthening of the old ones?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. $96,360.26.

2. $677,791.08.

VANCOUVER DRILL HALL SITE.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Did this Government purchase a drill hall site in the city of Vancouver? If so, when?

2. From whom was it purchased?

3. What price was paid therefor?

4. From whom did the Government get title or titles, and what was date of conveyance?

5. What is the description of the property so purchased?

Mr. ROGERS:

1 and 5. Yes, Block 43, D. L. 264A, bounded on the north by William street, to the south by Charles street, 396 feet along each; on the east by Commercial Drive, and on the west by Cotton street, 264 feet.

2, 3 and 4:

No. of lot.	Vendors.	Price.	Interest.	Date of Conveyance.
9, 10, 11 and 12.....	Mrs. Campbell.....	$ 16,500 00	655 00	9th Sept., 1913.
Part 19.....	Mrs. Benneast.....	5,100 00	202 46	16th Sept., 1913.
17.....	James McKay.....	6,500 00	257 62	1st Jan., 1913.
Part 13, 14, 15 and 16.	C. Grossman.....	6,787 00	139 66	9th June, 1913.
Part 19 and 20.....	Mrs. Ireland.....	4,200 00	166 65	12th Sept., 1913.
Part 20.....	Mrs. Beelamy.....	6,787 00	269 44	16th Sept., 1913.
Part 13, 14,15 and 16.	John McLeod.....	7,250 00	.....	21st Jan., 1914.
18.....	James Kerr.....	7,000 00	273 41	10th Sept., 1913.
Part 13, 14, 15 and 16, west.....	Mrs. Muir.....	10,250 00	.....	Certificate of title 21st June, 1915.
1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 21, 22, 23 and 24.....	Mrs. McSpadden.....	122,700 00	4,991 85	4th Jan., 1913.
		$193,074 00	$6,956 09	

All deeds were signed by vendors, as above, except that for part of lots 13, 14, 15 and 16, John McLeod, which is signed by John A. McInnes.

Certificate of title for Mrs. Muir's lots does not show signatures to deed.

H.M.C.S. RAINBOW.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Did the Canadian cruiser Rainbow sink a German steamer off Bahia Salians, Costa Rica, in the month of October, 1916?
2. Has the Government any reports of other German steamers sunk or captured by the cruiser Rainbow during the year 1916?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. It is not considered advisable to give any information with reference to the movements and activities of H.M.C. ships.
2. Answered by No. 1.

DISCHARGE OF SOLDIERS ON CESSATION WORK PAY.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. How many soldiers have been honourably discharged from overseas service after being deprived of what is known as "work pay"?
2. What reason does the Government assign for reducing the pay of these men?

Mr. KEMP:

1. 449 men have been returned for discharge on cessation of working pay.

2. Order in council. As war proceeded, it was found that it was not advisable to pay these soldiers higher rates than paid to others; their work not being so strenuous nor so dangerous, and in view of the fact that requests were being received to extend the payment of working pay to those not covered by the original regulations, it was decided to cancel such extra pay. Those in receipt of it were, accordingly, given the privilege of continuing on ordinary rates or taking their discharge. Many were satisfied to remain on ordinary rates.

BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What has been the rate of bounty paid to boat fishermen each year for the past ten years?

Mr. HAZEN: 1907, $4 each; 1908, $3.90; 1909, $4.25; 1910, $4.30; 1911, $4.10; 1912, $3.95; 1913, $3.95; 1914, $3.65; 1915, $3.45; 1916, $4.10.

MR. ALBERT DUSSAULT.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE:

1. Is Albert Dussault employed by the Customs Department in Quebec?
2. If so, when was he appointed?
3. At what salary was he appointed?
4. Has he received any increase in salary since appointment?
5. If so, on what dates?

Mr. REID:

1. Yes.
2. Employed April 1, 1913. Appointed permanent February 3, 1914.
3. $800.
4. Yes.
5. Increased $800 to $850, April 1, 1914.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Sinclair.—For a return showing a list of all persons employed during the year 1916 in the round house of the Canadian Government railways at Pirate Harbour, N.S., as brakemen, telegraphers, cleaners and labourers, showing the dates of their appointments and length of time employed respectively, and also the monthly rate of wages to each of said employees.

Mr. Macdonald.—For a copy of all letters, reports, papers and other documents relative to the dismissal of John R. McIntosh as postmaster of Cummings Mountain, Pictou county, and the appointment of James Cummings as his successor.

Mr. Wilcox.—For a copy of all petitions, letters, telegrams, reports and other documents relative to the closing of the Canard and Splitlog post office and the opening of Loiselleville post office, in the county of Essex, together with a copy of all petitions and documents relative to the establishment of rural mail routes from the Louiseville post office.

Mr. Ernest Lapointe.—For a return showing the names of all persons in the county of Dorchester who had claims arising from the construction or operation of the National Transcontinental railway which have been settled, adjusted or paid between the 8th and 31st of January, 1917, showing the amounts paid each of the claimants; along with a copy of all reports, correspondence, cheques, receipts and other vouchers in respect of these claims.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR A RETURN.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. How many horses have been bought in Canada for war purposes in each of the years 1914, 1915 and 1916, respectively, (a) for the Canadian army; (b) for Britain; and (c) for France and our other allies?
2. What was the amount paid for the horses in each of the years for the different countries mentioned?

NATIONAL SERVICE COMMISSION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. PUGSLEY: My right hon. friend said the other day that he would look into the question as to whether Major Tilley, a member of the National Service Commis-

sion, was in receipt of a salary, and, if so, whether under the statute, he would be disqualified from sitting as a member of the provincial legislature.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really must admit that I have not looked into the matter. As my hon. friend knows, I have been very busy with matters concerning the war appropriation I shall endeavour to get the information as soon as possible.

Mr. PUGSLEY: To-morrow?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will do the best I can.

THE IRISH-CANADIAN RANGERS.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is the Minister of Militia prepared to make a statement as to whether the Irish-Canadian Rangers are going to the front as a unit; also as to why the Highland Brigade of Nova Scotia has been prevented from going to the front?

Mr. KEMP: It is intended that the 199th Battalion, known as the Irish Rangers, will be attached to the 5th Division as a unit. With regard to the Highland Brigade of Nova Scotia, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. McCurdy), who has just returned, may have some information. I have not had time to talk to him about the matter, but I will do so; perhaps he will have a statement to make.

Mr. MACDONALD: Does the hon. Minister of Militia mean to say that things are going on in England that he does not know anything about?

WESTERN COAL MINING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. BUCHANAN: Has the Government any information to-day from the West with regard to the progress of the negotiations for the settlement of the coal strike? I am advised that at Lethbridge there is already considerable suffering. None of the mines are producing domestic coal. They have not what you call firewood in that country, and the people are burning lumber because they cannot get coal. The situation is extremely serious.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have under my hand a telegram received from the Minister of Labour this morning, the purport of which is that the Fernie strike has been settled. The minister will arrive here on Wednesday morning.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Mr. BUCHANAN: The Prime Minister will observe that the mines at Lethbridge are entirely different from those at Fernie. The mines at Fernie are not producing domestic coal for the use of the people on the prairies, but steam coal. The most critical condition is in regard to the mines at Lethbridge, which produce coal for domestic use on the prairies.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really have no more information than I have given to my hon. friend just now. When the Minister of Labour returns on Wednesday morning, we shall have full information on the matter.

Mr. KNOWLES: The question of the supply of coal for domestic purposes is too essential to be permitted to stand in abeyance until the Minister of Labour returns. We shall be adjourning on Wednesday in all probability, and it is a matter of life and death.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Minister of Labour went to the West to study the whole situation in regard to the supply of coal. I am not sure whether the telegram refers to a settlement of all the labour difficulties, or only a partial settlement. In view of the fact that the minister has started upon his return journey, I should suppose that probably a settlement of all the difficulties had been come to. However, I am not sure of that. I shall endeavour to ascertain between now and to-morrow.

QUEBEC AND SAGUENAY RAILWAY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. LEMIEUX: In view of the judgment by the Exchequer Court a few days ago, will the Minister of Railways say whether the Government intend to implement the legislation of last session concerning the Quebec and Saguenay railway?

Mr. COCHRANE: It is the intention of the Government to implement the legislation.

Mr. GRAHAM: Before recess?

Mr. COCHRANE: No.

PEACE RIVER SEED GRAIN.

On the Orders of the day:

Mr. OLIVER: Has the Minister of the Interior taken into consideration the conditions in the Peace River country in re-

gard to seed grain, and have any steps been taken to meet the conditions?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes. Some officials of the Immigration Branch are now in the Peace River country studying conditions with a view to meeting any contingencies that may arise.

FIFTH CANADIAN DIVISION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MARCIL: Can the Government give any further information in regard to the Canadian Associated Press cable which appeared in the morning paper. The despatch reads:

> Brigadier General Garnet Hughes, son of Sir Sam Hughes, it is expected will be given command of the Fifth Canadian Division, the organization of which is being completed here. Whether the Fifth Division will be sent to the front must depend largely upon the response of Canada to the call for men.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We have no official information on the subject.

THE CARE OF RETURNED SOLDIERS.

PROPOSED COMMITTEE.

Mr. F. F. PARDEE (Lambton West) asked for leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely: the proper treatment, care and provision for employment of returned soldiers, and the desirability of appointing a committee of the House to sit during the adjournment, for the purpose of considering this subject and reporting to the House at as early a date as possible.

And leave having been granted,

Mr. PARDEE: Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt of the fact that while the war and the winning of the war is uppermost in our minds, we have the supreme duty of providing that the men who left comfortable homes, who gave up profitable employment and lucrative positions, who went overseas from a sense of loyalty and devotion, and who were willing when so going to make, if necessary, the great sacrifice, and many of whom have returned to Canada broken in body and health, shall be fitly and properly taken care of by the state. Let me for one moment refer to what these men have done. I quote now from a report submitted by the Canadian War Records Office to the right hon. Prime Minister:—

> The duty of the Records Office was to follow the fortunes of the First Division in France, to share its experience, and to give to the people of Canada an account of the performances of its regiments; and finally to enshrine in a contemporary history those exploits which will make the First Division immortal. That division stood at Ypres in May, 1915, as the last bulwark of civilization against the triumphant inroads of barbarism. They held the pass and barred the road to Calais.

If the man who made that report had written volumes of the record of the Canadian troops he could not have said more than he has said in those few sentences. When we say that, just let us consider for one moment what the result would have been to Canada and to the Empire had the road to Calais not been blocked. Those men did it, or helped to do it, and to those men our gratitude ought to be due, not in a sentimental way, but in a manner to redound to the credit of the state. These men, when they enlisted and went overseas, did not go to fight for the love of fighting. They went from a sense of loyalty and a sense of duty. They went to preserve liberty, to maintain justice, to preserve the very Empire itself, and thus—I am speaking here as a Canadian to Canadians—they have secured for Canada and her people prosperity, contentment and wealth. So far as Canada is concerned, with the exception of those mothers and those fathers who have given their sons to this holy cause, none of us has felt the stress of warfare, all have lived in happiness and contentment. It has undoubtedly been noticed by every member of this House that calls are constantly being sent out for charity for these men. Concerts are given, entertainments are advertised as being for the help of the returned soldiers. Let me just read a statement which I cut from one of the Ottawa papers in answer to a circular that apparently had been distributed throughout this city, asking for help of a charitable kind, such as I have described. Here is a letter from a man with sons at the front.

He says:

> I think the conditions revealed in a circular which is being distributed from door to door soliciting aid for our returned soldiers is a disgrace to our country. That the Government should make no provision to aid the returned soldiers who have been rendered unfit for further duty at the front until such time as he would be in a position to help himself, would seem incredible if the information had not come from such a source. If the Government decided that the matter could best be attended to by local boards in the localities whence the soldiers came—why is no provision made to finance such boards?
>
> If the cost is to be a separate charge on the citizens, why not raise the money by

means of taxation, with a poll tax on those who do not otherwise pay taxes?

Many of us are paying from 2 to 2½ per cent of our income to the Patriotic Fund. Those of us who have sons at the front would hesitate to assume additional responsibilities to provide for—I shall say—an additional Patriotic Fund. Our own sons may return disabled, and in need of all the assistance we can render in this line.

If the Government of Canada and of the provinces have done as little as one would infer from a perusal of this circular in question—simply authorizing Aid Commissions to solicit charity, or raise money in any old way, I, for one, cannot agree with that part of the circular which says they "have not been unmindful of their responsibilities."

My argument, and I shall state it very shortly, is that no charity should be asked for, or given, to men who have rendered such splendid service to their country. It is degrading to the men, and it is degrading to the people of Canada. I say that those who, during the stress and struggle of the past two and a half years have lived here in peace and happiness and contentment, should not be solicited to contribute towards a fund to provide for returned soldiers, but that they should be made to pay, and to pay proportionately to their worth. That is, I take it, Sir, the real thought of the people of Canada. I believe that this is a matter which is wholly under the control of the Government, and that the Government should take it up at once. A central organization should be established, and that central organization should see to it that every soldier who returns, and every soldier who ought to be helped, is helped in a way that is fit and proper, to the needs of that particular man. I understand that about 200,000 men have left our shores.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: About 300,000, I think.

Mr. PARDEE: That makes my argument all the stronger. About 300,000 men have left our shores, and, according to the figures which I have, about 10,600 have returned. There are to-day in England about 12,000 invalided Canadian soldiers, and they will return to Canada at the rate of about 2,000 per month. When the war is over the men will come back at the rate of ten times the number that are coming back to-day, and I say that to subject these returned men to the vicissitudes of such an organization as now exists, will do justice neither to the men themselves nor to the citizenship of this country. We established in the province of Ontario a soldiers' commission under the Act of 1916. That soldiers' commission may be all very well in its way, but in speaking to its chairman in Ottawa, he informed me that on making enquiry the answer he received was: We want you to go on and do as much as you can for these men, and when you have got to the end of your tether we will take the matter up. That is not right. That is absolutely throwing back upon charity the maintenance of these men. In so far as the Ottawa commission is concerned, they tell me that they have absolutely got to the end of their rope. They have found employment, not always permanent, for the men who have returned; but to-day they are up against the fact that they cannot take care of any more returned soldiers. Then you have the Soldiers' Association itself here in Ottawa, and I understand that these soldiers' associations have been established in various centres of Canada. In Winnipeg they have a Soldiers' Association with 1,100 members; in Victoria one with 300 members; in Woodstock one with 150 members; in Vancouver, one with 250 members; in Hamilton, one with 300 members; in Edmonton, one with 300 members; in Calgary, one with 200 members; in Ottawa one with 200 members; in Montreal one with 500 members, and in Toronto, one with 700 members. These men are also endeavouring out of the goodness of their hearts—though so far as I know without financial assistance from the Government—to do what they can to help their comrades who have returned from overseas, but it is plainly evident to any one who will take the trouble to think the matter over for a few minutes that every one of these associations or commissions which I have mentioned must very rapidly come to an end of its resources; and then, forsooth, the soldiers will come back here in a broken and maimed condition, and there will be no proper organization to take care of them. I read from a newspaper published last Saturday:

From London, Ontario, it is reported that Private G. Walton of Windsor, a returned invalided soldier, was without overcoat or gloves, and had his hands frozen at Quebec. He is being cared for in the London hospital, and his case should receive such attention as will make similar cases impossible.

That is one concrete case, and, I have no doubt, there are hundreds of similar cases. It is not altogether the fault of the commissions because, so far as I can learn, some of the soldiers themselves are not too anxious to be helped, and some of them do as they ought not to do on their return to this country. Nevertheless, the large proportion of them come back in such a state

that if properly taken care of they can be made useful to the state and useful to themselves.

A pension scheme has, of course, been established, but I will not weary the House by referring to it in detail because every member is familiar with its provisions. It makes a certain allowance for certain disabilities according to a percentage. In Class 6, for instance, it provides "Disability under 20 per cent, a gratuity not exceeding $100." That is, if a man comes back 20 per cent less able bodied than when he went away, he is handed $100, and allowed to shift for himself. The men who went overseas were actual economic forces in this country for the good of the country, and if they have returned disabled to even a greater extent than 20 per cent, to the extent of 40 per cent or even up to 60 per cent, my contention is that they ought not to be allowed to depend merely upon a pension. The man who does nothing, who takes all and gives nothing, is of no use to the country. The Pensions Board ought to see that the men who are injured to the extent of 20, 40, 60, or even 80 per cent are taken in hand, taught some trade, and, as I said before, made of actual good to the country and to themselves; otherwise, it simply means that we will be paying millions of dollars in pensions and receiving absolutely no return therefor. Let me read an instance of what they are doing at St. Maurice in France:

> St. Maurice is a hive of workshops of all kinds, shoemaking shops, machine shops, auto repair shops, blacksmith shops with blazing forges, and clothes-making shops, and the workmen are the wounded soldiers from the firing line, minus an arm, leg or eye, on which they had before depended, but now launched on a new line which did not need that arm, leg or eye.

There is also the other scheme of teaching returned soldiers farming, and with that is coupled the question of land grants. With land grants out and out, I am not in sympathy, as I have before said in this House. Then there is the question of central camps, where the men could be taken to learn a trade, and then afterwards be distributed. These are all things, I submit, Mr. Speaker, which the people of this Dominion want to see attended to, and which it is the bounden duty of the Government to do. I admit that it is a large question. Other countries have had wars, and have had to tackle this same sort of problem, but we must remember that today in Canada we have to get into the way of doing big things. We belong to a mighty empire, and we have to grow bigger in the bigness of the whole, and if we want to succeed and be the nation that we ought to be, no duty and no obligation should be too great for us to shoulder on behalf of our citizen soldiers. These men are coming back from the front in daily increasing numbers, and so far as I know their care has so far been neglected by the Government. There is no further time to lose. This House will shortly adjourn for, I suppose, two or three months. In that time valuable information might be collected and valuable statistics gathered by a committee that should be appointed for that purpose. The committee could make a report which would be available for the benefit of the House when it re-assembles. It appears to me that now is the time to take action. No further time should be wasted, for every day that is lost means just that much the worse for the men who return from fighting our battles.

My own opinion is, if I may venture to give it to the House, that a Federal Commission composed of men of the highest standing with broad and full authority should be appointed by the Crown to continue for a period of say five years after the conclusion of peace, for the purpose of dealing with these questions. The commission should, of course, have an efficient staff and equipment. At each provincial capital and at one or more important points in the provinces from which enlistments have been greatest, sub-commissioners or agents should be appointed. They should be required to make frequent reports to the chief commissioners, not only on subjects of which the commission might seek information, but also upon all matters coming to their notice or in any way relative to returned soldiers. This would prevent overlapping of work between Dominion and provincial commissioners in case the provinces undertook in their own way to deal with the situation. Wherever also city or other municipal commissions have been or will be established the federal office should be in close touch with these also.

In conclusion, I again urge that this should be made a Government matter for which the Government should be responsible; that the funds required whatever they may be, should not in any way be allowed to be solicited or distributed in a way which savours of charity, and that whatever moneys are necessary for carrying on the work successfully should be made part of

the national debt of Canada for which the people of this country would be responsible.

There can be no question, there is none in my own mind at least, that were this done it would be an aid to recruiting. There are instances within my own personal knowledge, and undoubtedly there are hundreds of others, where recruiting to the extent of at least two or three men has been hindered by the fact that no sufficient provision is made for returned soldiers. When the war ends the need will be greater than it is to-day, or than it has been, and I say that we should guard ourselves against that day, so that when it does come we should be at least in a partial condition and in a partial state of readiness to take care of the men when they come.

I cannot close my remarks better, Sir, than by reading the following paragraph in the Ottawa Soldiers' Aid Commission literature.

> Our duty to them is clear. They have been our substitute on the battlefields of France and Flanders. They have suffered in our behalf. Their bodies have been maimed in our defence. On us rests the high and sacred obligation of making their future lives reasonably comfortable and as useful as possible.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am glad that my hon. friend has brought this subject to the attention of the House and country, and I say at once there is not the slightest objection to the constitution of a committee such as he suggests. I shall see to it that such a committee is appointed, and that the information which I am about to give to the House as to what has been done is placed before it with a view to supplementing as far as may be necessary in the judgment of the committee the very great work that has already been accomplished, and which I think is very inadequately appreciated by my hon. friend, judging by the observations he has just addressed to the House.

I quite agree with what my hon. friend has said as to the very great desirability of obtaining employment for the men who return from overseas, and the great desirability also of vocational training and re-education for such of them as are unable to engage in their former occupations. It is beyond question that the worst service we could do to any one of these men would be to place him in such a position that he would not be disposed to make an effort on his own part, in so far as his physical condition permitted. In this country we are all labouring men, in one sense. There is no idle or unemployed class, and it is desirable to give to the returned soldier a reasonable opportunity to engage in any activity which may be of use to him and to the state as well. I understand that to be the view of my hon. friend, and in that view I absolutely concur.

In connection with what my hon. friend has said respecting the raising of funds, I was very much impressed the other evening by the observations which my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) addressed to the House on this subject. I took upon myself to ascertain what measures, if any, had been taken in other countries, particularly in the United Kingdom, to put some restriction or limitation upon the raising of funds in aid of men who have returned from overseas service, because, while it is no doubt true in the vast majority of cases that these funds are undertaken with good-will, with good intentions, and for a good purpose, nevertheless one who listened to the observations of my hon. friend on that subject could not fail to be impressed with the view that there might be opportunities of an undesirable character in that connection, and that some restriction should be placed in this, as in other countries, upon the raising of funds for such purposes. I have placed in the hands of Mr. Gisborne, the Parliamentary counsel, the legislation which has been passed in the United Kingdom, and I have asked him to adapt that legislation to conditions in this country. It will have to be modified very considerably, because in the legislation in the United Kingdom use is made of certain bodies which are non-existent in this country. I hope Mr. Gisborne will soon be able to bring that work to a conclusion, and to present to the Government his recommendations as to the legislation which might be adopted with advantage by this Parliament.

Another observation that I would like to make is that not all the rumours and stories that come to us with regard to returned soldiers are absolutely founded on fact. I have had a great many of them brought to my own attention; I have taken a great deal of trouble on some occasions to investigate them, and in many instances I have found that the person who had written to me on the subject had not been well informed, and that the conditions were absolutely different from those which had been represented to me.

My hon. friend has stated that about 10,600 men have returned from overseas ser-

vice. I have no official figures before me, and I accept his estimate for the time being. Those men may be divided into two classes: first, those who, upon arrival in Canada, are retained under the care of the Military Hospitals Commission, placed in hospitals, in sanatoria, or in convalescent homes, and who continue to draw their pay and allowances and to be provided for in that way; and, secondly, those who are discharged and as to whom it is the duty of the Federal and provincial governments to see that they have every opportunity for employment either in the occupations in which they were previously engaged or in some other occupation.

It may be well for me to go in some detail into this question, because it is perfectly obvious that my hon. friend is not fully informed as to all that has been done or as to all the arrangements that have been made; and indeed I am sure that is true of a great many of the members of this House and doubtless of a very large number of the people throughout the country, because in the vast work which is being carried on in connection with the war it is beyond expectation that even the members of this House would be fully advised of all that has been accomplished in relation to matters such as this or of a like character.

My hon. friend has referred to the question of settlement upon the land. So far as that is concerned, there was a conference between representatives of the Federal Government and of the provincial governments some few weeks ago at which the subject was taken up in a good deal of detail. The conference was called more particularly for the purpose of ascertaining what arrangements for land settlement or employment would be available in Canada for such of the soldiers from the British Islands as might desire to make their home in this Dominion. It was and is the purpose of the British Government to retain, if possible, those men within the British Islands. If, however, any number of them are disposed to emigrate from the British Isles, it is equally the desire of the British Government that they should come to one or other of the overseas dominions. For that purpose they have constituted in the British Isles a central body on which they have asked each of the overseas dominions to be represented, and we have appointed Mr. J.

4 p.m. Bruce Walker, of Winnipeg, a man of great experience in these matters, to be the representative of Canada for the time being upon the central body. The Imperial Government desire from the Dominion Government, as well as from the provincial governments, information as to what assistance will be given in respect of land settlement. They also desire to know what the conditions are generally throughout the Dominion with regard to employment for those that may not desire to settle upon the land. And it is my expectation, when I go overseas within a few days or weeks, that I shall be able to take with me information upon that subject. The provincial governments have had that matter under consideration, the Federal Government has also had the matter under consideration, and before this session is brought to a conclusion, hon. members may expect that perhaps more than one measure with regard to land settlement will be brought down and submitted for the consideration of Parliament.

The question of demobilization, to which my hon. friend has alluded, generally, if not specifically, has also been under consideration. A commission will shortly be appointed within the United Kingdom to deal with such matters as have to be undertaken there, and I notice that it is the purpose of the National Service Board to obtain pretty full detail from the men of the Canadian forces overseas as to the occupations in which they were engaged before they enlisted, as to their desire upon their return to re-engage in those occupations, or to settle upon the land or to be otherwise employed. The card which is to be sent out to them will ask for information as to a great variety of subjects, which it is thought will be of valuable assistance when demobilization takes place. The National Service Board is also taking steps to make what is called an industrial survey of Canada with a view to ascertaining what employment may be available for men of our own forces or men who may emigrate to this country from the British Islands when the war shall have been brought to a conclusion. In other words, the purpose is to get information, in the first place, from the men themselves as to their desire to settle upon the land or to be employed in some other way, and to obtain a just estimate of their experience in the work for which they are best suited; then in the second place to ascertain by inquiries in this country, first, what opportunities for land settlement there will be, whether under the Federal legislation to which I have alluded or under legislation by the provinces, and, secondly, what opportunities for employment there are likely to be in Canada after the war has been brought to a conclusion.

On the one hand, we shall have information as to the experience, the knowledge, the training of the men who will return from the overseas forces and their desire to settle upon the land or otherwise; on the other hand, information as to the opportunities, whether for land settlement or for other employement, which will be available in this country when the war is over.

Coming, however, to what is being done at the present moment with regard to the men who have returned from overseas, I have asked the Military Hospitals Commission to give me a pretty full memorandum of all that they have undertaken and carried out. It is not claimed, of course, that the arrangements already made have reached a final stage of perfection, and the experience which is gained in these matters from time to time may and very likely will result in additional organization and perhaps in modification of the organization already established. When the men began to return from overseas, the Government sought for the experience of other countries so as to learn by that experience what were the best arrangements for their reception and treatment. It was found that in the United Kingdom, in the other Dominions and in France as well, experiments were being tried, and that it would be necessary for Canada to make experiments and to learn something by her own experience. A system has been evolved here which is thought by those who are responsible for it to be a very good one, and to be equal, if not superior, to any system elsewhere in force within the Empire. At least I am informed by the secretary of the Military Hospitals Commission that Sir Rider Haggard, who recently passed through Canada after visiting South Africa, Australia and New Zealand, was especially appreciative of the system which he found in vogue in this country. I understand he also had a very considerable knowledge of what had been accomplished in this connection in the United Kingdom. Speaking before the Canadian Club at Regina in July last, he said:

I heartily congratulate the Canadian Government for so wise and humane a system. I make no comparisons. We are told that comparisons are odious, but I have travelled through the Empire and I know of no system equal to that which you are fortunate enough to have in Canada.

Another statement coming from a thoroughly impartial source is contained in a letter dated the 15th day of December, 1916, to the Secretary of the Military Hospitals Commission from Mr. W. Fitzpatrick, C. M.G., a member of the State War Council for Victoria, Australia. Mr. Fitzpatrick says:

The principles you have laid down are so sound, and the organization is so good, that I have hopes we will follow in your foot-steps largely. While on the whole there is a great similarity between the methods in Canada and Australia we did not approach the problem with the systematic methods that characterize your schemes. Our work has been disjointed—piecemeal and irregular, but I hope that with the Canadian example before us as I have presented it in my pamphlet there will be more uniformity in the future.

It is, I assume, within the knowledge of the members of this House that during the summer of 1915 a commission was established by order in council which is known as the Military Hospitals Commission. That commission was charged with the duty of providing convalescent homes and hospitals for those who returned to Canada invalided or otherwise disabled. It is presided over by a member of the Government, Sir James Lougheed, and it has established a large number of institutions where men are receiving treatment. In speaking in the debate on the Address, I set forth the character and number of these institutions. Perhaps it might not be amiss if I should state once more the scope which their operations have attained.

There are four classes of patients dealt with by the Commission in hospitals and convalescent homes in various parts of the country. First, there is the treatment of active cases—I understand active cases to be those which require continuous medical treatment. Up to quite recently we have not had many of these; but, owing to the great number of casualties in the fighting on the Somme, it became necessary that active cases, as well as others, should be sent to Canada in order that the British hospitals could be cleared. We have had a number of them already, and anticipate that many more will come in the future. The second class is the convalescent; the third, those who suffer from tuberculosis; and the fourth, those who suffer from some special disorder, such, for instance, as shell shock or rheumatism. The Commission has now in operation, or under construction for the above purposes, the following institutions: for class one, sixteen hospitals or homes, with accommodation for 2,600 men; for class two, twenty-seven institutions, accommodating 4,700 men; for class three, eighteen institutions, with accommodation for 900 men; and for class four, four institutions, with accommodation for 200 men. The number of men who have passed

through the hands of the Commission is nearly 10,000.

It might be worth while for me to state, for the information of the House and the country, the course taken with regard to a man from the time he becomes invalided or wounded until he returns to Canada, and until he is finally rehabilitated. When a man is wounded he is taken to the nearest medical station and thence to a base hospital. Possibly, thereafter, he is taken to another hospital, and, if his injury is severe, he is transferred to England. I need not attempt to go through all the various stages of the work in England. When a case reaches a condition in which transference to Canada is deemed advisable a party is made up which is accompanied by medical and other officers, and the men are sent across the Atlantic. The Government has established three receiving depots, the principal one of which is at Quebec, with subsidiary depots at St. John and Halifax. During the summer months most of the steamers come direct to Quebec, where the men disembark and enter the depot. In winter they disembark either at Halifax or at St. John, and the men residing in the Maritime Provinces enter the receiving depot at the port of arrival, and those for other parts of Canada, or destined for further treatment elsewhere, proceed by train to Quebec to enter the receiving depot at the port. A board of three medical officers examines every man who is invalided. This board has before it the medical records forwarded from England, and recommends that the man be discharged or that further treatment be given him, according to his condition. Discharge is given when the disability from which the man is suffering is not a result of service, and has not been aggravated by service. In that case he is given his arrears of pay to date—fifteen days' pay and allowances in advance—a suit of civilian clothing, and free transportation to his home or elected destination, with free meals en route. He is also given a card of introduction to the secretary of the Provincial Employment Commission, to which I shall make reference later.

If the board of medical officers consider that a man's disability is such that he is entitled to a pension, his discharge is postdated thirty days, and pay and allowances to the date of discharge are given to him. He receives also a suit of civilian clothing and transportation to his home or elected destination. A large number, however, of those returned require further medical and surgical treatment. These men are handed over to the Military Hospitals Commission and are sent to one of the institutions operated by that Commission, the choice of the institution being determined partly by the locality in which their homes are situated and partly by the disability from which they are suffering. Each man receives an advance of $10 on boarding the train, and a cheque for a further amount, according to the balance due, is mailed to the paymaster at the point to which the man is going. Men in this class are not given a suit of civilian clothing, as they still remain soldiers and are subject to military discipline. The suit of civilian clothing is, however, given later, on their discharge from the hospital.

A representative of the Military Hospitals Commission interviews each returning man at the receiving depot and obtains a statement regarding his disability, his family, his previous civilian employment, the amount of remuneration he received before enlistment, his occupation, and several other necessary details, and forwards this information to the secretary of the Employment Commission. Telegrams are also despatched to official bodies and others in order that a proper welcome may be tendered by the man's own friends. Usually a man is given leave to visit his home before entering upon treatment, but this permission is granted only when, in the opinion of the Board of Medical Officers, such leave will not be detrimental to his health.

The medical service of the Commission is divided into special classes, including specialists in the following branches: general practice, tuberculosis, orthopaedics, mental diseases, eye, ear, and throat diseases, massage, electrical treatment, physical drill, and rheumatic treatment. The medical services are under the charge of Lieut.-Colonel Alfred Thompson, M.P., the Medical Superintendent.

On the arrival of a man at one of the institutions operated by the Commission, the medical officer in charge orders the treatment which he appears to be in need of, and this treatment is continued until his case has reached finality, whether that should take one month or twelve months. No expense is spared in the provision of the best food and medicines for the patients at these institutions.

I think it is well that I should make special reference to the provision made by the Commission for men suffering from tuberculosis. I understand that in other

countries the provision made by the State for cases of this kind is very much less comprehensive than the provision we have made in Canada. A number of men who are under treatment developed the disease, as I understand, before going overseas. Such cases would not be taken in charge by the State in some countries. However, it seemed to us, in view of the dreadful character of this disease, that we should make no discrimination whatever, and, accordingly, all men who develop tuberculosis after they enlist are taken in hand by the Military Hospital Commission and receive treatment. Unfortunately a considerable number of men have developed this disease, many of whom have not been outside of Canada. The cost of providing accommodation and treatment for this class of patient has been very considerable, as there has hitherto been a serious lack throughout Canada of tubercular sanatoria. New institutions have been opened by the commission, while others have been enlarged.

It is needless to say that the sanatoria in which tuberculosis is treated have to be separate institutions. In many instances arrangements have been made with provincial governments which have tuberculosis sanatoria, whereby the institutions are enlarged, the Commission paying half, and, in a good many cases, the provincial government paying half the cost. The additional accommodation will belong absolutely to the province after the needs of the military service shall have been met. In other cases the Commission has been obliged to established its own sanatoria.

The question arose as to the status of men who still continued under treatment in convalescent homes, hospitals or sanatoria. These men continued to be members of the military force. In order to provide for the discipline and pay of men in the various hospitals and homes operated by the Commission, a military organization known as the Military Hospitals Commissions Command has been created, as part of the Canadian Expeditionary Force for home service. This Command is under the direct juristion of the Commission. It is charged with discipline and other matters at the institutions operated by the Commission, and is a direct link between it and the Department of Militia and Defence. Under its auspices special physical drill, which has been found to be of much value in the hospitals of England, has been introduced with most beneficial results.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

My hon. friend referred very properly to the qusetion of re-education and vocational training. It is proper that I should state very briefly what has been done in that regard. A very important part of the work undertaken by the Commission is that which deals with vocational training during the period in which the men are undergoing treatment. The question of re-education after their discharge is, of course, also an important one, particularly for those whose disability is such that they cannot return to their previous civilian occupations. In a large number of the institutions operated by the Commission, classes are held in various subjects, which are attended by the patients. These classes have been found to have not only an educational value, but also a distinct therapeutic value. This educational work is carried on in co-operation with the educational departments of the Provincial Governments.

As I have said, a certain proportion of the men undergoing treatment are found to be unable to follow their previous occupations by reason of their disabilities. The Government has, therefore, arranged, through the Military Hospitals Commission, to carry out a system of re-education after these men have been discharged from the Canadian Expeditionary Force.

Hitherto I have been speaking of the training and education which have been given to the men while they continued in the military service, under the charge of the Military Hospitals Commission, in some hospital, convalescent home or other institution. What I am about to say relates to the training of these men after they have been discharged from these hospitals, as well as from the military service.

The Government has arranged, through the Military Hospitals Commission, to carry out a system of re-education after discharge from the Canadian Expeditionary Force. The Commission has appointed vocational officers for Ontario, the Maritime Provinces, Quebec, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia, in conjunction with the Provincial Employment Commissions, which represent the provincial governments. Disabled Soldiers' Training Boards and Provincial Advisory Committees on Training have also been appointed. A Disabled Soldiers' Training Board consists of a member of the Provincial Commission, a vocational officer and a medical man. The duties of this Board are:

(a) To consider all cases which, in the light of the medical reports, appear to be subjects for special training, and to report upon each, with suitable recommendations, to the Military Hospitals Commission.

(b) To consider from time to time reports of the progress of men undergoing training and to make recommendation as to change of treatment or of training, or its discontinuance.

Each Provincial Employment Commission has been asked to nominate suitable persons to act as an advisory committee on the training of disabled soldiers who are eligible for re-education. The personnel of this advisory committee includes in most instances, some person acquainted with the processes of education, an agricultural educationalist, an employer, and a labour representative.

The duties of the provincial advisory committee may be summarized as follows:

(a) To prepare, with the assistance of the vocational officer, schemes of instruction in general subjects and elementary vocational training in, or in connection with the convalescent homes or hospitals of the province.

(b) To organize and carry out schemes as may be approved.

(c) To maintain a regular inspection, preferably through the vocational officer, of all instruction being carried on.

(d) To make a survey of the facilities at present, and from time to time, available for vocational training in public educational institutions, private educational institutions and private workshops, farms, etc.

(e) To assist the Employment Commission by providing definite information as to the training received by men who desire assistance in obtaining employment.

(f) To appoint or approve local sub-committees on training in connection with local employment committees in centres where it may appear necessary to have such committees.

(g) Generally, to advise and assist in the training of returned soldiers in every possible way.

The question of what new occupuations a disabled man may be trained for is clearly first of all, a medical one. But it is also a question for a technical specialist or "vocational counsellor"; a man well versed in a knowledge of the methods of various industries and of the training necessary for those who desire to pursue them. But further, and this is an important consideration, it is an economic consideration, touching the law of supply and demand. While there are a number of occupations for which it is not difficult to train men, it does not follow that employment can readily be obtained in them. Last, but not least, the man's own wishes and desires for his future must, of course, be consulted.

The question, therefore, according to the view of the commission, is an individual one, and each case is investigated separately. The decision as to the occupation for which an opportunity of being trained is to be offered to any man, is made in the light of the medical, technical, economic and personal factors of his case.

As long as a soldier who has not been discharged is under treatment in one of the institutions operated by the commission, he is entitled to pay of rank and his allowances, which include separation allowance, exactly as if he were at the front. When he has been discharged and has been passed for re-education, he and his family are maintained at the expense of the Government, while he is receiving his training. That is to say, a man is found who is not disabled but who cannot resume his former employment. He can doubtless engage in some employment for which, however, he will require necessary education and training. While that man is receiving that training necessary to enable him to undertake a new occupation, he and his family are maintained, as I have said, at the expense of the Government, because it would be impossible for the man to avail himself of the training, if, in the meantime, his family were destitute and suffering. It seems therefore necessary that the Government should go thus far and upon its recommendation the Military Hospitals Commission has been authorized to incur that expense.

A special scale of pay and maintenance has been prepared, which varies according to the size of the family. In other words, the pension to which he is entitled by his disability is augmented by a special allowance for such time as his training may occupy, the purpose being to have the man engage in a new occupation, which, with his pension, will make him comfortable; that is to say, while he is learning that new occupation, the Government supplement his pension allowance by providing for his family.

Mr. OLIVER: I wanted to know about what was the actual amount.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It varies in different cases. I really have not that detail, but when this matter goes before a com-

mittee, as it certainly shall in view of the suggestion of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Pardee), all these matters will be submitted in the greatest possible detail by the officers of the Military Hospitals Commission.

Another and an important question, which has been raised by the hon. member who has made the motion, is the introduction of the men who are returning to employment. Employment is in one sense a provincial or local matter, although I do not for one moment desire to minimize the responsibility of the Federal Government for assisting in the matter. There was a conference between the Federal Government and the provincial governments in October, 1915, and the view then taken, without dissent, as I understand, was that, for the time being at least, the question of finding employment should be undertaken and dealt with by the provincial governments. I shall quote textually the memorandum which was agreed upon between the Governments as represented by the head of the Military Hospitals Commission and the representatives of the various provincial governments. That memorandum is textually as follows:

> The Government of each province should appoint a central provincial committee consisting of such number of members as each province may deem advisable.
>
> All expenditures necessary in connection with the organization and administration of provincial and other purely local committees should be borne by the provincial or local authorities, or by voluntary contributions.
>
> Each of the provinces of Canada, working through its central committee, should assume the responsibility of endeavouring to find employment for discharged soldiers, who, upon their return to Canada, are physically and otherwise fit to assume such employment. All expenditures necessary in undertaking the duty should be borne by the province.

That was the memorandum agreed upon; that was the scheme prepared at that time and the scheme which has since been carried out. Therefore, the situation resolved itself upon that basis in this way: As to men returning to Canada who are of the convalescent class, they were taken charge of by the Military Hospitals Commission, and in so far as might be advisable or possible, they received training or education which would be of use to them upon their ultimate discharge. So far as concerns the men who were disabled and thereby incapable of resuming their former occupations, the Military Hospitals Commission undertook to make provision for the necessary training, and also to provide for their families in the

period in which such training was being received. Then as to those who do not come back as convalescents—

Mr. OLIVER: Is any part of that expense borne by the provincial governments?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No.

Mr. OLIVER: The educational expenses are entirely borne by the Dominion?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: All borne by the Federal Government, as I understand it.

Thus, we have the convalescents who are receiving treatment in hospitals; we have those who are discharged from hospitals but are not disabled and who receive training under the direction of the Military Hospitals Commission, and thirdly, we have those who desire to engage in some employment, and as to those one might look at the situation in a double aspect.

Some of those men who have returned from the front came back to positions which were held open for them after their enlistment, and they are not included in the figures which I am about to give. In fact, I have not before me any statistics with regard to the number of men of that class. But I am about to give some statistics which have been furnished by the secretaries of the Provincial Employment Commissions, and I venture to think that the amount of work which they have accomplished in this connection will be a surprise to most of the members of this House, and perhaps to the people of this country. I have from all nine provinces returns which have been furnished to me by the secretary of the Military Hospitals Commission. They are divided into three classes:—the number of returned soldiers for whom employment has been found; the number of returned soldiers who are still unemployed; and the number of men discharged from the camps without going overseas, for whom employment has been found.

In the province of Prince Edward Island, the number of returned soldiers for whom employment has been found is six; the number for whom employment has not been found is five. In Nova Scotia the number of returned soldiers for whom employment has been found is 307, and the soldier for whom employment has not been been found is 15. In New Brunswick, the number of returned soldiers for whom employment has been found is 190, and the number for whom employment has not been found is 60. In Quebec, the number of returned soldiers for whom employment

has been found is 1,438, and the number for whom employment has not been found is six. In Ontario, the number of returned soldiers for whom employment has been found is 1,750, and they have no record of any soldier for whom employment has not been found. That is, there is no returned soldier unemployed. In Manitoba, the number of returned soldiers for whom employment has been found is 633, and they make no report of any who is not employed. In Saskatchewan, the number of returned soldiers for whom employment has been found is 424, and there is no return of any for whom employment has not been found. In Alberta, the number of returned soldiers for whom employment has been found is 621, and there are 23 for whom employment has not been found. In British Columbia, the number of returned soldiers for whom employment has been found is 517, and the number for whom employment has not been found is 39. Taking these totals, we find that employment has been found for 5,886 returned soldiers, and that there are 148 in the various provinces for whom employment has not yet been found.

Mr. EDWARDS: Do these figures apply to discharged soldiers?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Mr. PARDEE: Do I understand my right hon. friend to say that there are only 148 returned soldiers in all the provinces for whom employment has not been found?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is the statement made to me on the reports to the secretary of the Military Hospitals Commission by the various provincial committees.

Mr. PARDEE: Is that up to the end of 1915?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is up to the 3rd of February of this year. This information is based upon reports made to the secretary of the Military Hospitals Commission by the various provincial committees which were constituted under the arrangement made in October, 1915, at the conference between the Federal authorities and the provincial authorities. I should add that the secretary of the New Brunswick Provincial Commission states that work can be found for all returned soldiers. That province has 60 unemployed men, but it is not anticipated that they will be out of employment for very long. The secretary of the Soldiers' Aid Commission of Ontario reports that no discharged soldiers able to work are out of employment, and that there are 150 vacancies now on file. That is, there are opportunities for employing 150 men if they are available. The secretary of the Saskatchewan Provincial Committee states that there are practically no returned soldiers out of employment, although the problem of procuring light employment is becoming very difficult.

In addition, in New Brunswick, employment has been found for fifty camp men; that is, men discharged from one or other of the military camps without going overseas. In Ontario, 550 such men have found employment, in Saskatchewan, 34, and in British Columbia 44 such men have procured employment through the provincial committees. If we add these figures, as received from the various provincial committees, we find that there is a total of 678 camp men, for whom employment has been found, and if that number be added to the 5,886 returned soldiers for whom employment has been found through the various provincial committees, we have a total of 6,564 men who enlisted, who have been discharged and for whom employment has been found, while, so far as returns from the various provinces show, there are only 148 men for whom, up to the present, employment has not been found.

I should observe that while the Military Hospitals Commission itself does not undertake any responsibility with regard to employment, that commission does furnish the secretary of every provincial commission with a record of every man returning to the province in question. Shortly before each man is discharged from an hospital or convalescent home, a notification is sent to the secretary of the provincial committee so that, if possible, a situation may be in readiness for him on his return to civil life. It is also stated in the memorandum, from which I am quoting, that the pay and allowances given to the man in advance, on his discharge, are to enable him to look around for satisfactory employment. It also observes that many men go back to their former situations, but that these men are not included in the statement which I have just read giving the total number of men for whom employment has been found by the provincial committees. The memorandum which I have before me speaks with very great appreciation of the splendid manner in which the provincial governments have responded to the present need, and expresses the opinion that as the need becomes more

acute the provinces will be ready to redouble their efforts.

I may also add that the Government have not lost sight of the fact that there are many openings in the Federal service which may be filled by returning soldiers. It was my expectation to have this afternoon a statement showing the number of returned soldiers who have been appointed to positions in the Federal service. I am informed that in one department alone at least 120 have been appointed. I have given directions to have the information furnished, and by the time the committee has undertaken its work, that information will also be available.

Orders in council, making provision for giving preference to returned soldiers in the Federal service have been passed, and, if I am not mistaken, have all been brought down. My hon. friend also alluded to the question of pensions.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the question of establishing permanent soldiers' homes been considered?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not think that that has yet been taken up, but it may be a proper matter for the consideration of the committee who will look into the whole subject. With regard to pensions, the subject was under consideration by a committee last session of Parliament, and I need hardly say that the members of that committee devoted themselves to the very important duty which they were called upon to discharge, with great earnestness, great energy, and great zeal. The report which they made was embodied in an order in council. That order in council was passed, of course, merely as a temporary measure, and it was quite understood that a Bill would be introduced this session. This Bill is in course of preparation, and will be brought down, I hope, at an early date, and I have it in mind that after the Bill is brought down it should be referred to the same committee which had the matter under consideration last year. They devoted a great deal of time to the subject and became thoroughly acquainted with it, and any suggestions for modifications of the report they then made should be considered by that committee in the first instance.

Mr. MARCIL: I understand that a Pensions Board has been appointed since last session.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, upon the recommendation of the committee. The members are Mr. J. K. L. Ross, Colonel Labatt and Major Todd.

Mr. MARCIL: Would the right hon. gentleman consider whether the French-Canadian element might not be represented on that board?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That will be a matter for consideration. The board was not appointed to represent any particular district, any particular class, or any particular race, and, in appointing it we endeavoured to select the best men available. The suggestion of my hon. friend will of course be considered.

Mr. MACDONALD: Can the Prime Minister give us any information as to the number of pensions distributed to the different ranks.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have not that information with me, but I think it can be easily obtained. In conclusion, I merely wish to add a word with reference to some criticism which has been made over delays occurring in the payment of the first pension cheque. The amount of labour involved in dealing with pensions, particularly in the earlier activities of the pensions board, has, of course, been very great, because the Board had not only to undertake and carry out new duties, but was also confronted with the task of establishing a very considerable organization while its ordinary, every-day work was being carried on. I understand, however, that the system which is being adopted will lead to very much less delay than has sometimes occurred in the past. I do not know if there is any further information I can give to the House at the moment, but it would be proper and appropriate for me to say that I entirely agree in and appreciate the remarks which were made by my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) in proposing his motion, as to the splendid patriotism of the men who have enlisted in the Canadian overseas forces, and who, by their valour and heroism at the front, have brought such splendid distinction to the country they represent. I quite agree with him also that the country must do all that is reasonable and just to take every care of these men upon their return to Canada, and that, I am assured, will be the spirit in which every member of the House will approach the consideration of this question.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington): Mr. Speaker, if I might be permitted

to make a few observations on this subject I would say that I think the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) is to be congratulated on having brought this matter to the attention of the House, and the House is to be congratulated on the very full information which the Prime Minister has seen fit to give in regard to this question, which is of such great importance to the people of Canada to-day. I know that this information will be gratefully received throughout the country, because there has been considerable curiosity and a good deal of unrest among many of our people as to just what treatment was being accorded our returned soldiers who had seen active service at the front and had been discharged by reason of wounds or some other disability. I think the remarks of my hon. friend from West Lambton were intended to relate particularly to those who had been discharged from overseas service as medically unfit, rather than to those who are receiving medical, hospital, or surgical treatment at the present time. There have been a great many cases of men who have served overseas, and who, though not actually wounded, have been rendered medically unfit and been discharged from further service. The treatment of these men, or some of them at all events, has not been as generous as it might have been. I think my hon. friend from West Lambton referred particularly to those men who had been discharged and who took a ten dollar bill or a fifty dollar bill, or the maximum of one hundred dollars, on being discharged from further service through no fault of their own, but merely because from some cause or another they had become medically unfit. Cases have come to my own knowledge of such men, and these cases involve considerable hardship. In one case a man who had a wife and nine children resident in Canada was discharged on the 20th of May last. Upon his dischargee in England he received $100. He was not returned to Canada until September. Upon his return home he found his wife and family at their last resource; they had even sold the household furniture. The man himself, when he landed at Guelph, where he had formerly lived, was absolutely without a dollar, and saw nothing in sight. He had to be assisted subsequently, and two or three months afterwards he obtained employment as a guard at the provincial institution. I have in mind three cases similar to that I have just mentioned, and I have given this case to illustrate the difficulty to which I think my hon. friend from West Lambton intended to direct the attention of the House, namely, the treatment of men who are returned to Canada before employment is found for them. Their lot is a hard one. Some of them come back none too well clad, and the majority of them without any money at all. One man who had been discharged in England as medically unfit, on landing at Halifax, received $100. Another, some months after his return, received from the department $50, and that man has no employment yet, and he lives in Ontario. This period between the discharge of a man and the day when he obtains employment is certainly a hard time for him, and if married for his family as well.

The news which the Prime Minister has given the House in regard to conditions in Ontario is most gratfying to me, and I am sure the whole province will be gratified to hear that every returned soldier who is fit for work has had employment offered to him, and that there are in Ontario to-day no less than 150 vacant positions which can be filled by returned soldiers, according to the return which I understand, is brought down to the first day of the present month of February. I will certainly take the opportunity of notifying two men whom I have in mind that they had better file their applications with the provincial authorities at once. Every one realizes that the task before the Government and before the country in dealing with the returned soldier is going to be serious, more serious next year than this, most serious when demobilization really sets in. I listened with the greatest interest to the scheme outlined by the Prime Minister this afternoon, and if I had any criticism whatever to offer in regard to it, it would be that it is rather involved: there are too many commissions and sub-commissions, too many divisions and subdivisions. I think it will take some time to work out the scheme, and during the interim there is going to be a great deal of hardship suffered by soldiers on their return to Canada. My suggestion—and I give it only as a suggestion—is that the Government would do well to take some definite step now in regard to vocational training. We are going to have a very large number of men suffering from total permanent disability, who will never be able to earn their living again and who will no doubt in many cases be absolutely dependent upon their pensions; but for men who are only partially disabled, dismembered or blind of an

eye, steps should be taken immediately by the Government, and I do not believe in deputing that work to the provincial governments or to any other body. I believe a commission should be formed by this Government, and the formation of a commission, if a commission be thought desirable, should not be delayed, but the work should be undertaken in the very near future. My right hon. friend says that some vocational specialists, some technical specialists, would doubtless have to be employed for such a purpose. Let them be employed, They can be procured.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They have been procured.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Let them get to work now.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They are at work.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Let the Government adopt the necessary means to put into application whatever is determined upon by those vocational specialists. This Parliament surely can grant the money for such a purpose, to establish in the immediate future, say during the coming summer, a very broad comprehensive scheme of vocational training, where the services of men who have lost an eye or of men who have been partially dismembered, may in the future be usefully employed. The time to start is immediately. It takes time to work the matter out, but if started during the present spring, by next autumn, when there will be large numbers of men available to take courses at such an institution, that institution can render a tremendous benefit to this country and to the individual who has the benefit of a course in it.

I am not quite as enthusiastic as some people are in regard to the number of returned soldiers who will settle on the land and become agriculturists. Agriculture is a business that must be learned just as any other business, and while a number of returned soldiers will certainly take advantage of an opportunity to go upon the land, I do not think there will be any great rush of returned soldiers upon the land unless the inducements are very great, and unless men have had some previous training in agriculture or unless their minds naturally turn that way I do not think that the land question is going to offer more than a partial solution of the difficulties which will confront Canada when demobilization takes place. At the present time, I am satisfied that the Government has made a splendid showing in regard to its treatment of the injured, of those suffering either from wounds or disease, and I am satisfied that our hospital system, our medical and surgical treatment, and the provision made in this country for tubercular patients on their return from the front are up-to-date and a credit in every respect to the Government. But I do feel that a little more might be done, even as a mere welcome to the man who comes back to this country medically unfit, to keep that man going until his own particular province shall have provided him with an opportunity of obtaining a position. Having regard to the figures submitted to the House to-day, we have nothing to complain of in Ontario. I hope that will continue; I doubt if it will continue because the number of returned soldiers will increase in the future; but for that short period from the time when they arrive in Canada until they obtain positions, those men and their families should not suffer for one moment of time.

5 p.m.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, I think the House and the country are indebted to the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) for the discussion which has been started this afternoon. No one would have walked the hospitals of Europe during the past year and seen the torn and broken men who a few months ago left this country in the fullness of health and strength without realizing that a terrible problem confronts Canada and the British Empire in the absorption of the men who have fought on our behalf. The more one thinks of the problem, the more difficult the solution becomes; and if my opinion is worth anything, I think it will take the best judgment and the best brains of this country as well as of other parts of the British Empire, to make adequate provision for those who, the world admits, have done their duty in fighting for the cause of the Empire. But I think the hon. member for West Lambton forgets somewhat or is not aware of what has already been done. I am inclined to think that not many of the men who have returned from the front are going to be prepared to go on the farm. When I was in England and France and Belgium, I spoke to many men as to what their ambitions for the future were, and the general trend of opinion was that the men wanted to return to the place from which they had come and to go back to the work they knew best. It is simple enough to say: Send a man out on the farm; but if a man knows noth-

ing about farming—and farming to-day is a science, just as many other occupations are—he is not going to be able to earn an adequate living, and if a man cannot earn an adequate living on a farm, he is not going to stay out there simply for the joy of living in the country, and I think that statistics will go to show that of all the men who have returned to Canada, not more than three per cent have expressed their willingness to go on the farm. Therefore, I think a problem that confronts us is this: What steps are we going to take to secure employment for the men who have gone from our shores? As a member of the Soldiers Aid Commission in the province of Ontario—and I use the word "aid" rather than the word "employment" as used by the Premier—I may say that at its early meetings it realized the problem which it had to face, and upon inquiry it soon came to the conclusion that if we were adequately to meet the situation, it was necessary that we should have the co-operation of local boards throughout the province and that we should have the sympathy and the co-operation of the employers. With that end in view the commission set to work to have subsidiary boards established in the larger centres from which more than five soldiers had left for overseas, and at the present time I think there are some fifty-three bodies in Ontario adequately doing the work for which they were constituted. My information is the same as that given by the Prime Minister—that to-day there are vacancies that cannot be filled because the men are not to be had, and that any soldier who wants work and is willing to work can find a position if he applies to the Soldiers' Aid Commission. The commission does not stop altogether at securing employment for these men. The Commission has authority " to care for and find employment for the members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force," and by the Statutes of 1916 that power was further extended, so that they have power to care for and find employment for the members of His Majesty's Imperial Forces who went overseas. We are going further than finding employment for these men. If a man comes back so broken that it is impossible for him to get work at his former occupation, the Government of Ontario have placed at the disposal of the commission the technical institutions throughout the province, and a great number of these men are being re-educated under the auspices of the Commission. The commission is making provision also for the maintenance and subsistence of a man's family while he is being re-educated. If it should happen that a man is in a place where work is not available, and work is available at another place, the commission will send the man to the place where work is to be had. The commission makes loans to men to carry them over temporary embarrassments. So, the situation in Ontario is governed most satisfactorily.

I desire to touch for a moment on a misapprehension which exists in the public mind. Let me quote to the House a statement which appeared, I am sure by inadvertence, in the Evening Journal of 21st January last:

> The Government so far recognizes no responsibility towards the man who enlisted in the Expeditionary Force and who developed some disease before he left Canada, although this may have arisen from the hardships and exposure attendant upon the performance of his military duties.

That is a misapprehension of the facts. The Military Hospitals Commission takes care of a man who breaks down from exposure, even though he should go no further than the place in which he was enlisted. Such a man is treated with exactly the same consideration as is the man who has been wounded in battle. The original pension scheme made a distinction between the man who had been wounded in battle and the man who was injured in some other way, but the present order in council makes no distinction. Once a man dons His Majesty's uniform he becomes, so to speak, a ward of the state, and if through exposure, exertion, disease or accident, he becomes a less fit man that he was before he enlisted, he thereby becomes entitled to a pension as if he had been wounded on the field.

Complaints have been made in the past of delays in the granting of pensions. In certain cases, such complaint may have been justified. The pension problem is a new problem for Canada, and, in the nature of things, a certain time must elapse before the complex machinery of the new system can be made to work smoothly. But the organization to-day is so perfected that there is no cause for delay. If a man is entitled to a pension, that pension should be promptly granted to him. There have been cases in which a break occurred between the time when a man's pay and allowances expired and the time when his pension began. But negotiations are now under way to evolve a scheme by which pay and allowances will continue until the pension is granted, so that there will be no time

when the disabled man will not receive either his pay and allowances or his pension.

Among the problems that the Pensions Board or the Hospitals Commission will have to face is that of the men who have suffered impairment not amounting to full disability. I think that in Canada we are going to be met very often with this class of case. A man has lost a limb by explosive bullet, shrapnel or otherwise, and has been treated in a convalescent hospital. After treatment he is discharged as fit for work. But when he is thrown into the hurly-burly of industrial life, nerves that had been frayed by exposure in the trenches are going to break, and the man will be unfitted for his occupation. We shall have to face the problem of the man who has been discharged as not entitled to a pension, but who, as subsequent experience shows, is so broken in his health that he must have hospital treatment. I think the Government of Canada will have to meet the situation and that it will be prepared to meet it by taking that man into the hospital and giving him the treatment necessary to restore him, as far as possible, to health and strength. Another problem we shall have to meet is the question of what may be called functional education as distinguished from vocational education. Hundreds of men will come back to this country not much impaired, if you take the mere capacity to work as a standard, but very considerably impaired in relation to the occupation which they followed before enlisting. I have a case in mind, that of a man who, before he went to the front, followed the trade of a boilermaker. He was hit in the right shoulder and an important muscle and nerve was injured. He is as well as ever, apparently, but when he raises his hand above his shoulder, the power to bring it down with the old-time force is gone. He says: I am only entitled to a small pension, because constitutionally I have made a substantial recovery; but because of the injury that I have suffered, I can only earn a labourer's pay, although, before I went to the front, I earned the pay of a skilled mechanic. By a course of functional education, the injured nerve and muscle might be restored to strength. We must consider the question of functional training.

When one visits the Old Country, he realizes the effort that is being made to place the injured soldiers in useful occupations. Our problems are not greater than theirs, but the steps they are taking are an example to us of what can be done. You see there men who have been trained to engage in some lighter occupation than that to which thy were accustomed. You see men who have lost one arm, or perhaps part of a hand, who have been fitted and trained to do as much work as one so injured can possibly do.

In closing, I wish to say, as I said in the beginning, that I believe this country is willing that money should be spent and effort made so to provide that the men who have given to Canada a place among the nations of the world, and who have come back either broken or injured, shall suffer as little as possible for the sacrifices they have made. Because, when the last word is said, they have taken our places in the trenches, and those of us who have remained at home should be only too willing to pay, and pay well.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): I am going to take a somewhat critical position, as I think becomes a member of this side of the House; and, while I have nothing but praise for the very full statement given by the Prime Minister, and for the terms of that statement, yet I would venture this criticism: that in dealing with this subject we have been dealing with it as though it were a matter that was not urgent, a matter that was not present; we have been dealing with it as something that might arise, yet might not arise. And the consequence is that tremendous hardship has been caused to individuals and tremendous discredit to the Dominion of Canada, simply because we have not done what we ought to have done and what we must do in time. When the war broke out and we sent 33,000 men to take part in that war, we knew that we would have broken men; we knew that we would have need for provision as to pensions, vocational training, hospital treatment and employment for returned soldiers. But we did not take at that time the steps that we should have taken; we did not take them a year after, or the year after that. We are taking them only now, when the problem has become tremendous, when the discredit has been established, when untold injury has been done to the military and patriotic enthusiasm of the people by the neglect of men who have served our country and to whom our country desires to give every consideration. Because of the policy

of " wait and see "—a policy which so nearly destroyed the British Empire—we have had in Canada these unfortunate cases.

The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) has drawn attention to the fact that in many cases a long interval has occurred between the shutting off of the ex-soldier's pay and the receiving of his pension. I shall not enlarge upon that; I simply say that within my own knowledge there have been such cases, deplorable and discreditable, which have been seriously detrimental to the credit of our country and to the military enthusiasm of our people. I shall not go into details; they would be harrowing, and would not add to the facts of the case. In my judgment there is no excuse for that condition. The hon. member for Kingston will distinctly remember that that question came up for consideration before the Pensions Committee last year, and that we were at the point of making a recommendation that the pay should continue until the pension began. Upon representation being made to us, however, that that condition would be provided for, we did not put in the recommendation. That is my recollection of the matter.

Another point to which due regard has not been given is this: When a man is discharged without pension, he is discharged because of his unfitness to do the work that we wanted him to do and that he offered to do for us. On the face of it, that is evidence that the man's condition is not such as will enable him to have an equal standing with his competitors in the labour field. I consider that the authorities have been unduly regardless of the facts in shutting off such a man's pay, giving him $10 and a ticket home, and saying: "We do not know you any longer." A man has a family dependent upon him is discharged from military service because he is not fit, physically, mentally or otherwise, to continue in that employ. That is to say, his power or ability to maintain his family is not as it was when he entered our employ, because at that time we took the responsibility of accepting his services in the belief that his physical and mental ability was at a maximum.

Mr. EDWARDS: Does the hon. gentleman refer to a man who went overseas and returned?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes. Having discharged this man, we say: " We do not owe you anything; we give you no consideration." Even if a man has no dependents at all, he is apt to be placed in the position of a vagrant—as a matter of fact, cases of this kind have occurred—but if he has a family, as in the case, which has been mentioned, of a man with a large number of children, the condition is very much worse. I think that the authorities would do themselves and the country credit if, when they are giving these men their discharges, they do something to help them through the period of difficulty and straitened circumstances which often follows the cutting off of their soldiers' pay and the discontinuance of the separation and Patriotic Fund allowances to their families. We have been proceeding altogether too much upon the assumption that we are dealing with soldiers as the word " soldier " was understood in former days. We are not dealing with soldiers as that word was understood; we are dealing with citizens, and we should deal with them from the standpoint of their citizenship and of their value to the community as citizens.

It seems to me that the Government should long ago have made provision for those totally disabled soldiers who, being unable to take care of themselves, have no relatives, or whose relatives are not in a position to take care of them. This could be accomplished by establishing a number of soldiers' homes, such as the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) spoke of during the course of the debate on the Address. Most harrowing cases have come to my attention; I shall not trouble the House with the details of them. I think that the Government has not been well advised in making no provisions for taking proper care of these men.

In regard to vocational training, I had the honour to bring to the attention of the Prime Minister last year the fact that at Edmonton we have a technical school that is available for this work. I do not think that it has yet been availed of, and I would respectfully suggest, if it be in order, that this school, as well as others throughout the country, be availed of to this end.

Mr. G. E. McCRANEY (Saskatoon): Before you put the motion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to the attention of the Prime Minister a matter, which, perhaps, is not connected with the subject introduced by the member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee). In a number of the provinces of Canada, if not in all of them, the distinction between real property and personal property has been done away with in dealing with the estates of deceased persons. But the law with regard to holograph and nuncu-

patives wills has been preserved, and that law provides in my province of Saskatchewan and I think also in Ontario, that the holograph or nuncupative will of a soldier shall deal only with personal property. There is apt to be confusion in the minds of the soldiers and the public in the belief that the holograph and nuncupative wills of soldiers deal with all their property as any other wills would do. I wish to make the suggestion to the Government that it make inquiry as to the facts I have stated, and that the request be made to the legislatures of the various provinces in which this distinction is still preserved that the law be so amended that the holograph and nuncupative will of a deceased soldier shall include realty as well as personal property.

Motion for the adjournment of the House negatived.

$100,000,000 PUBLIC SERVICE LOAN.

Bill No. 19, to authorize the raising by way of loan, of certain sums of money for the public service, Sir Thomas White, read the third time, and passed.

WAR LOAN—$500,000,000.

House again in Committee to consider the following proposed resolutions.—Mr. Rainville in the chair.

1. That it is expedient to provide that a sum not exceeding five hundred million dollars ($500,000,000) be granted to His Majesty towards defraying any expenses that may be incurred by or under the authority of the Governor in Council during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1918, for:—

(a) The defence and security of Canada;

(b) The conduct of naval or military operations in and beyond Canada;

(c) Promoting the continuance of trade, industry and business communications, whether by means of insurance or indemnity against war risk or otherwise;

(d) The carrying out of any measures deemed necessary or advisable by the Governor in Council in consequence of the existence of a state of war; and

(e) Payments made for the said purposes during the fiscal year ending the thirty-first day of March, nineteen hundred and seventeen, in excess of the amounts authorized by The War Appropriation Act, 1916.

2. That the Governor in Council be empowered to raise by way of loan, temporary or otherwise, such sums of money as are required for the purpose of making any payment authorized by any Act founded on these Resolutions.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: Can the Prime Minister say whether or not it is expected that the Order which was made by the House last year for a return giving the details of the expenditures that have been made out of the war vote has been complied with? The Minister of Militia, in reply to the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) complained that there was quite a number of details, but that is no sufficient reason why the Order of the House should not be complied with. Is the Prime Minister in a position to say that we will get that information this session?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really am not able to say. I thought that the two large volumes containing the proceedings of the War Purchasing Commission already placed on the table of the House would contain that information. I have not looked at the volumes.

Mr. MACDONALD: There is nothing in them as to expenditures.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I suppose it will be all in the auditor general's report when we get it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: And when will we have the auditor general's report?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My right hon. friend heard what the Minister of Finance said about it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is all we hear. All it amounts to is that we cannot have it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We are commencing a little earlier this year than the auditor general expected.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Are we to understand that the motion which was passed last year is not to be fulfilled in the terms in which it was ordered by the House? The House ordered certain information to be laid on the table. Twelve months have elapsed, and surely, in all conscience, there has been time enough to furnish that information.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I remember that last year the Acting Minister of Militia at that time said that what was being asked for was practically the auditor general's report in advance, and therefore I would assume that the information then asked for would be contained in the report of the auditor general, as soon as we can get that report. We are making every effort to get it. It is not desirable to bring the information down both in the form of a return and also as the auditor general's report. That would be a useless expenditure.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This would perhaps have been a good reason for not granting the motion; but the Order of the House was allowed to be passed and it is due to the House that it should be fulfilled.

ROSS RIFLE—DISCUSSION IN COMMITTEE.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. member for Carleton asked as to the changes in the Ross rifle since the outbreak of war. I am informed that all the changes which have taken place are of a very minor character and are as follows:

Butt trap spring strengthened. Change recommended October 16, 1914, by the Small Arms Committee.

Extractor cut shortened to prevent bolt head turning over. Change recommended by the Small Arms Committee, April 10, 1915.

Strap of piling swivel strengthened. Change recommended by the Small Arms Committee, April 10, 1915.

Rear end of receiver to be rounded. Change recommended by the Small Arms Committee, June 2, 1915.

New pattern nose cap. Change recommended by the Small Arms Committee, June 11, 1915.

Chamber enlarged to .464 to facilitate extraction. Change authorized in July, 1915, and again in August, 1915.

Removal of sling swivel from trigger guard. Change recommended by Small Arms Committee, November 29, 1915.

The screws were rim punched to prevent them working loose. Change made upon advice from overseas.

Bolt stop with larger striking surface. Change recommended by the Small Arms Committee, June 11, 1916.

The cavity in the butt for the oil well was deepened ½ inch, making it 8 inches in depth in the wood. Change recommended by the Small Arms Committee, June 30, 1916.

As I have said, I am informed by the Master General of the Ordnance that the changes are all of a very trivial and minor character.

Mr. MACDONALD: Would the Prime Minister tell us exactly where the Government and the country stand with reference to the question of the Ross rifle? Are we to understand that notice of a formal nature has been given to the Ross Rifle Company under the contract of the intention of the Government to ask them to manufacture a rifle similar to the Lee-Enfield rifle, but that no order has been given to the company for any definite number of rifles?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, that is the situation.

Mr. MACDONALD: Having regard to the manifest desirability of having the manufacture of arms in this country, and, more particularly, in view of the situation in the country to the south of us, whence the supply of arms will no doubt be cut off on account of their own necessities—does the right hon. gentleman regard that as a desirable situation? Can he not conceive of the possibility of conferring with the Ross Rifle Company, and obtaining some definite statement as to the number, in order to hasten the manufacture of those rifles upon a larger scale than 10,000, which was intended to be the minimum in peace time? Is there not a way in which the matter could be hastened so that the country might know that this matter is being taken care of? As it is, both parties seem to be at arm's length. My hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) suggested that if there was any difficulty the Government could solve it by expropriating the factory. The matter seems to have come to a standstill without the exercise of that authority which the Government manifestly have in war time. The matter seems to have got to a stage where nobody is moving, and no preparation is being made for the future.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not think there is any detriment to the public interest in the delay which has taken place. As a matter of fact, I have already pointed out that it is impossible to give an order until we get the drawings and specifications which were asked for in September last, but which have not yet been received. The question is as to what the Government should undertake in the production of rifles, having regard to the fact that a very large number of rifles already manufactured will probably be on hand at the end of the war, and that these will be suitable for training purposes. After the conclusion of the war we may expect that training purposes alone will have to be considered for some years. On the other hand as I have already pointed out, there is the fact that undoubtedly the Ross Rifle Company has made a very large expenditure for the purpose of producing rifles on a large scale during the war, and while it is manifestly impossible for the Government to continue to give orders on a war scale in time of peace, nevertheless it is proper for the Government to have such consideration for that expenditure as would not result in marked injustice or unfairness to the interests which have made that expenditure. That is the situation which confronts the Government to-day. It is one that is not free from difficulty, and one to which the best possible consideration will be given.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: On Friday, in the explanation which he gave upon the subject, my right hon. friend stated to the House that an order in council had been passed fixing the time when the new type of rifle was to be manufactured by the Ross

Rifle Company. The order in council went on to say this:

And that the contractor and the said company be required, on and after the first day of December, 1917, to make all rifles supplied under the said contract to correspond to such last mentioned substituted standard sample rifle the Government undertaking to protect the contractor and his assignee against any actions for infringement of patents as stipulated by the contract, and, moreover, that the Minister of Militia and Defence be authorized to give a notice in the form hereto annexed to the said Sir Charles Ross and his assignee, The Ross Rifle Company.

Are we to understand that no action has been taken by the Company to have rifles manufactured under the terms of this order in council?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I cannot say what the company have done. We have given notice that after the date mentioned the rifles to be produced must be of the new type, but we have not yet given an order for the reason I have mentioned: that we have not yet received the drawings and specifications which are necessary for the purpose of giving such an order. The reason why we have not yet received the drawings and specifications is explained in the telegram which I read to the committee on Friday last.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: About this question of the Ross rifle I wish to say that I altogether object to the Government doing business with a private company for the production of munitions of war such as rifles. I believe that rifles for the purposes of war should be made in a public arsenal on plans devised by our own engineers and experts in the manufacture of rifles, and that we should not be bound, as we are said to be bound, by a contract with the Ross Rifle Company. I want to say further that in view of the statements that were made in this House when the Ross rifle contract was first entered into, some of them by hon. gentlemen associated with the present Government, and in view also of the experience on the battlefields of Europe where the Ross rifle was thrown away by our soldiers as being a bad weapon, their lives being in jeopardy, I do not think we ought to pay another dollar to the Ross Rifle Company. To test the feeling of this committee, I propose to move an amendmend adding Clause 4 to the resolution to this effect:

(4) That none of the money so raised or voted shall be used for the purchase of Ross rifles.

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

The people of Canada are more than dissatisfied with the experience of Canada in connection with the Ross rifle. The people of Canada are in favour of the starting of a national arsenal for the manufacture of rifles by ourselves, and they are in favour of the elimination of the whole question of profit in connection with munitions. On my own behalf, on behalf of my constituency which has had rather a wide experience with the Ross rifle, and on behalf of our soldiers who have been to the front and who discarded the Ross rifle, I think this contract ought to come to an end here and now, and that not another dollar ought to be paid to this company for those rifles. I therefore move the amendment which I have just read.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that the amendment is in order, but assuming for the moment that it is, it seems to me impossible for the committee to adopt it, and for this reason: The provision which is included with respect to the Ross rifle is not in respect of any further order, but is in respect of an order already given, and upon which the company is already engaged. It is estimated that about 80,000 rifles under the order given in February, 1916, will remain to be delivered after the end of the present fiscal year. The Government having given that order, and thus having entered into a contract for those rifles, is under obligation to pay for them; the rifles must be paid for unless the good faith of the country is to be called in question, or unless in the meantime some other type of rifle may be substituted for them, and I do not think that that is possible within the period mentioned.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to be a party to voting for the breaking of any contract that this Government has entered into in good faith, but I am bound to say that in my judgment the contract entered into was an unjustifiable and improvident contract, judged from every point of view, and I could not conscientiously vote for the payment of any money on that contract. The suggestion that has been made that the contract should be changed is the proper one, I submit, so that the rifles supplied should be Lee-Enfields instead of Ross rifles. Under these circumstances we should be getting value for our money, and the country would get rifles that could be used. The suggestion that it takes a year or any such long period of time to make the change for which provision was

made in the original contract entered into so many years ago is, I think, not borne out by the experience we have had in the making of munitions of all kinds throughout the Empire and the United States. There is no manner of doubt in my mind that if the diligence had been used we could have been making Lee-Enfields now at the Ross rifle factory, and if the Government should be put up against it by a vote of this House I believe they could yet get Lee-Enfields made at the Ross rifle factory in time to meet the needs of the war. Therefore, for my part, I am going to support the amendment of the hon. gentleman, if it is in order to move it. While on the subject I wish to make one more observation. The Prime Minister was good enough to say on Friday last that I must suffer in my conscience because of having been a party to the contract that was made by the Government of Canada with the Ross Rifle Company.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If it were so poor a rifle as my hon. friend argued.

Mr. OLIVER: I did not argue; I merely stated the facts. I just want to point out, first, that the Ross rifle contract, made in 1902, provided that in case of war or emergency the Government of Canada was at liberty to make or buy rifles where it pleased and as it pleased, over and above the amount that the Ross Rifle Company could furnish. The second provision that I wish to draw attention to was that the Ross Rifle Company was bound, on due notice, to make any alterations demanded by the Government of Canada, and the third provision was that they were bound by the contract to make any other kind of a rifle that the Government of Canada should see fit to ask or order them to make. So that the original contract provided in these three particulars for the safeguarding by the Government of the interests of the people of Canada under three different sets of circumstances, one of these sets of circumstances being the great condition of war that has arisen. I want to point out further to the Prime Minister and the House that the rifle that was made by the Ross Company under contracts with the Liberal Government was not the rifle that was in the hands of our soldiers in France and Flanders under the administration of this Government.

Mr. EDWARDS: Was it a good rifle?

Mr. OLIVER: I am not sure; it may have been a better rifle. But it was not the rifle. It could not have been a worse rifle, because the rifle that was put in our soldiers' hands in France and Flanders has been taken out of their hands with the consent of this Government forced upon them by the authorities at the British War Office.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was the rifle that the late Government provided for?

Mr. OLIVER: Mark I, Mark II, and Mark II with three stars. There were three makes provided, and these were all discarded by the present Government. In November, 1911, an order was given for the manufacture of Mark III, and deliveries of that rifle was begun to be made in November, 1912, and it was the Mark III rifle that our soldiers carried in France and Flanders, and which caused the loss of hundreds of lives in those battles.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Solicitor General): Before the committee rises at six o'clock, I should like to say just a word with reference to a matter in which my name was mentioned on Friday last, relative to the necessity of drawings and specifications for the purpose of the manufacture of the new rifle. I have read the debate and observe that the Prime Minister expressed the view that the contract called for drawings and specifications to be served upon the company before the notice would take effect. On the contrary, the situation, although in effect exactly the same, is in direct words this: The drawings and specifications are not referred to in the contract itself as having to be served on the company, but as a practical engineering necessity the specifications and drawings have to be served before there can be a proper contractual relationship between the Government and the company. The Militia Department officials take the ground most positively that there can be in effect and in practice no manufacture of rifles and no preparation to manufacture rifles until the drawings and specifications are delivered. That is all I desire to say now.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MACDONALD: I would submit to the Government the necessity of clearing the air in regard to the rifle situation. My hon. friend the member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has moved an amendment, the purport of which is that the contract which this Government made in Feb-

ruary, 1916, with the Ross Rifle Company should not be fulfilled. What this House and the country is concerned with at the present time is whether or not this country can supply within her own borders a rifle which will be satisfactory to our men when they go out to fight. Without going into anything that has happened in the past, I think it is conceded and declared by hon. gentlemen on both sides and the proposition is accepted, that the Lee-Enfield pattern, which is now in use in England and which is now being manufactured in England, is such a rifle as would be satisfactory.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I did not catch what the hon. gentleman said. Did he say that the rifle now being manufactured in England is satisfactory?

Mr. MACDONALD: That is what I understand to be the policy of the Government, because they have intimated to the Ross Rifle Company that they require that company hereafter to manufacture rifles of that pattern.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: This particular rifle, as I have already explained three or four times, is not being manufactured in England at the present time.

Mr. MACDONALD: If it is not being manufactured in England, it is being manufactured for the British Government in the United States.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: For the British Government.

Mr. MACDONALD: The question where it is being made for the British Government is a matter of no concern to us. The fact is that a certain rifle of a certain pattern is being manufactured and that this Government have adopted that as being the pattern which is satisfactory to them, and have given notice to the Ross Rifle Company to manufacture rifles of that pattern a year from now. The Government, however, have not intimated to the Ross Rifle Company how many rifles will be required, and the whole rifle situation is for the moment obscure on account of the inability of this Government and the company to come to some understanding in regard to it. The Government ought to know how many rifles they require, but they say: We cannot take any further steps until we have a specification; until we have a certain pattern. My right hon. friend will agree with me that any one who has any experience at all in regard to the manufacture in Canada and elsewhere of goods that are based on steel, especially at this particular juncture, knows that the most important problem is to get the raw material, and if my right hon. friend allows week after week to go by before the blocks of the particular sealed pattern is produced, he is simply postponing to a lengthy, if not to an indefinite period, the manufacture of the rifle by reason of that delay. In order that material may be obtained, it is necessary that information should be given as to how many rifles the Government will require under their contract. The same thing applies to the stock of the rifle. All these matters are based on the raw material. Why is it that the Government stand on the brink of this question and do nothing one way or the other? My complaint is this: They know how many rifles they will require at the end of the year; they know they will need more than ten thousand, which is the minimum fixed in the contract that they would be bound to take; but yet they decline to indicate how many rifles they require, and it is therefore impossible to obtain material. If three months after this they say they want a hundred thousand rifles of the new pattern, where is the material to come from? My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia takes the position, I understand, that the Ross rifle of the type that was sent to the front, is the best type.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The best in the world. It has been proved to be so.

Mr. MACDONALD: That is the position of the ex-minister in the matter. He is to be commended for the fact that he takes his ground and stands upon it. My hon. friend has had this merit in regard to his administration, that if he thought a thing was right, he stood by it, no matter what any one in England said about it.

Sir SAM HUGHES: There have been tests of every kind in connection with the two rifles and the records are available. I challenge the world to produce a record showing that the Ross rifle has come out second to the Lee-Enfield. I do not know whether or not the report of a bogus test has been sent by General Alderson to General Gwatkin. If it has, I propose asking some questions about it. But there has never been an official test, or even a general test, as between the Ross rifle and the Lee-Enfield rifle wherein the Ross rifle has not in every sense beaten the Lee-Enfield.

While I am on my feet, I desire to correct a statement made by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). He said that the

Ross rifle, Mark III, was adopted by the Liberal-Conservative party. I speak from memory, but I think it was in 1910 that the decision was reached to adopt the Ross rifle, Mark III.

Mr. MACDONALD: There is this to be said in favour of the hon. gentleman (Sir Sam Hughes) that while he was in charge of the militia at least he had his own opinions and was ready to stand by them. In his correspondence with the Prime Minister he spoke broadly of things that were done, or not done, in England, with regard to the whole administration of affairs in relation to our forces, their supply and equipment: but when he has the opportunity he does not back up in this House the statements he made.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I have never deviated from any of my statements.

Mr. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman wrote these things in a letter to the Prime Minister but has not gone any further. This whole question of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Robert Borden) or his former Minister of Militia taking acute issue with those who were responsible for certain things done in a military way on the other side of the water, is a very important problem, and the Ross rifle question is merely one phase of it. The ex-Minister of Militia was right, or else he was wrong, in certain statements that he made, and makes now, not only in regard to the Ross rifle, but in regard to other supplies paid for by the hard-earned money of the people of Canada and scrapped when they were taken overseas, at a loss of millions and millions. We are asked to accept, without a word, the statement of some gentleman over there because he happens to be connected with the War Office, as though he were an infallible being whose opinion is not to be doubted. The right hon. Prime Minister seems to think that because a man wears the uniform of a British officer he is so far above anybody who is Canadian born that by no possibility could anybody in this country venture to question him. The ex-Minister of Militia does not believe in that.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Let me correct my hon. friend. He said "Canadian born." My view of this matter has nothing to do with a man being Canadian born, or British born, or German born. The principle that I lay down is that a man is in the service of Canada.

Mr. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman has interpreted my ideas. We send battalions overseas on the pledge of the ministry that these battalions shall go to the front under their Canadian officers. But when they go across the water, some man who has not worn a uniform as long as the men under which the Canadian boys are serving tells them that the pledged faith of the Canadian Government matters nothing, but that because he happens to be a British officer those who come from the dominions, no matter what may be their ability and knowledge of their business, shall have nothing to say. And when in this Canadian Parliament we ask the Canadian Minister of Militia to tell us about it, he cannot tell us anything but must cable to London. And for two and a half weeks he has been sending cables to London, and he cannot tell us to-day where we stand in regard to our forces. We are voting $500,000,000, and it is time that we should learn, in the interests of the country, not only in regard to the Ross rifle, but in regard to the status of our men and their equipment, and all other questions overseas, whether this Government is to accept without question the opinions of gentlemen on the other side of the water. We have been in this war almost three years. The casualties of officers and men belonging to the old regiments of Great Britain have been very great indeed. There are men to-day who are commanding regiments going out from Great Britain that have had no longer military experience than the men coming from Canada. Why, then, should we be told that because a man is attached to a Canadian regiment, his opinion about rifles, equipment, or anything else, is worth nothing, as though he belonged to an inferior people whose right to express an opinion is not to be considered?

Mr. EDWARDS: And who has said that, except it be the hon. gentleman himself?

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend should know that actions and results speak louder than words. He ought to know that the ex-Minister of Militia has time and time again arraigned the Government, of which he was then a member, for pursuing that policy in regard to almost everything in connection with our troops overseas.

Mr. EDWARDS: Do not a considerable number of Canadian officers hold responsible

positions at the head of the troops in France?

Mr. MACDONALD: What does the hon. gentleman mean? Is he calling upon us to express exultation and delight because a number of our officers who have gone to England are permitted to go to France? If so, he must not expect me to join him. On the other hand, I want to know why it is that two thousand Canadian officers taken from their regiments are not permitted to go to France because somebody who was born in Great Britain, who has had no longer training than many Canadian officers, decides that they shall not go. I want to know why it is that, without regard to the pledged faith of this Government, some man in Great Britain who happened to have a little brief authority decides to butcher our battalions and scatter them to the four winds of heaven. That is what is being done. The reason I mention this matter is because my right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) says the Ross rifle is no good—

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not say the Ross rifle is no good.

Mr. MACDONALD: The right hon. gentleman says that the Ross rifle is not the weapon that our men ought to be armed with during the war.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I said that it had been exchanged, for reasons which I gave to the House; I did not say what the hon. gentleman said I said; he knows perfectly well that I did not say it.

Mr. MACDONALD: My right hon. friend is a casuist of the first class. He puts into other words just what I have said. He says the Ross rifle was displaced for good and sufficient reason, that reason being that it was not satisfactory to our forces. But the ex-Minister of Militia tells us that it is a better rifle than the Lee-Enfield. The Prime Minister says that because of the opinion they have in England the Ross rifle must be thrown overboard. Well, we have a fully equipped rifle factory in this country. If we cannot make the Ross rifle, why not make some other rifle? We on this side of the House take the position that there is no more reason to believe we cannot make rifles than there was to believe that we could not make shells. When we ask why rifles are not made in this country the right hon. gentleman says: I have given notice of a year—

Some hon. MEMBERS: When was it given?

[Mr. Edwards.]

Mr. MACDONALD: In December. But the Prime Minister does not state how many rifles he wants. He does not pursue the ordinary business policy that a person purchasing manufactured steel would pursue, of indicating his requirements so that those who have to obtain raw material may know what they are to arrange for. And he says that somebody in England does not tell him about the pattern. There is the situation. I think his position proves everything that the ex-Minister of Militia said. That hon. gentleman has told us that for ten months at the beginning of the war he was not permitted to have anything to say. And he predicted that the appointment of an Overseas Minister of Militia would lead to a state of chaos, I think he was a true prophet.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have stated the position of the Government over and over again, and I have nothing to add. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) does not understand or appreciate it, that is a matter for himself. I have stated what the difficulties are that the Government will have to consider, and I have nothing to add to what I have already said in that regard.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM: What I cannot understand about the situation as explained by the Government is this: Suppose the Government takes the position that they were bound by the contract under ordinary conditions. I do not admit that they were so bound as a matter of fact, but let us assume for the moment that they were bound. But the Government has cancelled other contracts because the conditions are not ordinary conditions. I believe that under the War Measures Act the Government could take possession of the Ross rifle factory. I believe they could go so far as to make a charge against any one and have him shut up. If the Ross rifle is not right, why is not the manufacture of it stopped? If the Government were to break the contract, what is the worst that could result? The worst would be a merely monetary loss through a successful action for damages for violation of the contract. But, technically, an action could not even be begun against the Government without the Government's own consent. I do not depend upon that however. What I say is that, even admitting the Government's contention, the very worst that could happen would be a suit against them for damages. Well, the Government assumes that our sons ought to be armed with some other

rifle than the Ross rifle. What, then, is the situation? The situation is, that they are putting in the balance on one side a possible monetary loss through a suit for damages and on the other side the proper or improper equipment of our boys, and they are allowing the prospect of monetary loss to outweigh the proper arming of our boys. I cannot see it in any other way. And the manufacture of a rifle is to continue which the Government say cannot be used. We are spending millions of money, and we are going to spend all that is needed for the successful prosecution of this war. I think, to, that Canada will get all the men that have been asked for if the people are properly approached and properly guided. But we must not acquiesce in the idea that anything in the way of a monetary loss by the country or by the manufacturer of these rifles should stand in the way of the boys at the front having the best rifle that they can get, or that the expenditure of money on a rifle that is not going to be used should be continued. The Finance Minister quite properly delivers lectures on thrift, but how can he reasonably advise ordinary people to stop spending money on things they do not need when he is handing out money for a rifle which he says will not be used? The answer is: "We have a contract signed." Under the present circumstances that answer is no answer, even if the contract has been signed. Considerations of this kind must be put aside in the face of the great crisis which presents itself. The results of a proper course of action in this respect might not be welcome to some, but to many families in Canada the results of the present policy will be much more unwelcome than the cancellation of this contract would be. I shall not enter into an argument as to the merits of the rifle. The Government have given their judgment that the rifle is not serviceable; therefore they should at once stop having these rifles manufactured and asking the people to pay for what they are not going to use.

What can the Government do if they want to manufacture the Lee-Enfield rifle, as they say they do? I believe that we ought to have in Canada a concern for the manufacture of an arm for ourselves. No one denies that there is in this country a large equipment and a staff of expert men. I am informed that the British Government are prepared now, and have been for some months, to send over machinery and equipment to the Ross rifle factory for the manufacture of the Lee-Enfield rifle. The duty of the Government is plain. No matter what the monetary consequences may be, stop manufacturing a rifle that you do not purpose using, take advantage of the offer of the British Government, bring over machinery and equipment and begin at once to manufacture a rifle which the experts of this Government say is the one that our men at the front should use. The necessity of winning the war is paramount to everything else, and, if it cannot be done through an arrangement with Sir Charles Ross, I would go so far as to say that we should nationalize the Ross rifle concern, take advantage of the offer of the British Government and proceed at once to manufacture a rifle which we can use.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. gentleman has worked himself up into a state of excitement—

Mr. GRAHAM: I am in earnest, not excited.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: —upon a suggestion which, if he had stopped for a moment to think, he would not have made. He is speaking of the manufacture of these rifles in connection with the arm which is used by the Canadian forces at the front. I have explained at least half a dozen times since this debate began that the Canadian Expeditionary Forces at the front are supplied with the Lee-Enfield rifle and that the British Government have entered into a definite engagement to that end. When my hon. friend, therefore, introduces the bogie of the Canadian forces at the front being supplied with Ross rifles which are to be paid for out of this vote, he introduces a suggestion which, if he had paid any attention to the debate, he would have known to be of no relevancy whatever.

Mr. GRAHAM: The rifles, then, are not going to be used?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The rifles will be used for certain purposes, just as the Ross rifles which are being supplied to the British Government under their order will be used for certain purposes.

Mr. OLIVER: Will they be used for war or for peace purposes?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They will be used in the training of our men, and they may, as I have said already, be used in warfare under different conditions. There is a difference of opinion about the merits of the Ross rifle. I have never ventured an opinion on the merits of the rifle, because I do not

possess sufficient knowledge and experience in such matters to make my opinion of any value. I have to go, therefore, by the opinions of others who have the requisite knowledge and experience in this respect. The member for South Renfrew seems to be under the impression that it would be merely a question of paying an amount equal to the profits on the manufacture of the rifle, or something of that kind, if we cancelled this contract at once. In the contract as made by the Government of which the hon. member of South Renfrew was a member, no authority was reserved for cancelling it. If we should say to the Ross Rifle Company: "We will not accept your rifles," what would be the result? The material for those rifles has been obtained, and the parts have very largely been constructed. The parts have not yet been assembled, but if I mistake not very little will remain to be done after March 31 except the assembling. The result of such a proposal as that made by my hon. friend, therefore, would be that we would have to pay for these 80,000 rifles and would not get them for any purposes for which they might be found useful. I should not suppose that any person possessing ordinary common sense would suggest that this be done.

Mr. GRAHAM: Neither would I.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is precisely what my hon. friend suggests, if he i aware of the facts.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not at all.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What does he suggest, then?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have suggested it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If the hon. gentleman's suggestion means anything at all, it means precisely what I have stated.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not at all.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. gentleman either was not very sincere in his remarks—which of course, I do not suggest, or, he did not understand what he was talking about.

Mr. GRAHAM: Thank you.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I venture to say that the hon. gentleman did not know the extent to which the manufacture of these rifles has procceded, in the production of the various parts which will eventually be assembled into the completed rifle. If we took the course which he suggests, the net result would be that we would pay for the rifles, but would not get them.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am not going to take any part in the discussion of this contract. I have not interfered in any orders in connection with the Ross rifle practically since the war began, because both political parties in days gone by have yielded to improper influences in seeking to make a political football of the manufacture of the Ross rifle under the inspiration of interested parties across the water. In our experience in South Africa we found that the Lee-Enfield rifle jammed repeatedly. I did not want to take up this line of argument, but I purpose doing it owing to the trend that the discussion has taken. I say that the Lee-Enfield rifle jammed repeatedly in South Africa. I can point you to the records of the British House of Commons which show that British officers said that to put that rifle in the hands of their soldiers in South Africa was murdering them. More of their own men, they said, were injured by the Lee-Enfield rifle, owing to the defects of it, than were injured by the Boer Mauser rifle. The British experience in South Africa was that, again and again, not only did the Lee-Enfield jam, but it burst. We all had that experience in South Africa. Then it was found in South Africa that the bolts dropped out very readily. We have had none of that with the Ross rifle. The Lee-Enfield rifle in South Africa was very badly sighted; some of the rifles fired to the left, some fired to the right. Towards the close of the war we got some of them to fire accurately, but the sighting of the rifle was very bad. So we had seven or eight very serious objections to the Lee-Enfield rifle in South Africa. As a result of that the British Government purposed changing their rifle. The British Lee-Enfield private arsenals unfortunately were owned, and are owned to-day, by German interests. I make that statement without fear of contradiction—

Mr. LEMIEUX: A serious statement.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The stock may have been transferred, but they were owned by German authorities, who fought and opposed any change in the British rifle, planning for this war. When this matter was realized, it was decided by the Canadian Government to take up a new rifle. The Mannlicher, a long, quick-firing rifle, was used extensively by the Boers in South Africa. It was not of as long range as the Mauser or the Lee-Enfield, but it was an excellent rapid-fire gun. It was a straight pull rifle the same as the Ross, only with a

different mechanism. It was an excellent rifle for any range short of 800 yards, up to close quarters, and we learned to our cost what that rapid-fire rifle meant in South Africa. Accordingly I have yet to see the man who knew anything about a rifle—and there are a great many people making motions about rifles here who do not know the butt end of a rifle from the muzzle—

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is the British War Office aware that the Lee-Enfield is controlled and owned by German firms?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I said the private factories. The British factories make the Lee-Enfield, but there are also private factories that make the Lee-Enfield.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Have they received any orders during the war?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I presume they are turning them out right along. The stock, previous to the war, was held by German interests, and that was known in England; I presume that the British authorities knew of it.

Mr. OLIVER: Does the hon. member suggest that General French or General Haig is in league with Germans?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Neither has said a word against the Ross rifle.

Mr. OLIVER: The hon. gentleman cannot read.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Oh yes, I can.

Mr. OLIVER: Then you cannot understand.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Oh, yes, I can understand, but my hon. friend is so thick in the head that he cannot understand. There is not a word in any report from General Haig or General French saying that the Ross is inferior to the Lee-Enfield or that there has ever been a comparative test.

Mr. PARDEE: What about General Alderson, does he understand rifles?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not think he would know the butt from the muzzle.

Mr. OLIVER: What rifles are the Canadians using in France?

Sir SAM HUGHES: The Lee-Enfield at present.

Mr. OLIVER: The Lee-Enfield?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes, the Lee-Enfield, I am very sorry to say. The whole mistake in this matter was this; when the Canadians were sent over we armed them with Ross rifles, and when any attempt was made to change anything, the British authorities should have been told: These are Canadian troops; that is made in Canada, we have equipped these men in this way, and it is none of your business; we are responsible for what these men carry and what these men do and we are willing to assume the responsibility. If we had done that and told these gentlemen to keep their hands off, the thing would have been all right. I understand there has been a report read, containing the answer to the ten questions. Suggestions were sent around for weeks by somebody's inspiration, little printed slips were sent around to our troops asking questions about the Ross rifle. These men, having experience of the retreat, the horrible retreat, the murderous retreat of the British soldiers, from Mons to the Marne, where thousands and tens of thousands went down, as the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) might say, murdered, not by the Lee-Enfield rifle, but by the British ammunition—three factories turned out bad ammunition that jammed the rifles. That was the Lee-Enfield rifle; there was not a Ross rifle on the continent at that time. The Lee-Enfield rifle jammed over and over and over again. The Munsters were shot to pieces, the Gordons and the Guards were shot to pieces by the jamming of rifles with bad ammunition. And yet this gentleman from Edmonton, with the opportunity of getting at these facts, stands up and blames the jamming on the Ross rifle.

Mr. OLIVER: What rifle had the Canadians when they were shot to pieces?

Sir SAM HUGHES: They had bad ammunition, that is what they had.

Mr. OLIVER: That is not what Sir Douglas Haig said.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, that is what he says.

Mr. OLIVER: No it is not.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I happen to know. These ten questions were sent around week after week. The boys, most of them, had been accustomed to the Lee-Enfield, and any new rifle coming in, to which they were not accustomed, would naturally be a little odd to them. I quite well remember that when the Snider-Enfield rifle gave place to the Martini, there was any amount of objection. The boys wanted to stick to the Snider-

Enfield. So when the Lee-Enfield came in and took the place of the Martini, the boys wanted to stick to the Martini. So when the Lee-Enfield in turn gave place to the Ross, a number of the soldiers were afraid that the bolt would blow back; they did not understand the mechanism and naturally objected to the straight pull. One of these questions was: Do you not find the Ross rifle a little heavy? The Ross rifle with bayonet is of the same weight as the Lee-Enfield with bayonet. Another question was: Don't you find the Ross rifle too short in the bayonet? The idea there was that the other fellow would get at him in using the bayonet, forgetting that a long rifle with a long bayonet is far easier to thrust aside than a short rifle with a short bayonet. Why I saw Henry Godwin, with a little dagger, beat the champion of the British Army with rifle and bayonet. It is not the length of the rifle and bayonet but the way it is handled; and then, too, the leverage that can be exerted on the end of a long rifle and bayonet by an opponent is much greater than in the case of a short rifle and bayonet, so that the long rifle and bayonet can be more easily thrust aside and is so less useful in the attack. These questions were sent around and there is not one of them that could not be answered in favour of the Ross rifle. General French never had a comparative test. I asked him to have an official test of the two rifles, I offered to let him pick his best experts in England and I would pick the best experts in the Canadian Army, and if I did not trim him to a finish on every point I would agree to swallow the two rifles—a rather difficult job to perform. We have had a lot of talk and nonsense about this thing and therefore I want it clearly understood, in reading these ten question, that not one of them is borne out by any comparative test ever produced in France.

I challenge the Prime Minister to produce a solitary comparative test—he cannot do it, because I have gone into this and fought it out. It is like many another thing. For instance, why did we pay $5,240 for trucks when our own better ones are now running while these are in the ditch, and ours could have been had for $2,800? Because I bowed, foolishly bowed—I should have resigned from the Cabinet or forced the issue of our being allowed to run our own show. Then why was our Oliver equipment discarded? I passed through with the Prime Minister and we only saw two or three regiments, apart from the Canadians, equipped with the Webb equipment. I saw more Canadians with Webb equipment than British soldiers. This is the way this humbug goes on up and down. The inspection and throwing out of our material has been simply, to my mind, a scandal. We had another report—I wonder if that was read? Was that report from General Alderson to General Gwatkin read? Has the Prime Minister ever made any inquiry as to where that report came from?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: How it got out?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes. To whom did General Gwatkin hand that report?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I asked about that and I understood it got out without his authority or knowledge. I do not know how.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Then why was General Gwatkin not dismissed?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend was responsible for it.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Oh, no, pardon me, I was not responsible for it. If I had been he would have gone long ago, and the Prime Minister knows it. With regard to this report of Alderson's, Sir Max Aitken and General Carson told me that defective ammunition was being issued. This was after the affair, to which I referred the other evening, concerning the 28th Battalion under Colonel Embury.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Where did the defective ammunition come from?

Sir SAM HUGHES: There were three brands of it. I think two were British and one was from the United States but one was Canadian. I want to say that none of our ammunition turned out bad. I forget the names of the brands.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They are all on record.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes, they are on record. The three brands were defective and no rifle could have fired them. One of them was so deadly that to have sent men to the firing line with it would have been simply murder. We found an ordnance officer attached to Canadian headquarters issuing that ammunition to the extent of 5,000 rounds which were placed in the pouches of one battalion which was in the blow-up. I have no hesitation in saying that that ordnance officer should have been led out and shot, and if I had been running the show I would have carried that out. I

protested, and demanded his dismissal, but he is there yet, I understand.

An hon. MEMBER: What happened at St. Julien?

Sir SAM HUGHES: At St. Julien, the Ross rifle was used. The only real rifle victory in this war was fought and won by the Ross rifle, and half of the boys were using bad ammunition at that.

About this Alderson or Gwatkin report—I want the Prime Minister to take note of this, and perhaps Gwatkin will get a ticket for home next week—that report was based on a test between two boys to show that it was bad ammunition. Following upon the Embury affair, General Alderson sent Sir Max Aitken and General Carson each a copy of the report. Each off his own bat wrote him that the report was false, that no such test had ever been held, that it was only a test of ammunition and not of the rifle. One of them pointed out to me moreover that one of the boys who took part in the test, a boy from Millbrook, had never fired a rifle 50 times in his lifetime. He was driving a motor engine and was picked out to test the defective cartridges. When an officer who understood the use of a rifle took it, the test showed that the Lee-Enfield rifle jammed far more frequently than the Ross rifle. They wired to General Alderson, and one of them wrote and sent a corrected report, and yet General Gwatkin did not hand that report out with the other, although, as a matter of fact, it came on the same mail. No explanation was given to the House, and the correcting report was not given out to the press at the same time as the other. There is no doubt that the world put two and two together. Nobody could know of the conspiracy in one of my departments, and this was part and parcel of the conspiracy from start to finish. And yet these gentlemen are there to-day.

There is another matter to which I would refer. The Princess Patricia's battalion went to the front carrying the Lee-Enfield rifle. They were cut to pieces through their rifles jamming. I have letters from the late Colonel Farquhar telling me about it. At that time they had not discovered that the jamming was due to bad ammunition, and he thought it was due to the dirt. He wrote saying " Fix all the boys up with oilcloths, and tell them to take the bolt out, and wipe it clean with the oilcloth," because he said the rifles jammed over and over again with the dirt. A young fellow, a captain from Calgary, told me a week or two ago that when he was in the firing line—he was then a private—they carried sticks and the staves of barrels so as to smash open the bolts in their rifles, which were Lee-Enfields, when they jammed. We did not hear anything of this because there was no one interested in decrying the Lee-Enfield rifle. I would not decry it now but for the course taken by certain gentlemen in this House. The Lee-Enfield was found defective in South Africa; it was rejected by the Japanese Government eighteen years ago as being absolutely unfit for service. It was unfit for service then and it is unfit to-day compared with the Ross rifle. The chamber of the Ross rifle was found to be slightly smaller, and we enlarged it, and every possible objection to the rifle was removed thereby.

There is another matter that I desire to bring up while I am on my feet—I did not intend speaking on this question at all. I have received several cablegrams from officers of certain battalions at the front in the firing line stating that their battalions are going to be broken up to make way for certain other battalions. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has referred to the Highland Brigade of Nova Scotia being broken up. The Prime Minister will recollect that when Nova Scotia sent its first battalion—it was really only half a battalion—the boys were splendid; there were none finer in the world, but that the men did not reflect the credit on the province that they should have done because they did not go into the firing line as a battalion, but were kept as reserves. Individually, they were magnificent, but they did not have the opportunity of doing credit to the province that they would have liked to have had. When the Highland Brigade of Nova Scotia was organized I felt a little keen in regard to the matter because of what had happened, and I took the matter up with the Prime Minister. With his authority I gave my solemn pledge to the officers of the brigade and to the committee that had helped to organize it, that it would be kept intact. The Prime Minister may recall that on one occasion he spoke to me about the 85th Battalion. I said, "For heaven's sake, let us carry out one pledge we have made to the people of Nova Scotia." I merely recall that to the Prime Minister. I gave the same pledge to the Irish Battalion of Montreal. We had Scotch Battalions, English Battalions, Canadian Battalions and darkie battalions, and when the Irishmen of Montreal got their battalion together I thought it was only just to give them the

promise and to carry it out, that they would go as a regiment to the front. I did the same with the 104th Battalion of New Brunswick. Every one who knows our history will remember that in 1812 the old 104th marched all through to Canada, as it was at that time, through the wilds in a Canadian winter. When the 104th Battalion was organized for this war we gave the people of New Brunswick to understand that that regiment would be held intact. The same held good of the 105th Battalion from Prince Edward Island. These were the regiments that were to be held intact. That was the plan, and I have seen and heard nothing to cause me to deviate from it to-day.

I may point out that Camp Borden trained more men during the past summer than there are training in England to-day, that Camp Hughes, in Manitoba, trained more men during the past summer than are in England training to-day, and that Valcartier and other camps have trained almost as many, and yet we do not find a resident Minister of Militia at Camp Borden, at Camp Hughes, or at Camp Valcartier. Why all this paraphernalia should be introduced in London, I have never been able to find out. General Carson, with Colonel George Murphy, and thirty-one assistants, ran the business, and when any hon. gentleman asked for any news of his friends at the front he got an answer within a few days. When any hon. gentleman asked if any one was wounded or wanted a report about any one, he got his answer in a very few days from General Carson. To-day you get nothing. General Carson with only thirty-one officers could keep the work going, train men, and send them to the front and win battles, whereas to-day I am told there are 700 assistants, costing $6,000,000 a year, as the result of the action of the Minister of Finance when he ordered the Prime Minister to appoint an Overseas Minister; I forget what he was going to do. We find all that saddled on the country, and I presume to-night the Minister of Finance is preaching thrift and economy to the people of Ottawa.

My plan, and I want it emphasized, and I want the Prime Minister to consider it, was this: We have four divisions at the front. Now I cannot see why we should not have six or even eight, if we have plenty of men in England, and if they are well looked after. I would not run all the new divisions in fresh, but I would do so gradually, after the boys have got in harness and been trained. We need not hold any more of the front than now, but this plan would always allow us to have two divisions in rest. It would absorb the Nova Scotia Highland Brigade, the Quebec Brigade, including the Irish Regiment, the regiments from the eastern townships, the French Canadian regiments, the New Brunswick Brigade, and regiments from the West. Every corps would then have its local representation from all over the Dominion, not necessarily battalion units, because battalions from most localities are now broken up, but taking five or eight battalions from Ontario we could have one part of them as the active brigade, and the other part could be kept in training for details. I worked out the plan with the War Office, with Sir Douglas Haig, and Sir William Robertson, and it met with the approval of every one of them, and for the life of me I cannot see why the plan has not been carried out. This plan would obviate the necessity of breaking up the Nova Scotia Highland Brigade, the New Brunswick Brigade, the Prince Edward Island Battalion, the Irish Regiment of Montreal, the Quebec Battalion and others, and there would be no trouble whatever. Then in the spring, if a drive comes, instead of having four divisions we should have six divisions trained during the winter months, and they would be ready for any drive that might come along. Our losses with the six divisions would be no more than with the four, because we should be holding no more of the front. Our losses would be less per brigade, although the total might be the same.

I might point out that if it had been distinctly understood there was to be no monkeying with the Ross rifle, no changes at all, there would not have been one word more about it. Let me point out further, in regard to Sir John French's report—and I do not blame Sir John French for that report, for it was concocted by the same people who sent over these other reports. I do not blame Sir John French for the statements he made, for he only accepted the statements of Alderson, and the report was made up for Alderson by some of these whippersnappers who have been mentioned, and who knew nothing of a rifle, and whose only ambition was to get rid of everything of Canadian make. Sir John French says in his report that he found 3,000 Lee-Enfields already in the division. I told Sir John French that the British regulars would come along at night, when they did not

have an opportunity in the day time, and steal the Ross rifle for their snipers and sharpshooters. The British regulars soon realized the deadly value of the Ross rifle for that kind of work. In the morning our fellows would find their Ross rifles gone and Lee-Enfields left in their stead.

I did not intend to say anything about this matter, but was prompted to do so by the trend given to the debate by some hon. gentleman recalling the old days when some hon. gentlemen who did not belong to the Liberal persuation attacked the Ross rifle. It strikes me that it is not well for the Ross rifle or for the welfare of the troops that this criticism has been launched. The only trouble with the Ross rifle has been bad ammunition. The Lee-Enfields have jammed over and over again. The Ross rifle has jammed over and over again with bad ammunition, but it has not jammed nearly so badly as the Lee-Enfield has jammed.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF: I should like to say a word before the motion is put. We have just listened to a very serious charge by the ex-Minister of Militia against not only this Government but the British Government as well. He says that the Lee-Enfield is no good now, and that it was no good at the time of the South African war. What must we think of this Government and the British Government if the statements made by the ex-Minister of Militia are true? He takes the position that he knows all about the merits of the Ross rifle, and that the chief military authorities in Great Britain and all the members of the British Government know absolutely nothing whatever about it, and he says that the Lee-Enfield rifle is not a fit weapon to put into the hands of our soldiers, let alone the British soldiers. That is a very serious charge to make, and I think some one on the Government benches should have something to say about it. I will not go any further into that; it is a matter for the Government to deal with, and surely the British Government might take notice of it too. If, then, the Ross rifle is declared to be no good by one who claims to know everything about it—

Sir SAM HUGHES: I said the ammunition was no good. I did not say the rifle was no good.

Mr. TURRIFF: He said that the Lee-Enfield was no good in South Africa and no good in the present war, and that on every occasion when a test was made the Ross rifle proved superior to the Lee-Enfield. The ex-minister will not deny that.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Hear, hear.

Mr. TURRIFF: He has the courage of his convictions, and is not afraid to stand by them on the floor of Parliament. While I cannot agree with the ex-minister, I certainly admire his courage in standing by what he believes to be true. My hon. friend does not say that it was bad ammunition. He says the Lee-Enfield was not a good rifle.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I said that in this war neither the Ross rifle nor the Lee-Enfield had jammed with good ammunition.

Mr. TURRIFF: I accept my hon. friend's explanation.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It is not an explanation; it is my statement.

Mr. TURRIFF: There are one or two things that seem to stand out in the strong light of day in connection with the Ross rifle. Efforts have been made by the Government to show that they were bound to accept the Ross rifle under the contract made by the late Government. But the contract did not provide that the rifle had to be the Ross rifle. The company had to furnish any rifle the Government approved of, and the Government had the right at any time to change the specifications of the Ross rifle that was being manufactured for them. No matter what is said to the contrary, this Government is absolutely responsible for the Ross rifle that is being put in the hands of our Canadian soldiers. I am not going to hold the Government responsible for what happened before the war. There is no question that the Ross rifle is a good target rifle, and probably one of the best sporting rifles in the world, but soon after the war started, as soon as our Canadian troops were engaged in the spring of 1915, it was demonstrated that the Ross rifle was an absolutely unsuitable weapon for our soldiers in the trenches. That is the report of everybody.

Mr. EDWARDS: When was that demonstrated?

Mr. TURRIFF: In the spring of 1915.

Mr. EDWARDS: Before that it had not been demonstrated.

Mr. TURRIFF: I say that it was demonstrated in the first battles in which the Canadian soldiers used the Ross rifle. I know that in the spring of 1915 the British authorities in the field re-armed the First

Division with the Lee-Enfield rifle. Previous to that time word was coming back every day of the week from the Canadian soldiers at the front that the Ross rifle was absolutely unsatisfactory, and that on every occasion where it was possible for a Canadian soldier to throw away his Ross rifle and pick up a Lee-Enfield, he did so. Now, do you think that the Canadian soldiers in the First Division, our own people were all crazy; that they were led astray by the manufacturers of the Lee-Enfield rifle in Great Britain; that these men who were fighting and giving their lives for their country did not know one rifle from the another, did not know whether the Ross rifle was a good one or a poor one?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Might I point out to my hon. friend that it was not until October, 1915, that the Canadians seemed to realize that bad ammunition was the cause of the trouble?

Mr. TURRIFF: Then all I have to say is that the British war authorities took action a long time before the Canadian soldiers found out that the Ross rifle was not a satisfactory rifle, because in the spring of 1915 the First Division was rearmed with Lee-Enfield rifles. I hold the Government responsible from that time forward. I do not hold the Government responsible up to that time; but when, in the spring of 1915, now almost two years ago, they got word that the Ross rifle was an unsatisfactory war weapon—and they got that information from the men carrying the rifles and also from the British authorities—

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is the Government to be condemned for not observing the British regulations? The British authorities threw out the trucks for the First Division, and then, for the Second Division, I refused to have the trucks changed.

Mr. TURRIFF: That is a matter in regard to which the ex-Minister of Militia and the Prime Minister of Canada are at daggers drawn, the Prime Minister of Canada can deal with that question. I have seen a good deal of correspondence between my hon. friend and the Prime Minister and I am free to admit that the ex-Minister of Militia got the best of that correspondence.

Sir SAM HUGHES: And I will get the best too when it comes to a comparison between the Ross rifle and the Lee-Enfield rifle.

[Mr. Turriff.]

Mr. TURRIFF: If my hon. friend can do that, he is a better man than I think he is, because it does not seem reasonable to me that the British Government, the war ministers, and the generals of Great Britain who are fighting in the fields of France and Flanders to-day can all be fooled or bribed by the Germans. I do not believe that for one moment, and I do not believe the people of Canada or the people of Great Britain will take the view of the ex-Minister of Militia as against that of the British Government, the war generals and the Government of Canada.

Sir SAM HUGHES: May I point this out to my hon. friend? I do not suppose one out of a hundred thousand ever heard anything about the matter. It has been shown that reports are allowed to pass through without ever being read.

Mr. TURRIFF: That may be. What I want to do is to show that this Government is responsible for the condition of things in which we find ourselves to-day. I say again that in the spring of 1915, this Government had absolute evidence to show that the Ross rifle was unsatisfactory. Even if they do stick to the strict letter of the law and even if it is a fact that it takes a year to make a change in the manufacture of a rifle, had the Government done its duty, then almost a year ago we could have been supplying a new rifle, but as a matter of fact, no one knows better than hon. members sitting on the Government benches that it does not take a year to change the manufacture of a rifle. They know that under the contract they could have changed the pattern of the rifle, and anybody knows that a great deal of the machinery that is established in a rifle factory is exactly the same whether it is used for the manufacture of a Lee-Enfield or for the manufacture of a Ross rifle. Had the Government acted as they should have acted and taken steps at once to have a new rifle made when they found the Ross rifle was not satisfactory there would have been no need to have stopped the manufacture of rifles. The machinery could have been so changed that within six months the factory could have been turning out either a Lee-Enfield rifle, or the pattern of the Lee-Enfield that is now being manufactured in the United States for the British Government, or any other type of rifle that the Government chose to have manufactured. But they did not do that. They went on manufacturing the Ross rifle in spite of the fact

that they knew it was not satisfactory and that the Canadian soldiers of the First Division had thrown away their rifles whenever they could and that they had been re-armed wth the Lee-Enfield rifles. That was the condition of affairs from the spring of 1915 to the spring of 1916. Then the matter is crowded more and more on the attention of the Government. The British authorities took the matter into their own hands and refused to arm the Canadian soldiers with Ross rifles, and they notified this Government as far back as May last that they were going to re-arm the Canadian soldiers with the Lee-Enfield rifle as they went across from Great Britain to France. Why did not the Government even then, one year after they received the first intimation that the Ross rifle was not a satisfactory weapon, make the change? My hon. friends on the Government benches know perfectly well that they could have had those changes made in a short time; that the factory was prepared to make the changes and that the factory suggested that changes should have been made in the rifle that was being turned out, a rifle that our soldiers were being armed with and a rifle that they threw away whenever they got an opportunity to pick up another one.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What changes did the hon. gentleman say we should have made that were suggested by the Ross Rifle Company?

Mr. TURRIFF: Does my hon. friend say that no changes were ever suggested by the Ross Rifle Company?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know what the hon. gentleman refers to? He says that the Ross Rifle Company suggested changes which we should have made. When he says that, he ought to know what the changes are; and if he knows what they are, he ought to tell us.

Mr. TURRIFF: I ask my hon. friend, who is a member of the Government: Were changes ever suggested by the Ross Rifle Company?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am sorry I cannot answer. I do not know what the hon. gentleman is driving at. When I make a statement I will give the evidence in support of it. I am asking the hon. gentleman to give the evidence in support of his statement.

Mr. TURRIFF: If my hon. friend, who is a member of the Government, cannot answer, how does he expect me, a private member, to answer? My hon. friend will not make the statement, and I challenge him to make the statement. He has made the statement that the Government was bound by the contract made by the late Government, and he has not yet substantiated that statement. If he can do so, we would like to hear him; but my hon. friend has taken good care not to make the statement that no changes were ever suggested by the company manufacturing the Ross rifle. My hon. friend has not made that statement, and I do not think he purposes making it, because he knows he will be getting into deep water if he does. In May or June of last year the British Government said: Don't send over any more Ross rifles.

Mr. EDWARDS: Did the Ross Rifle Company suggest to the Government that any changes should be made in the rifle, and if so, what changes?

Mr. TURRIFF: Now, my hon. friend is trying to take upon himself the duties of the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen). We all give the Solicitor General credit for being very clever, and able, and sharp, and I think that if he did not make much progress it would be unwise for the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) to try. Last spring the British Government said: Don't send over any more Ross rifles. The Ross rifle is the one that had been in the hands of our Canadian boys at the front. I have heard men who have been in the trenches, and have been fortunate enough to come back, say that in hundreds of cases our Canadian boys have stood with their Ross rifles, jammed and useless in their hands and the Germans have come up and shot them in their tracks. I say again, the Government is responsible to a very large extent for much of the loss of life that occurred through the Canadian soldiers being armed with the Ross rifle long after the Government knew that that rifle was unsatisfactory as a war weapon. We have information, I do not know how true, that a number of Ross rifles—we are told, tens of thousands of them—were tampered with in an effort to improve them, by men either at the front or in Great Britain; that the bolt was taken out and tempered, and was so hardened that it became as brittle as glass, so that in many cases the little knob that keeps the bolt from flying out broke off like a piece of glass and the rifle became useless after firing a few shots. That was done under the regime of the Prime

Minister, and we have never heard of any punishment being meted out to the men who tampered with that rifle. Yet these rifles were put into the hands of our soldiers without being tested, after this tempering of the bolt had been done. Who is responsible? Is it the Prime Minister, or is it the ex-Minister of Militia? That mistake cost the lives of hundreds of Canadian boys.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I might point out that the hon. gentleman is wrong. These rifles were put into the hands of soldiers, training in camp in England, and the tempering or tampering, was detected. Those rifles never got to the front.

Mr. TURRIFF: I understand that this tempering was done in England.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Let us explain. After the tempering had been done the rifles were put into the hands of soldiers to be used, and the discovery of the defects was made in England before the troops crossed.

Mr. TURRIFF: On whose authority was that tempering done?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I never got to the bottom of it. It was only last year that it occurred, and it is one of the things I was working at when I came home.

Mr. TURRIFF: At all events, it appears that authority was given by somebody to do this tempering, and these rifles were put into the hands of our boys, and hundreds of them lost their lives on account of the rifle proving useless. Not having proper inspection they—

Sir SAM HUGHES. Let me correct the hon. gentleman. Not one of the rifles with a bad bolt got to the front. It is not true what the hon. gentleman says about our boys losing their lives through this—perfect nonsense. If the rifle jammed, it was due to bad ammunition and not to the rifle itself. I examined the matter critically and am confident that that is the case. What harm would happen if the knob of the bolt broke off? If the weapon was defective, the man had only to pick up another one. But this tempering was done in England. As soon as I heard of it, I ordered an inquiry, and this was under way when I came home.

Mr. EDWARDS: When was this?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Last year.

Mr. TURRIFF: Here we have the statement that this was done apparently without the knowledge or authority of the Minister of Militia of that day. Was it done behind his back by his collegues or was it done by somebody in the Old Country? My opinion is that many of those rifles, thousands of them, got across to France and Belgium, and in the time of battle they proved useless after the first few shots. I have talked with returned soldiers, and officers too. The ex-Minister of Militia said that what I have said is absurd—that any man lost his life through the rifle jamming. I have heard these men say that they have seen scores of men shot down with rifles in their hands they could not use.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Due to bad amunition.

Mr. TURRIFF: Well, there is the position of affairs. And in the face of all this the Prime Minister asks this Committee to vote $2,666,000 to buy more Ross rifles.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I challenge the hon. gentleman to give the name of an officer who has seen a score of men shot down.

Mr. TURRIFF: I have their word for it, and I would take the word of an officer who has been in battle as quickly as I would take the word of the ex-Minister of Militia. I have been told not only by officers but by men that these things have occurred. Why has the rifle been changed? We are asked to vote the money for the manufacture of 80,000 additional Ross rifles, a large number already delivered, and a large number not yet delivered nor even manufactured. Surely the time for the Government to cancel the contract for the Ross rifle was when the British Government sent word that they did not want any more Ross rifles sent to Great Britain, and that they would arm the Canadian soldiers with Lee-Enfields. Surely that was the time to let the matter stand in abeyance until the necessary machinery could be put in to manufacture the Lee-Enfield or any other rifle that the Government decided upon. But my hon. friends did not take that means of getting a good rifle to put into the hands of the soldiers; in spite of the advice of the British Government, they continued to manufacture the Ross rifle. My right hon. friend now asks for $2,666,000 to manufacture a rifle which, generally speaking, will not be used for war purposes, but will be utilized for training the men in Great Britain. But it is not necessary to pay $28 for a dummy rifle with which the soldiers may drill and learn how to handle a rifle. You could get something to take the place of a rifle for drilling purposes at a

cost of $1, or, at the most $2. My right hon. friend, however, purposes spending $2,666,000 for a rifle which will not be used in war except under certain circumstances; which is not going to be sent to France or Belgium, where the fighting is going on—and he is going to continue purchasing this rifle for months to come. This is an absurd position for the Government to take, and the people will hold the Government responsible, not only for the kind of rifle that they have put into the hands of the soldiers, but also for the waste of money in purchasing rifles that are not going to be used. It is such a waste of money that the only thing that I can compare it with is the extravagance of this Government in everything connected with the war.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Solicitor-General): Mr. Chairman, the Government is in the position to-night of being attacked from the opposite side of the House because we authorized the substitution of Lee-Enfield rifles for the Ross rifles too late, and as a result are blamable before the people of Canada—and, at the same time we are attacked by the ex-Minister of Militia because we authorized this substitution too soon. It is rather amusing to observe the efforts of hon. gentlemen opposite making their attack from one viewpoint with all the vigour in their power, watching the ex-Minister of Militia making his attack from the opposite viewpoint with the vigour that he is capable of, and at the same time struggling desperately to keep on sympathetic terms with the ex-Minister of Militia. I desire to assure the committee that between the two the members of the Government feel quite comfortable in the belief that the entire course pursued by the Administration with regard to rifles has been the right course; that the substitution was made at the right time, not too soon not too late, made at the only time when in the eyes of intelligent and impartial men we could justify it to the people of Canada.

I would not undertake on any occasion to discuss the comparative merits of the two rifles; no one is less capable of that discussion than I. We cannot be governed as members of the Administration by our own views of the comparative merits of the rifles; we must be governed by the views of those whose opinions are entitled to be the controlling factor in the decision of such a vital question. We have been governed by the views of those men; we have followed their views and the results have justified our decision.

If I may be allowed to make one remark as to what principle I think should be followed in the matter of the selection of a standard rifle for Canada it would be that we should use the same rifle as is adopted as the result of experience by Great Britain herself; that our rifle should be the same rifle as hers, and that the combined wisdom of the two countries should be at the back of whatever rifle is used. That has not been the case in Canada for many years, and those responsible for that not being the case are the hon. gentlemen who sit opposite. They are the persons who, in 1902, undertook to establish a standard service arm for this country; who pinned the fate of this country in peace and war to that arm, and who did so in defiance of the judgment of the authorities in Great Britain. The Liberal Government of Canada entered into a contract on March 27, 1902, for the production of a rifle in Canada of which they were to supply a standard sample to the Ross Rifle Company. They later established a factory on the hill at Quebec and they made that selection in defiance of the advice of the officer commanding the troops in Canada, who informed them that in his judgment it was by no means a suitable place for the establishment of a rifle factory. Political considerations seemed to have governed them from the first, while military considerations were left altogether in the background. Before they went ahead they received a protest from the War Office of Great Britain against the adoption in this or in any part of the British Empire of a standard rifle differing from the standard rifle adopted by Great Britain herself. In defiance of that protest they went ahead, adopted a standard rifle, the Ross rifle, Mark I, placed it with the Ross rifle Company, and manufactured that rifle for some years. They are the parties responsible for the adoption of that standard and for all the consequences that necessarily ensued, And, what consequences necessarily ensued? What consequences are attributable to the action of those who adopted this as the standard rifle of Canada?

They later altered the type in some respects, maintaining the main principle, and they called that the Ross rifle Mark II. Later they altered it again and they called that the Ross rifle Mark II ***, and that was the rifle adopted by the late Government until shortly before they went out of office.

The hon. member for Edmonton (Hon. Frank Oliver) speaking, I know, not intentionally in the wrong, but utilizing an article which appeared about a month ago in the Toronto Globe, made himself responsible for the assertion that it was this Government which changed from the Mark II to the Mark III rifle.

Mr OLIVER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He adheres to that still; he still clings to the Globe article of January 6 last, scarcely a line of which could be properly described as anything less than loathesome mendacity. I purpose establishing what I say. I do not think that the hon. member for Edmonton even yet intends to make a statement that is wrong.

Mr. OLIVER: He does not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He does not? I happen to have the order in council here, right in front of me, which was passed by the late Administration, adopting the Mark III rifle. No more suitable time than now is likely to present itself for reading that. It is dated October 2, 1911. For the purpose of fitting the story to the necessity of the argument, the Globe has dated it in November, 1911; but, unfortunately for the Globe, the order in council is dated October 2, 1911. Now, perhaps the hon. member for Edmonton will admit that he is wrong. Here is the order in council:

The Committee of the Privy Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Militia and Defence, advise that an order for 10,000 rifles, for delivery during the calendar year, 1912, be given to the Ross Rifle Company, subject to the provisions of the contract entered into with the company for the manufacture of rifles; and subject to the following further conditions:—

1. That no payment on progress estimates be paid on account of said 10,000 rifles until the Parliamentary appropriation for 1912-13 becomes available.

2. That the pattern of the rifles to be supplied shall be that known as Mark III.

Was that adopting the Mark III rifle? There is no answer. I read from the order in council:

Inasmuch, however, as this pattern has been adopted subject to final agreement on two minor points, viz.: the alteration of the gas vent and the extension of the wooden hand guards for the backsight, any order to be given to the company shall be made subject to the final acceptance of these two features.

Mr. OLIVER: Oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman say that the alteration of the gas vent and the extension of the wooden hand guards for the back sight make it a Mark II**?

Mr. OLIVER: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN (Reading):

As the contract provides that notice of any order for the delivery of rifles during any calendar year should be given to the contractors not later than the 30th September next preceding the beginning of that year, the present recommendation is being made in advance of a final settlement of the two minor points above mentioned, in order to insure delivery of the rifles required during the calendar year 1912.

And this order in council is signed by the Clerk of the Privy Council, and the original bears the autograph signature of Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Mr. OLIVER: Hear, hear.

Mr. PARDEE: Is it not so that the order for Mark III rifles was placed by the Conservative Administration?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Later orders were, but the first order is right there.

Mr. PARDEE: Oh, no.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is this not an order?

The Committee of the Privy Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Militia and Defence, advised that an order for 10,000 rifles for delivery during the current year 1912 be given to the Ross Rifle Company—

Mr. PARDEE: That is simply the ordinary notice. Was not that order placed by the Conservative Administration?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, the order was filled during our Administration. How could it have been otherwise? The hon. gentlemen were thrown out of power.

Mr. PARDEE: Quite so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But they adopted the Ross rifle Mark III before they resigned office, and authorized the giving of an order for 10,000 of these rifles.

Mr. OLIVER: Authorized.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, authorized and more—

Mr. OLIVER: Yes, and who gave the order?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The officers of the Militia Department. Who else?

Mr. OLIVER: Oh, no. There is a Minister of Militia, you know, in all Governments.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Might I point out to the Solicitor General that I think this is piffle. There is no use beating around the bush. The Ross rifle Mark III was authorized by Sir Frederick Borden, if I remember aright, in December, 1910.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is quite right.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I remember the whole thing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was seeing first how far these gentlemen would go. As a matter of fact, the notification to the Ross Rifle Company to readjust its factory to make Mark III rifles was served on the company by the Liberal Administration on December 28, 1910. It will be clear, of course, to every one that the hon. gentleman is still quite right in the assertion that the late Government was in no way committed to the Ross rifle Mark III.

Mr. OLIVER: The hon. gentleman did not make that assertion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That you were not committed to the rifle?

Mr. OLIVER: No, not at all. That is the assertion my hon. friend made.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understood the hon. gentleman to say it, and when I asked him if he meant it he repeated that he did.

Mr. OLIVER: Oh well, my hon. friend is mistaken, that is all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: So much for that. In this connection just to show the character of the criticism, just to show the length that newspapers and a certain militant section of hon. gentlemen opposite will go in order to make party capital out of a subject of this kind, let me say that after I made a short speech in Montreal sometime early in November last year in which I in no way attacked hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to this contract, in which I refrained from attack of any character and merely defended the present Administration against attacks which had been made, articles were sent broadcast throughout Canada under the pay of the Liberal party of this country to the effect that I had deceived the people of Montreal——

Mr. OLIVER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —because I had told them that the late Government had adopted the standard of rifle with which the soldiers of Canada went to the front in this war, and they said this: "This is a very flimsy excuse; the only rifle the late Government adopted was the Mark II**; it was not the Mark III which is a flimsy weapon—it was not the Mark III at all; that is the adoption of the Borden Government, asserted this article Mr. Meighen succeeded, one writer said, in mixing the babies. Where does the writer of that article, where do the newspapers that sent it throughout Canada stand in the face of the order in council with the signature of the late Prime Minister authorizing an order for Mark III rifles, and in face of the notification to adjust the factory to make Mark III rifle served on the 28th day of December, 1910, or almost a year before they went out of office? I do not criticise even yet the late Administration for the change from the Mark II** to the Mark III. It was a perfectly proper change. Perfectly proper for why? For one thing, as I am informed by militia authorities—I do not know myself—the Mark VII ammunition, which became the ammunition of the British Empire, will not fit into the Mark II**, but it will fit into the Mark III. There may have been other reasons, I make so criticism against the adoption of the rifle But why deceive the people of this country and make false and mendacious attacks?

Mr. OLIVER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN. It is said by hon. gentlemen opposite that this rifle of theirs was a fine target rifle and was a fine sporting rifle. Those are the words of the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). He says: That is all it was used for in our time and it worked very well for those purposes, and there our responsibilities end. I say to hon. gentlemen opposite that they did not surely adopt the Mark III as a sporting and target rifle. Was it to shoot bullseyes and partridges that we started the manufacture of these rifles at Quebec? They adopted it as a war rifle for the soldiers of Canada to use—for how long? To use in war until the time came when the proper authorities who should know best decided that there was a better rifle available. Is that common-sense or is it not? Is not that the proper time when the use of the rifle should cease? Is there any time earlier than that moment, when any Government would be justified in discarding the national arm of Canada and reverting to another arm? The moment, I repeat was when those in authority who best knew advised this Government that there was a better rifle available for our troops.

For whatever loss, if there was any,—I do not know because I was not there; the ex-Minister of Militia was there and he knows something about it—for such loss, if any, as resulted from the use of the Ross rifle more than would have resulted from the use of the Lee-Enfield up to the time when we were advised by responsible officers that a better rifle was available, hon. gentlemen opposite, and they alone, are responsible to the people of this country. When did that time come?

Perhaps before I enter upon this phase of my argument, I might revert to a few more of those attacks that have been made even to-night against the statement which I made, I think about as innocent a statement as human breath could make, that we were bound by the contract which the Government of Canada solemnly entered into. Yes, I did say in Montreal that we were bound by the contract of the late Administration, but I uttered a few more sentences right afterwards which are not quoted, which appeared in both the newspapers that reported the speech, but which are omitted designedly in order to give to the people of this country a false impression of what I said.

The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) is on the point to-night when he says that even although there is a contract, you have power under the War Measures Act to break it, and you ought never to put a measure of damages against the lives of the soldiers of Canada. No one subscribes to that doctrine more heartily than I do. No one subscribed to it in more specific terms than I did in the very speech which I made in Montreal. In that speech I said this: although that contract existed, and although in honour we were bound to it, there was in relation to that contract, as there is in relation to every other civil contract, the alternative of damages, an honourable alternative, and that if it had been possible for this Government to have got a better rifle to place in the hands of the troops of this country it would have been our duty to tear that contract in shreds and pay our damages like men. I said that there, and I repeat it now.

But was there a rifle that we could get that was better? Was there a rifle that we could get at that time upon which those who ought to know best, and do know best, had planted the imprint of their approval? Nay, was there a rifle of any kind that we could get at all? If there was I would be glad to hear what it was and where it was. If there was not, was it our duty to keep the Ross rifles, or was it not? I am not holding up a white flag. I am out here in the open. I am ready to discuss this thing to the ground, so far as I am able, and if any hon. gentleman opposite believes that I am making an assertion that varies from the fact, or that he has information which goes to refute anything I say, he is welcome to give it to me now.

I repeat: when did the time come when we were in a position to assure the people of Canada that a more efficient rifle was available for the sons of this country at war? Did it come in 1915? I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, do they think it did? Did it come in 1914? The hon. member for Edmonton says, "Oh, we heard stories from the front that the Ross rifle jammed, and you should have changed the rifle when you heard those stories." Does he repeat that now?

Mr. OLIVER: Sure.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, we hear some strange recommendations from the hon. member for Edmonton. I will read a couple of them now, but before I read the first I will say that I think there is a great deal of common sense in it. He was discussing the question of what authority we should take in the matter of a choice of rifle and equipment for this country for our soldiers, and here is where he said we might have got our authority. On page 451 of Hansard, February 2nd, 3 days ago, I find that the hon. member for Edmonton said:

> I should be glad to back the Minister of Militia or any other member of the Government —perhaps I might except the ex-Minister of Militia—but I would be willing to back the members of the Government generally—against an equal number of men of equal rank in any other country. But it is not a question of the respective abilities of the men in control of our affairs and those in control of affairs in Great Britain. The men in control of affairs in Great Britain are the people who are running the thing; it is their say; and if we are going to help to win the war, we must do it by helping them and not by going counter to their ideas. When it pleases them to require a rifle of a certain style, or equipment of a certain style, it is for us to provide that which will conform with their idea, so that we may work with them harmoniously.

Do not take the idea of some of the soldiers of Canada, but take the idea of the Government of Great Britain and their responsible officers—that was the advice given to us by the hon. member for Edmonton on 2nd February. He goes on:

> We may think that we have as good as they have or better; but so long as they are carrying the big end of the burden, if we are going to be successful in helping them we must co-operate

with them and not antagonize them by the equipment, munitions, or armament we bring forward.

That is a very good doctrine. It seems to me that that assertion very closely approaches the height of common sense. When we are fighting side by side with the soldiers of the Motherland, we are necessarily under the supreme direction of the military officers of the Mother Country. But the hon. member for Edmonton must admit that we get very different advice from some of his friends opposite, advice which he must admit that it is pretty hard to follow. Take the advice we got to-night from the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). He scoffs at the idea of our bowing at all to the knowledge of British officers, or of the British Government, or of anybody else outside of this country. That is very different advice indeed from that tendered by the hon. member (Mr. Oliver). We also got very different advice the other night, which I will read now. Here is some more advice that we got on the 2nd February last:

> The exigencies of the case were such that it was the business of the Government of Canada to follow events on the battlefield so that on their responsibility, and not on that of British officers, they would be sure that our men had, or had not, in their hands a rifle that was absolutely efficient. I absolutely protest against the responsibility being placed on any other shoulders than those of our own military department, who are charged on our behalf with seeing that our troops are efficient, and that their armament is efficient. It is not the responsibility of the British Government; it is the responsibility of our Government; and when, after experience had shown that the rifle was inefficient, not on the authority of Sir John French, but on the experience of our own men who threw it away, there was no escape from the responsibility of the Government to see that that rifle was replaced as soon as it could be.

Very different advice indeed is that we get from hon. gentlemen opposite, diametrically opposed advice, and it is very difficult for the Government to follow it when hon. gentlemen opposite cannot agree among themselves.

An hon. GENTLEMEN: Who said that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who is the author of this? It is the very same gentleman who was the author of the first statement I read, and just ten minutes after he had given us the first, he gives us this advice, which is diametrically opposite. The hon. gentleman is not so skillful as his leader. His leader very often gets on opposite poles, and enunciates doctrines that are violently opposed to each other, but he takes care that at least some distance of geography intervenes between the one point of delivery and the other, or if he can get no distance in geography, he manages to get some distance in time. Such, Sir, is the advice of hon. gentlemen opposite with respect to the authority that we should adopt.

I ask again, when did we get such authority as would enable this Government to have discarded the Ross rifle the national arm of this country, and to have accepted the Lee-Enfield? When did we get such authority as would justify our position before reasonable men? Did we get it in 1914, and if so where did we get it from? Did we get it in 1915, and if so what was that authority? Where is the responsible official whose authority we should accept who made a single statement in the year 1915 condemnatory of the Ross rifle? Where is the responsible official whose authority we should listen to for a moment, who advised or recommended the Government to make the change from the Ross rifle to the Lee-Enfield in 1915? The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) laughs. He knows there is no such authority. He knows there is nothing on the record and nothing in existence that would have justified this Government in abandoning the Ross rifle in 1915. I ask him, does he not know that?

Mr. MACDONALD: I was not following my hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That may be a very safe position to take.

Mr. MACDONALD: If I have to say anything about my hon. friend's remarks, I will say it when he is through. He is very fond of carrying on a conversational discussion all around the House. That is not proper debating.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We are in committee, it is proper debating. Hon. gentlemen opposite think it is not proper because they do not permit interruptions themselves. I ask him again, if in 1915 there was any recommendation made on the authority of any official or any one else whose authority we ought to accept, that would have justified us in abandoning the Ross rifle for the Lee-Enfield. He heard that, but he won't answer. He knows there was not one. He won't answer because he, himself on the 5th of May 1916, stood up in this House and stated that the Ross rifle we had then was a good rifle, and we ought to keep it. The hon. member for Pictou heard those reports from the

front about the jamming of the Ross rifle in the spring of 1915, and he doubtless heard reports about the jamming of the Lee-Enfield too. He heard reports from soldiers who much preferred the Lee-Enfield to the Ross, and I think he must have heard reports from many others who preferred the Ross to the Lee-Enfield. I heard both, myself, and for the life of me, I could not tell from those reports where the balance of merit lay. That was the position in 1915. On the 19th of June 1915, Sir John French wrote to the War Office that there were soldiers in the First Division who had lost confidence in the Ross rifle. And why? Because the Ross rifle had jammed with a bad brand of British ammunition. Sir John French made no other criticism whatever of the national arm of Canada. Now who is the hon. gentleman who will say, that when that report came to this Government we would have been justified in lightly throwing away the national arm of this country for another rifle, even had such another rifle been available anywhere in the world?

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. gentleman mentioned Sir John French's report. Does Sir John French in that report say that the jamming was caused by a bad brand of British ammunition?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was caused by bad British ammunition, and the committee which he refers to in his letter states that it was Brand B 1915 ammunition, and that brand only, which caused special jamming in the Ross rifle.

Mr. OLIVER: Why has not that information been laid on the table of the House?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It has been. It was put on Hansard by the Prime Minister himself. That is what I object to in hon. gentlemen opposite. Instead of studying the facts first, they make their speeches first and study the facts afterwards.

Mr. McKENZIE: I did not hear my hon. friend's answer to my question whether Sir John French says in his report that the jamming was caused by a bad brand of British ammunition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He says the jamming was caused with British ammunition. At all events, it was bad for the Ross rifle.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. minister puts that part in himself.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I may infer that it is bad if it jams in rifles that were properly made, and the Ross rifles were properly made. I do not know whether Sir John French uses the word " bad " himself or not. At all events, the ammunition was defective, and it has been reported on as defective. Sir John French reports that the jamming was on account of the ammunition.

Mr. PUGSLEY: He does not say it was defective.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes he does. His report is on Hansard, page 417, and says:—

Looking:

(1) To the unanimous opinion of my Committee that the Ross rifle could not be relied upon to work smoothly and efficiently in rapid fire with any ammunition other than that of Canadian manufacture;

(2) to the fact that no ammunition of this nature was available in this country and that sufficient supplies could not be obtained from England, and,

(3) to the want of confidence in the rifle which a large number of the infantry evidently felt, as evidenced by the fact that over 3,000 had, without authority, exchanged their rifles for those used by their British comrades, and taken from casualties on the battlefield.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I should like to know why these rifles were sent to England without suitable ammunition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Suitable ammunition was sent.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Sir John French says not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This other ammunition got in. I understand that, at that time, the ammunition was pooled.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am quoting from Sir John French's report:—

(1) To the unanimous opinion of my Committee that the Ross rifle could not be relied upon to work smoothly and efficiently in rapid fire with any ammunition other than than of Canadian manufacture;

(2) to the fact that no ammunition of this nature was available in this country, and that sufficient supplies could not be obtained from England.

I want to know why these rifles were sent to England without sufficient ammunition suitable for the purpose being sent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We first of all want to know whether that is a fact.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Sir John French says it is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, he does not. On June 12 when Sir John French re-armed the Third Division with Lee-Enfields, there was not at that time available sufficient Canadian ammunition. The ex-minister can answer that better than I, but I think it

was because a plan had been adopted at that time of pooling the ammunition, and as a consequence it was inevitable that some British ammunition should get to our men. Everybody had assumed that the British ammunition and ours were identical. That was the principle of manufacture, and there was no reason for not pooling ammunition, but as soon as it was found there was a make of British ammunition which did not work smoothly in the Ross rifle, from that day other ammunition was provided, and I have a letter here from the War Office to the effect that it would not be necessary to change the Ross rifle in the hands of other troops, because there was sufficient Canadian ammunition on hand.

Sir SAM HUGHES: One would infer from my hon. friend's remarks there was only one brand of British ammunition that was bad, whereas there were three distinct brands of British ammunition that jammed in both the Ross rifle and the Lee-Enfield, and one brand of American ammunition. The brass cartridge case was too much annealed and clung to the chamber of the Ross rifle. That ammunition was supposed to be taken out, and was taken out so far as the Lee-Enfields and our First Division are concerned. But when the Second Division went over with the Ross rifle, as many as 5,000 rounds of this defective ammunition got mixed up with the good ammunition in the Canadian service. That is one point that I think should be positively enquired into.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Who was responsible for that?

Sir SAM HUGHES: It was issued by an Ordnance Officer, a gentleman whose removal I asked for long ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY: A Canadian officer?

Sir SAM HUGHES: No.

Mr MEIGHEN: Sir John French's report contains this statement, which of itself stood as a barrier, and in view of which no Canadian Government would have been justified in abandoning the national arm of this country:

7. In conclusion, I would observe that in my reports I have never condemned the Ross rifle, nor have I any sufficient data to justify me in doing so.

Now, if Sir John French had not sufficient data on the 19th day of June, 1915, how did the hon. member for Assiniboia have that data, because he said that we had sufficient information in Canada in May 1915, to abandon the Ross rifle?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will the Solicitor General read the next six lines of the Report?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Wait until we get through with this. We are now through, as there is no answer from the hon. member for Assiniboia.

Mr. TURRIFF: Let my hon. friend sit down first.

Mr. OLIVER: The Solicitor General need not get impatient.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does my hon. friend want me to sit down?

Mr. TURRIFF: Prior to that date the First Division had given up the Ross rifle and had been re-armed with the Lee-Enfield.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We all know that. The hon. gentleman has missed the point altogether.

Mr. TURRIFF: That is sufficient.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In May, 1915, my hon. friend says we had evidence enough on which to abandon the Ross rifle. Sir John French says that on the 19th day of June, 1915, he did not have sufficient evidence to condemn the Ross rifle. He knew all about the Canadian soldiers picking up the Lee-Enfield rifles, but that was not sufficient for him to condemn the Ross rifle. How is it sufficient for the hon. member for Assiniboia and the hon. member for Edmonton to condemn the Ross rifle?

Mr. TURRIFF: My answer is that if the fact that 3,000 Canadian soldiers, men of the class that we sent overseas, threw down their rifles as being unfit and unsatisfactory for them to wage an even fight, is not sufficient justification for changing the rifle, why is the Government getting a new rifle to-day?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because we have justification since. I repeat to my hon. friend that Sir John French knew all about the 3,000 Canadian soldiers picking up the Lee-Enfield rifles. That is stated in his report, and he knew all about that at first nand; he saw it. How is it that that was not sufficient to justify him in condemning the rifle, and yet it is sufficient for the hon. member for Assiniboia? Does he know better than Sir John French? Does he know better than the "man called French" referred to in history by the hon. member for Carleton?

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend is hiding behind General French.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On a matter of rifles, I would prefer to hide behind French rather than behind the hon. member for Assiniboia.

Mr. CARVELL: As my hon. friend refers to me, I may say that I was sitting here trying to behave, but if he wants me to get into this thing, I am always ready. Will the Solicitor General read the report of the Committee upon which Sir John French based his report? It will be found on page 430 of Hansard. If he will do that, he will find that in the second column this committee is reported as stating:

The committee were practically unanimous in advising that the Ross rifle should be employed on the lines of communication, and that if possible, the Canadian troops should be armed with the British rifle.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is in the paragraph before that? Just let me read that; It is not inconsistent with this paragraph.

Mr. CARVELL: Those are the facts.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The paragraph reads:

A unanimous opinion was expressed that the Canadian manufactured D.A.C. 1914, Mk. VII ammunition only, of those tried, was suitable for rapid fire with the Ross rifle, that provided a sufficient supply of Canadian manufactured ammunition of this type could be supplied, the other defects apparent were not sufficient to condemn the Ross rifle in view of the present shortage of rifles generally, and that those types of British-made ammunition which were tried should not be issued to troops armed with the Ross rifle.

They say: For the present the proper thing is to produce Ross rifles, and that they are all right with Canadian ammunition.

Mr. OLIVER: Where do they say that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In one paragraph.

Mr. CARVELL: Ross rifles?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. CARVELL: Read the paragraph again.

Mr. MEIGHEN (Reading):

A unanimous opinion was expressed that the Canadian manufactured D.A.C. 1914, Mark VII ammunition only, of those tried, was suitable for rapid fire with the Ross rifle, that provided a sufficient supply of Canadian manufactured ammunition of this type could be supplied, the other defects apparent were not sufficient to condemn the Ross rifle in view of the present shortage of rifles generally.

Why are you to discontinue manufacturing rifles when there is a shortage and when the rifle has not been condemned?

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. OLIVER: Go ahead.

Mr. MEIGHEN (Reading):

And that those types of British made ammunition which were tried should not be issued to troops armed with the Ross rifle.

The committee were practically unanimous in advising that the Ross rifle should be employed on the lines of communication, and that if possible, the Canadian troops should be armed with the British rifle.

But they say it is impossible. Now let me ask the hon. member for Edmonton—Sir John French had that report before him when he wrote his letter of the 19th day of June, and having that report, he said: "I have not sufficient data to condemn the Ross rifle." How is the data sufficient for the hon. member for Edmonton to condemn the rifle?

Mr. OLIVER: It was sufficient to make Sir John French disarm the Canadian soldiers.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is that report signed?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Will the hon. gentleman kindly read the signature? Does it give any comparative test between the Ross rifle and the Lee-Enfield—any test, not hearsay? I can tell you there was no test made between the two rifles.

Mr. CARVELL: The report says: "The following tests were carried out."

Mr. OLIVER: The ex-minister had better settle that with the Solicitor General.

Sir SAM HUGHES: He is wrong sometimes, but he is all right there.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The signatures are:

C. M. Mathew, Colonel, D.D.O.S., G.H.Q.
C. R. Woodroffe, Lieut.-General, A.Q.M.G.
H. Guest, Major G.S.
C. D. Baker Carr, Major,
Commandant Machine Gun School.
T. Burchall Wood, Colonel,
A.A. and Q.M.G. 1st Canadian Division.
J. A. Murray, Lieut.-Colonel,
D.O.O. 1st Canadian Division.
W. H. McNeil Campbell, Captain R.A.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I would like to make one suggestion which I am sure would settle the whole matter. There are in Canada plenty of men who are experts with the Ross rifle and plenty who are experts with the Lee-Enfield rifle. There is plenty of the defective ammunition of the three brands and plenty of good ammunition. I would suggest that the following test be made: Let one dozen experts with the Ross rifle and one dozen experts with the Lee-Enfield

rifle test out the two rifles with good ammunition and with bad ammunition; and if the Ross rifle does not win out in every test, then, as I said before, I am willing to swallow the two rifles.

Mr. CARVELL: That is a sporting offer.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This is a question which I have been trying to have answered by the Solicitor General, but I have been unsuccessful. How does the ex-Minister of Militia account for this statement made by Sir John French, which will be found on page 418 of the Unrevised Hansard:

> I have expressed and acted on my opinion, that, so far as I can judge, the ammunition of British manufacture is not suitable for use with the Ross rifles and that there is a large and growing feeling of want of confidence in their rifle on the part of the men in the Canadian Division, which is amply justified by the report of the committee.

How does my hon. friend explain that?

Sir SAM HUGHES: If the hon. member for St. John had been paying the slightest vestige of attention to my remarks he would understand what I tried to impress upon him when I was speaking—long before that report was made, early in April, I knew it here; I had copies of the circulars that were being sent out and that were designed to cause want of confidence on the part of the men in the Ross rifles. The ten suggestions embodied in that report were skillfully passed around amongst the soldiers in an endeavour to create amongst them a want of confidence in the rifles they were using. They were written on bits of paper to imitate typewriting.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will the ex-minister say who did that?

Sir SAM HUGHES: How could I know? I was not on the ground. They picked them up on the road—anywhere. There was evidence of intention in this matter. Otherwise, how were these ten points embodied in the report of the distinguished officers when they came to make a deliverance on the subject? How did these officers happen on these very ten points? And the man among them who was best posted on the subject of rifles was Col. Kerr.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I desire to ask one other question.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Just one other question, and then I will stop. Were the hon. gentleman and his colleagues aware that in the report of Sir John French, in June, 1916, that officer said:

> There is a large and growing feeling of want of confidence in their rifle on the part of the men in the Canadian Division, which is amply justified by the report of the committee.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I assume that the hon. gentleman is quoting enough to show the tenor and is not taking a part away from its context in a way that would change its meaning. I got the report, but paid no attention to it so far as believing it was concerned, because I knew it was nonsense, that it reflected prejudice as created by the circulars which had been sent out with the intention of creating it. But, as I told the Prime Minister at the time, rather than have men in service go into action with rifles in which they had no confidence, even though I knew that rifle to be better than the other ones, and knew that the want of confidence was due to what had been drummed into them. I would accede to the making of a change.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When was that done?

Sir SAM HUGHES: The data before the Committee will show that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is sufficient to know that the Commander of the British forces in France, upon whom the responsibility rested had before him this whole report, ordered and authorized by himself, and in the presence of that report he not only refused to condemn the rifle but stated that he had not sufficient data upon which to condemn it. There was the further fact that in Canada we were not in a position to produce any other rifle.

As to the ammunition, I wish to read from a letter of the 15th July from the War Office to the ex-Minister of Militia. It is specially important in view of the argument of the hon. member for Edmonton. The letter is marked "secret," but this portion it can do no harm to read:

> I am to say that no action is proposed regarding the Second Canadian Division, as it is understood that a sufficient supply of ammunition of Canadian manufacture is available in this country, in the Canadian ordnance depot, to complete the equipment of the division and maintain it in the field for a considerable time.

Who is the man who would say that in the face of this document and of the position taken by the commander of the British forces in France we should lightly abandon the chosen arm of this country and start out to make a different one? I do not think that any man who wishes to be fair, or who

has a sense of the responsibility of his position as a member of this House, would say that there was sufficient evidence to justify us in deciding, a year or even six months ahead, to make another rifle and to discard the rifle adopted by the Canadian people on the responsibility of the late Administration.

Now I come to another phase of the subject, one that has been discussed in this House in the debate on the Address, as well as in this debate—the question of the obligation of this Government under the contract itself, the question whether or not we were tied by that contract, and if so, to what extent we were tied. I made the statement in Montreal that the Government were bound by the contract made by the late Administration. I am asked what I meant by that statement. Well, I do not know that I have the power to make that statement any plainer. And though it may seem a startling thing, yet I say that I meant exactly what I said. If I am asked, in what sense we were bound, I answer: Bound in every sense. The best efforts of literary versatility could not produce a simpler expression; common honesty. Common honesty could not produce a truer. But, it is said, Sir Charles Ross would have made new rifles "regardless of the contract." Sir Charles Ross, no doubt, would readjust his factory to make the Lee-Enfield rifle in less than a year if he could; he would not take up a year in making the change merely because the contract allowed that time; of course, he would try to do better than the contract called for. But does that mean that we were not bound by the contract? There is no respect in which we were not bound by the contract which this country had solemnly entered into. I give Sir Charles Ross great credit for having increased the production of his factory and for showing thereby great mechanical skill and great organizing skill as well. I give him credit for the intention to readjust and re-equip to manufacture the Lee-Enfield rifle in less than a year if he could. But I refuse to find, because Sir Charles Ross says he could do this in less than a year, that we should rely upon that and give our orders accordingly. And I refuse to believe, just because he was willing to do the best he could, that we were thereby relieved from the contract. Either we were bound, or we were not bound. If any one thinks we were not bound—

Mr. PUGSLEY: Who ever suggested that the Government was not bound?

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was not I asked to explain what I meant when I said that the Government was bound by this contract? I have been challenged to-night by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) to say what I meant by the statement that we were bound by a contract solemnly entered into. I was similarly challenged in the debate on the Address. I was challenged by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy), a member of the late Administration, to explain to Parliament and the country what I meant by uttering the plain, simple, obvious truth, that we were bound by a solemn contract. It is true we could break it on penalty of damages. But does that say we were not bound? And the hon. gentleman says now that there should be no one so simple as to question the assertion that we were bound—

Mr. PUGSLEY: If the hon. gentleman refers to me, what I said was that, if in the interests of the country and in order to supply our soldiers with a suitable rifle, it was necessary to make a change, this Government had complete power, particularly under the War Measures Act, to make the change, and even to take charge of the factory.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Undoubtedly, I made the same statement, and I made it in Montreal also. Certainly, if we had power, we would have done it and paid the damages rather than put an inferior weapon into the hands of our troops, if we had available a better weapon. But would the hon. gentleman even hint that on that account we were not bound by the contract? Of course we were bound by the contract.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Bound by a contract which you could easily put an end to?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The same as any other contract. If we were not bound by that contract, no government and no individual ever was bound by any.

Mr. OLIVER: Will the minister allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: Did the contract with the Ross Rifle Company bind the Government to the making of an inefficient rifle?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman consider that a question?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to answer it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It bound the Government to every term of the contract—and that is what I asserted in Montreal. Nobody would for a moment suggest that we would make an inefficient rifle if we could make a better one and put it in the hands of our troops in time.

Mr. OLIVER: What I am asking the minister is this: did the contract bind the Government to compel the Ross Rifle Company to make an inefficient rifle?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for Edmonton knows—I am sorry to say it to him, because I have respect for him—that his question is simply nonsense.

Mr. OLIVER: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The contract speaks for itself, and to its terms we were bound.

Mr. OLIVER: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I asked him a fair question. I ask him now either for a fair answer or a civil refusal.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It binds us to make the rifle that for the time being is the standard rifle. No government in the world would make that standard rifle a day longer than it could help, no matter what the damages were, if they could make a better rifle and get it to the troops in time.

Mr. OLIVER: Does not the contract permit the Government to change the form of the rifle at its pleasure?

Mr. MEIGHEN: With a year's notice.

Mr. CARVELL: Have changes not been made by the Ross Rifle Company since the beginning of the war on one month's or two months' notice?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Trifling changes, like the weight of a nose band or something like that—never a change in the type. The hon. member for Carleton stated that he would take the word of the man who runs the factory, irrespective altogether of other authorities. He made that statement in the House, and I have it before me. Let me on this occasion, without at all reflecting on the ability of Sir Charles Ross or the good faith of his company, say this: there was an order once before to change the type of the rifle. A year is all that is allowed by the contract within which to make such a change. What time was taken the last time the type of the rifle was changed? Notice was served on the company on December 28, 1910, and the first rifles of the new pattern were delivered in November, 1912, nearly 23 months afterwards. Something intervened—I am not saying it was the fault of the company. They in the meantime produced some other rifles; they kept their hands busy. But you cannot always depend upon prognostications, particularly on the part of men whose enthusiasm for the rifle, and, perhaps, for their factory, honestly influences their judgment. The hon. member for Carleton observed that the Prime Minister had quoted the authority of a letter signed by Sir George Perley that in the opinion of, as he decribed it, "some official" over in England, that factory could not produce rifles of a new pattern in quantities within two years. Not only was a year necessary, but in the judgment of "some official," to use the graphic language of the hon. member for Carleton, two years were necessary. He said we were taking the judgment of "some official" instead of the judgment of the man who owned the factory. Well, as the Prime Minister pointed out, we are doing nothing of the kind, we are taking all, and making the best decision that we can. But who is this "some official"? He was the Minister of Munitions of the British Government of that day. The Minister of Munitions of the British Government was referred to as "some official," and the hon. member for Carleton said that in his judgment this "some official" was incompetent and that the Prime Minister should be severely castigated for listening to him at all. That is the way the hon. member for Carleton would have us obey the behest of the hon. member for Edmonton—to comply in every case with the judgment of the British Government.

Mr. CARVELL: That is the interpretation which you put upon my words.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We had better read the words. What was the date of my hon. friend's speech?

Mr. CARVELL: February 2, I think.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps the hon. gentleman could give me the page?

Mr. CARVELL: I do not remember making any such statement. You will find it on page 445.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, here it is:

> About the possibility of converting the Ross factory inside of two years in order to make rifles of a new type. He—

That is, the Prime Minister.

—has given us a statement by some official in England who has some doubts about our ability to convert this factory in two years.

Then further on, he says:

I think that that man, whoever he may be, is incompetent.

Mr. CARVELL: That is not a fair reading. Go back four or five lines.

Mr. MEIGHEN: All right. The hon. gentleman gives the reason why he thinks this official is incompetent:

The same people who did not believe that shrapnel shells could be made in America two years ago, who wondered if 200,000 rounds could be made in America, possibly honestly believe that you cannot change this rifle factory to enable it to manufacture Lee-Enfields within two years; but if our experience of munition work in the past two years is any criterion as to our abilities, I think that that man, whoever he may be, is incompetent, and that my right hon. friend is deserving of the severest castigation for listening to his opinion.

The words used by the hon. gentleman are in precisely the language in which I conveyed them to the House.

Mr. CARVELL: Is there any high treason about that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say that it was high treason. The hon. gentleman said that he did not use the words; I have given not only the words, but his reasons for using them, and all I have to say is that his reasons were just as weak as his assertions.

Either we are bound by the contract or we are not. If hon. gentleman opposite can procure our release from it, we will release the other party to the contract any time at all. If hon. gentlemen opposite can procure the abandonment of the rights of the contractor by one jot or tittle, we will welcome anything whatever, but in the meantime——

Mr. PUGSLEY: Parliament has given the Government authority to do that, under the War Measures Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for St. John City would like to come to the rescue of those people who attacked me for making the simple assertion that we were bound by the contract. He has said that he would not suggest that we were not bound by it; let me, therefore, deal with those who castigate me for saying that we are.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What seems to me to be extraordinary is that my hon. friend tonight has set up a plea by way of confession of the negligence of himself and his friends, but he avoids the point by saying

that there is a contract here which bound them. That is the whole object my hon. friend had in view.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I say is that the contract binds both parties.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But when the war broke out Parliament gave to this Government the authority to take any step of any kind or description which it might think necessary for the more efficient carrying on of the war.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Haven't I repeated that over and over again.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then what is the use of repeating that argument that the Government was bound?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The fact that we have power to break a contract does not say that we were not bound by it. The Government might break any contract; we did not need any War Measures Act for that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is what Parliament gave the power for.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We might break it under penalty of damages as any individual can do. But I repeat that if we were not bound by this contract, no person, no Government, no individual, no company was ever bound by any contract in the history of the world.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the minister allow me to ask him a question? I am following the hon. gentleman very closely.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman wait until I am through?

Mr. McKENZIE: I caught you too badly before.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then catch me again.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does the minister say that the existence of a contract such as this would justify the Government in continuing to accept inefficient arms?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I told the hon. gentleman twenty times that it never would, and we never would have felt we should continue an inefficient arm or any arm if we could get a better one.

Mr. McKENZIE: Then why talk about the existence of the contract at all?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because the hon. gentleman sitting beside my hon. friend challenged me to do so, and dared me to substantiate the statements I made in Mon-

treal. That is none too strong and none too sound a reason, but it is the only reason I have; it is because I am challenged to do so by hon. gentlemen opposite who do not know any better. We would not have been justified in continuing the manufacture of this or any other rifle had we been able in sufficient time to get a rifle that we knew on sufficient authority was a better rifle to use. That is surely sufficient for the hon. member for St. John. Were we in a position to produce another rifle? Was a year's notice necessary? "Oh," he says, "they never would have taken all that time." I have shown that they took twenty-three months in 1910 and 1911. Was a year's notice necessary? If it was not, what is the plight of hon. gentlemen opposite? If a year's notice was not necessary why did hon. gentlemen opposite provide for a year's notice and put it in the power of the contractor to exact it? If it was not necessary, why did the hon. gentlemen give the contractor power to exact this notice if less time was sufficient? There is no answer—and there cannot be an answer.

The British Government tell us that in their judgment two year's time is necessary. "Oh," say some hon. gentlemen opposite, "the British Government have told you that they will supply you with jigs, tools and gauges," and on that they argue that very little time would be required. Do they not observe that in the very letters in which the British Government advises that two years would be necessary, they offer to supply these jigs, tools and gauges? In the same letter in which the British Government offer to give jigs, tools and gauges they offer plans and drawings, etc., and they warn us that we cannot expect substantial deliveries under two years. They may be right or they may be wrong.

Mr. CARVELL: After receiving that letter, did the Government or any official go to Sir Charles Ross or any other member of his company and ask them in what time they would be willing or able to produce the Lee-Enfield rifle?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Sir Charles Ross often said he could do it in less than a year. We did not ask him, he kept telling us.

Mr. CARVELL: Did you go to him?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He came to us. But will any hon. gentleman, on his responsibility as a member, say that we should have taken the unsupported word of a contractor who himself is to make the goods, and who is anxious for an order, and honestly so, that we should take that and have no regard whatever to other authorities even the authority of the British Government?

Mr. CARVELL: But did you ever go to Sir Charles Ross and ask him how long, in his judgment, it would take to convert his plant to manufacture Lee-Enfield rifles, 10,000 or 20,000, or any quantity?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have said that Sir Charles Ross told us without our going to him:

Mr. PUGSLEY: In what time, and what did he say?

Mr. MEIGHEN: My recollection is that he stated seven or eight months.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is when he was supplied with the jigs and gauges.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, that is my recollection of his conversation.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is when he was supplied with the equipment?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Suppose he said two months, and suppose he was honest in his statement—and I have no reason to question his bona fides. Who is the hon. gentleman who will say that we should have no regard for the opinion of the British Government in this matter, especially when their opinion is backed by their practice in Great Britain in this very hour? They know in Great Britain, at least they have expressed the opinion, that the Enfield .276 is an improvement on the Lee-Enfield which they themselves are producing and using. But they do not change their factories, they do not re-equip their factories to produce the better rifle. Why? Because they know that time, and a long time, would be taken, and that time is the lives of soldiers and that there is no time to spare. That is why they do not re-equip, and that is why they advise us: "Re-equip if you will, but be sure and consider that time will be lost." And we, in our determination of what to do, have regard not only to the judgment of Sir Charles Ross, but to the judgment of the British Government, backed up by the practice of the British Government itself. That is our position in relation to that question.

Mr. OLIVER: Would the hon. gentleman say just what the decision of this Government has been in regard to this Ross rifle?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Government, in this question, has reached precisely the point clearly defined by the Prime Minister.

The Government has not decided what order to give or whether any order should be given.

Mr. MARCIL: They have decided to let the Ross factory continue to operate in Quebec?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They have decided that it shall be re-equipped and adjusted to produce the Enfield .276, and notice has been given accordingly. That notice was given on the first day it was possible to do so, that is on the first day when it was possible to secure a standard sample certified by the inspector of small arms in Great Britain.

Mr. CARVELL: Has it also given an order for any rifles?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I said it has not. We have not yet received the drawings and specifications essential before any further progress on our part can be made. Ever since we received the report and decision of Sir Douglas Haig, we have made every endeavour to put ourselves in a position to make progress, and we have made the fastest progress in our power.

Now then, after the French report, what next occurred? The next thing that occurred was that on the 12th day of May, 1916, a communication was sent, I think it was directed to the ex-Minister of Militia, by Sir Max Aitken, to the effect that a serious situation existed with regard to the Ross rifle, and Sir Max Aitken asked him to show that cablegram to the Prime Minister. The ex-Minister did as requested. That was on the 12th of May.

Mr. OLIVER: The return brought down gave the first and last sentence of the cablegram, but not the body of the cablegram. Therefore there was information contained in that telegram that has not been laid on the table of the House. Could the minister give this information?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon member will not ask me to give the information when I tell the reason why it was not given. The reason it was not given is that we were not able to obtain the consent of the British Government to its being given, on account of war conditions. We are prepared, at any time that the consent of the British Government can be obtained, to lay the whole thing on the Table and fill in all the blanks that are left in the correspondence as brought down; but they have specifically forbidden that to be sent out for reasons that will be obvious to all.

[Mr. Meighen.]

That cablegram was received from Sir Max Aitken; it was shown to the Prime Minister on the 15th May, no doubt the day when it was received, because these cablegrams are sometimes delayed two or three days in transmission—and on the very same day this Government took a position, through the mouth of the Prime Minister of Canada, and what was it? We placed absolutely in the hands of Sir Douglas Haig, who commanded the British forces in France, the decision as to whether the rifle in the hands of the Canadian troops should be the Ross rifle or the Lee-Enfield. Nothing whatever occurred from the time of the French report, which refused to condemn the rifle, and stated that there was no data on which to condemn it, and the telegram from Sir Max Aitken on May 12. Immediately that cablegram was received we stated the facts to the British Government and to Sir Douglas Haig, and we asked for the judgment of Sir Douglas Haig. We not only asked for it, but offered to abide by that judgment whatever it might be. At that time we authorized the substitution of the Lee-Enfield for the Ross rifle if the commander of the forces in France, who ought to know best, and no man in the world knows better, said it was the proper thing to do. Now, I ask hon. gentlemen when did the time come earlier than the 15th of May at which we should have taken that position? When did it come earlier that we could have justified ourselves in throwing aside the only arm we could manufacture for many months to come, and substituting what could not be got as a matter of fact, another rifle? In that connection be this remembered also, that on the 30th March, 1916, the Prime Minister of Canada placed the position of this Government before the British authorities with regard to rifles, stating that we had given an order already which would be filled about a certain month, (which cannot be given) in the correspondence, and asking the British Government in effect, what do you advise us to do? If we are going to give another order, the time has come to give it. Already we are pressed to do so by the officers of the department, but we do not want to do so until we have the best advice you are able to give us as regards the working out of the rifle which is now in the hands of the Canadian troops, and as to whether any other rifle is available for their supply. What was the answer? On the 26th of the following month, the answer came back to the effect that Great Britain could not undertake to arm the Canadian

troops with any rifle, that they were not in a position then, and not even at the date, which was many months ahead, and which has not yet arrived, at which the present order would be fulfilled, to undertake the arming of the troops of Canada with Lee-Enfield rifles. In the face of that situation, with no other rifles available, what could the Government of Canada do but place it in the disposition and judgment of the commander of the British troops in France as to what under all the circumstances should best be done in the way of arming the troops of Canada.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Did the Prime Minister not also ask the British officers, I think Sir Douglas Haig, for a comparative test?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is true. Practically the same cablegram that was sent placing it in the hands of Sir Douglas Haig was sent, I think, to Sir Wm. Robertson, and that cablegram asked that after tests under war conditions had been made, the question as to what rifle should be used should be decided by Sir Douglas Haig, and stated that by his decision, whatever it was, we would abide. If the test had been made, well and good. Sir Douglas Haig took the position on 28th May, 1916, that in his judgment the tests already made were sufficient, and by a letter of that date he advised not us, but the War Office in London, that in his judgment it would be better to arm the troops of Canada with the Lee-Enfield rifle. That was done in a letter of the 28th May, and it was confirmed in another letter of the 21st June. As a result, the War Office in London by a communication of the 3rd July following sent to Sir George Perley who transmitted it to us, expressed the opinion that Sir Douglas Haig's action had been correct, that having been given authority, he had taken it and had asked our troops be armed with the Lee-Enfield rifle, and that the Small Arms Committe confirmed that decision. From that time on, we were in accord; the two Governments and the commander in chief of the forces were in accord that the troops of Canada should be armed with the Lee-Enfield rifle.

Sir SAM HUGHES: There is just one point that I desire to impress upon the House, and that is that the Prime Minister asked that a competitive test between the two rifles should be made under war conditions; he asked that the best possible test should be made. There was no competitive test, and there never has been a competitive test made officially by the British Government of these two rifles. I am merely emphasizing my own position. There has been no competitive test. The test referred to by Sir Douglas Haig was a test in which there was no competition at all. The point I am trying to bring out is that a competitive test was not carried out. If it had been, the Ross rifle would have come out ahead.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That correspondence reached this Government some time in July. I do not remember the exact date. The decision of Sir Douglas Haig was put into effect, he being of the opinion that the tests, whatever they had been, were sufficient. He being of that opinion, armed the troops of Canada with the Lee-Enfield rifle, and thereafter the Ross rifle was not used except, I believe, for special purposes at the front. It must be noted that even at that time Sir Douglas Haig stated that the situation in regard to the Third Division did not apply to the Second Division; in other words, that the complaints which had come from the Third Division had not come from the Second; but his judgment having been made supreme by the action of this Government he decided it was better all things considered, to adopt the Lee-Enfield. It was adopted then and there, and adopted with our authority. There was no earlier time when we could possibly justify the abandonment of our rifle than the date of the letter of the War Office to Sir George Perley, transmitted to us, and now, I am quite certain, on the table of the House, stating that the situation had changed, and that they, the War Office of Great Britain, assumed the responsibility from that date on of providing the troops of Canada with Lee-Enfields. Until that time they had not undertaken to do so. They had advised us before that that they would not be able to do so, but the situation had improved in the meantime, and they stated that they were able to do so in July. That being the judgment of Sir Douglas Haig, this Government acquiesced. Indeed, we were the first of the two Governments to say that if Sir Douglas Haig was of opinion that the Lee-Enfield was better for our troops under all the circumstances, the Lee-Enfield they should have.

From that time on, the situation, as it confronted the Government of Canada, was altered. Up to that time it was not a question of the commercial advantage to this country at all. It was a question of get-

ting the best weapon we could put our hands on for the use of our troops at the front. From that time on, namely, from July, when we were advised that the British Government were able to take care of the arming of the Canadian troops with Lee-Enfield rifles, the situation ceased to have the serious aspect it had previously assumed, and it never has assumed the same aspect since. From that time on, it was practically a commercial question, and nothing else. We wanted to produce our rifles, all the rifles we could produce, not because our troops, would otherwise be unarmed but because it was part of the policy of this country to make in this country as much as possible of what this country used.

In this connection I desire to refer to a speech of the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy). In the remarks which he addressed to the House on 29th January last, he used the following words:

> Nothwithstanding General Haig's statement of the urgency of the case and its approval by the Army Council, which offered to supply Lee-Enfields, and which requested that no more Ross rifles be brought to England, it was not until August 30, 1916, more than thirteen months after General French's report and sixteen months after the failure of the rifle had been demonstrated at the battle of St. Julien, that the Government of Canada finally gave its consent to the British War Office supplying Lee-Enfields to the second and third Canadian divisions, and expressed the hope that no re-arming had been done without their knowledge.

Now I have quoted correctly from the speech of the hon. member; that not until August 30, 1916, did the Government of Canada give its consent to the British War Office arming our troops with the Lee-Enfield, and that even then we expressed the hope that it had not been done without our approval. Does the hon. gentleman think that that was quite fair? Does he think it was a correct—I will not use a stronger term—way of stating the contents of the telegram of August 30, 1916? This Government authorized the change on the 15th of May 1916, in a cablegram to Sir Douglas Haig, providing he thought the charge was in the best interest of our troops. We authorized it then and no further approval was necessary. We authorized it to be done and it was done. A month before the 30th of August our troops were armed with the Lee-Enfields.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Where does that appear?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the cablegram of the Prime Minister stating we would abide by the judgment of Sir Douglas Haig.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is not in Hansard.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think it is right in the file. The cablegram was to Mr. Bonar Law. Secretary of State for the Colonies and it was forwarded at once to the General Officer Commanding at the front.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. gentleman says the cable was sent on the 15th of May. That was a cablegram to Sir Max Aitken. I should like to know the position Sir Max Aitken occupied in relation to this Government and the British Government.

Sir SAM HUGHES: He was appointed by Order in Council, general representative for Canada at the front, and he fulfilled his duties perfectly.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I thought he was an Intelligence Officer, an eye-witness.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The cablegram was sent to Sir Douglas Haig through the instrumentality of Sir Max Aitken. Sir Max Aitken had conveyed the other information to us, and as a consequence this cable went back through the same channel. It is in effect a cable to Sir Douglas Haig, and is supplemented by another cablegram on June 5, in which, practically word for word, the same information was placed before Sir William Robertson, Chief of the Imperial Staff in Great Britain. So that our authority, if Sir Douglas Haig thought it best, was given on the 15th of May, 1916, and could have been given no sooner.

What was the cablegram of August 30, to which the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) referred as being the first approval on the part of the Government of Canada of the change to the Lee-Enfield? It is a cablegram from the Governor General to the Colonial Secretary, as follows:—

> In pursuance of your cable message of July 11, my advisers announced that Canadian troops at front would in future be armed with Lee-Enfield rifles.

That is, we announced, in pursuance of the cable of July 11, that our troops would be so armed. The cable continues:—

> They are confident that no departure from this decision has been made without their knowledge, but they desire to be informed as to report which has reached them that Fourth Canadian Division was armed with Ross rifles when recently despatched to France.

Now, hon. gentlemen have the cablegram in which we stated that on the authority of the cablegram from the British Government we had long ago announced that our troops hereafter would be armed with Lee-Enfield,

and we say that notwithstanding that, we have heard a report that the Fourth Division have been sent to the front armed with Ross rifles, and we want to know if that has been done without our approval. And the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) tells this House that this was the first time we had approved of our troops being armed with the Lee-Enfield—the very opposite of the cable.

Mr. MURPHY: Is there a cablegram on the file dated May 15? I do not find it in Hansard.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was talking of the cablegram of August 30. The cablegram of the 15th of May was from the Prime Minister to Sir Max Aitken, for transmission to Sir Douglas Haig. That is the situation. From that day we have made every endeavour to procure the rifle and the drawings and specifications. First of all, we had to procure from the British Government a statement as to what rifle in their judgment would be the rifle to be used after the war, what rifle it was best that we should make, having regard to the future. We got that information, and as soon as we got it we immediately proceeded to put ourselves in a position to serve notice on the Ross Rifle Company to adjust their factory to make the rifle so recommended, and we have not lost a day or an hour since. We have pressed the British Government insistently. No doubt they have done their best under the circumstances, but notwithstanding our pressure it was not until the 20th of January this year that we were in a position to serve notice on the company, because we had not the standard arm which was to accompany the notice according to the contract, and without which the notice would have been practically of no effect at all, and almost worthless to the contractor.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Was that standard arm made in Great Britain or in the United States?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the United States, I understand; the British Government is not making it for the reason that they would not take the risk of the delay involved in readjusting their factories to turn out the new rifle.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If the Lee-Enfield in regard to which notice was given to the Ross Company on the 20th of January was made in the United States and supplied to the British army, why was there such a long delay in getting one of the standard rifles to the company?

Mr. MEIGHEN: For the reason set out in Mr. Bonar Law's cablegram of September 11, 1916. We set out to get that standard rifle in the United States in order to save time. A report that we were doing so reached the War Office, and on September 11 they cabled this Government asking us not to use a rifle procured in the United States as a standard until it had been inspected by the chief inspector of arms and ammunition of the British Government, and received his imprimatur and approval. Were we right in that or not? Should we have defied them and taken the rifle from the United States as a standard?

Sir SAM HUGHES: When were the contracts let in the United States?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have a pretty good idea but do not know that I am justified in giving the dates or deliveries, but I think I am justified in going this far, that if hon. gentlemen will make inquiry as to the date the contract was given in the United States and note the quantities delivered up to the present hour, I do not think they will find very much support for their optimism in thinking you can re-equip a factory and make a new kind of rifle in a very few months. I do not need to go back and repeat that we do not hide behind the contract. We are not attempting to conceal anything. We are quite free to say that if we could have done better by breaking the contract, we should have broken it. But we saw nothing better that could be done.

The very last people who should criticise us for not breaking the contract are the men who made the contract themselves. The criticism comes very ill from those very men who now stand up and make themselves the complainants. They themselves fathered the contract; they fathered this rifle. They forged the chains and fastened them on this country, and now they stand up and declaim against us because we did not burst the fetters with which they in their folly had bound themselves and all Governments to come.

That is the position in which we stand with respect to this rifle. We have nothing to conceal as regards our conduct, nor as regards our treatment of the whole rifle subject. It is a vital subject; it is a subject that goes to the very heart of our success. We have nothing to conceal; we invite no controversy, but we run away from none. Our course has been clear and is not only defensible, but impregnable from beginning to end. Because it is a vital question, one

of the most important of the thousand problems that confront us from day to day, it has received, in a special degree, the supervision of the Prime Minister, a supervision that has directed and surveyed, with ceaseless vigilance and with a care and an energy that almost passes comprehension, every phase of this work of this Government. On the record of this Government we stand and we fear the criticism of no man. Fortunately for us every step in the path that we have followed is now marked out by a long line of official records. They are there for all Canadians to read, and we urge upon the people of Canada to read those records in full and to study them carefully, and we appeal with the almost confidence to the judgment of every impartial and intelligent man.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): Mr. Chairman, as the hon. minister says: We are dealing with one of the most important phases of our responsibility in connection with the war. We cannot give this matter too careful attention. We are here to listen to the best that the Government can state on behalf of its course in this connection We have listened carefully and we have heard from the lips of the Prime Minister and from the lips of his Solicitor General, whom we all agree is not the least able member of the Cabinet, the best reasons they have to give for the fact that to-day we are called upon to vote $2,660,000 for rifles that are not to be used at the battle front. After we have paid to the amount of $6,500,000 for Ross rifles made in Canada, not one battalion, not one platoon of Canadian troops at the front is armed with that rifle, after two and a half years of war. In the face of such facts as these, I ask hon. gentleman on the other side of the House: Of what avail is the special pleading of the Solicitor General here to-night? What difference does it make to this country what advice I have given to the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House during this debate, or what advice the hon. member for Pictou, or any other member has given? The question before the country is not what advice we have given; the question is: What has the Government done and how far can the Government justify what it has done before the high court of public opinion? The question of the furnishing of our troops with what is called small arms, with rifles, is the most important question with which we have to deal; but we are dealing to-day with a vote of $500,000,000, appropriated in bulk for expenditure by this Government for the support of Canada's part in the war, and on the most vital point in all this vast expenditure, we find the result that I have already stated, that we have spent $6,500,000 and we practically have not a rifle in the firing line, and we are being called upon to-night to vote, if my hon. friend presses his motion, to pay $2,660,000 for rifles that are not yet manufactured and that will never see the front after they are manufactured. This is a far reaching matter. If such is the record of the Government on this the most important feature connected with the war so far as we are concerned, what are we to believe in regard to the other phases which involve the whole of this stupendous expenditure? We and our children's children will be paying on account of the burden that we are laying upon the people of the country by this vote to-day. We vote the money freely; our people pay it willingly; but surely we ought to know from the Government that the money is being expended wisely and for the purpose for which it is voted, and yet on this vote for rifles to arm our men we are paying $6,500,000 and we have not a rifle in the firing line.

The Solicitor General, in justification of that position, says that the members on this side of the House, the late Government, fourteen years ago, entered into a contract to make rifles in Canada for the use of Canada, which contract binds Canada for all time, and that because of that contract, this condition that I have spoken of exists and we who have ceased to have direction of the affairs of our country for more than five years are to be held responsible, and these gentlemen who have had full direction of the affairs of our country for more than five years are absolutely absolved from responsibility by the special pleading of the Solicitor General and even by the remarks of the Prime Minister the other night. There never was an occasion on which a more absurd contention was presented for the consideration of any deliberative body in the world. While I think it is a waste of time to discuss before this House and the country the respective responsibility of ourselves on this side and they on that side, yet seeing that my hon. friend is a very eminent member of the Government as well as of the legal profession, and that he has laid great stress upon that point and alluded particularly to my humble self, I shall not be accused of trespassing unduly upon the time of the House if I deal with that matter for just one instant. We admit that the Liberal Government made a contract with the Ross Rifle Company; we believe

that it was provident to make such a contract at the time at which it was made, and we believe that it was a provident contract. My hon. friend has said and repeated and repeated that we who made the contract are responsible if the rifles made under that contract are ineffiicient rifles. That contract provides, as I have already said: First, that in case of war or emergency the Government does not need to take rifles from the Ross Rifle Company beyond the number that the Ross Rifle Company can supply to the Government's order. Therefore, the Government was not bound for all time, nor for all rifles. And when the Solicitor General says specifically to a listening world that the Government and country were bound, may I be permitted, Mr. Chairman, with your consent, to suggest that the Solicitor General is attempting to deceive the public.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER: I will just complete that. The second point is, that the contract entered into by the Liberal Government provided that the Ross Rifle Company should make any alterations in the rifle, or the type of rifle, made by them, at the demand of the Government. Therefore, if the pattern of rifle made under the orders of the late Liberal Government was in any degree insufficient, there was within the four corners of the contract—that, I understand, is the expression used by a legal gentleman—specific provision which places the responsibility upon this Government to maintain that rifle in its condition of efficiency. There was a further provision in the contract that if and when the Government desired to have the company make another kind of rifle altogether, the company was bound to comply. These gentlemen have been in power for more than five and a half years. It was their responsibility during that period to see to it that the rifles manufactured for this country were efficient; it was within their power during the whole of that time to ensure that they should be efficient according to their views. If to-day we have not a battalion, a company, a platoon, at the front armed with Ross rifles, the responsibility is absolutely theirs, and no amount of special pleading, either by the Solicitor General or by the Prime Minister, can place responsibility upon the late Government or upon any member on this side of the House. My hon. friend was strong on the point that the rifle which was in the hands of the troops who crossed the ocean in September, 1914, was of a pattern which had been approved by the late Government. Admit for the sake of the argument that this is true. Specify, if you please, that we eliminate the time intervening between the outgo of the Liberal Government and the declaration of war. Assume that there was no provision in the contract which placed the responsibility upon this Government, and say that the late Government was responsible for the type of Mark III Ross rifle. Yet the late Government never ordered a Mark III rifle to be made, and there was never a Mark III Ross rifle made while the late Government was in office. The Solicitor General himself told us to-night that it was not until December, 1912, a year and two months after the late Government had left office, that the first Ross rifle Mark III was delivered.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was in November.

Mr. OLIVER: The hon. gentleman said December, but I will alter it to November if he pleases. Now, I submit that the Government which found no difficulty, no impediment to the cancelling of a contract for the building of a Canadian navy, a contract which they had in their desks when they took office, accompanied by a deposit of $100,000 of securities for its fulfilment, is not in a position to claim that, because the late Liberal Government had sanctioned Mark III Ross rifle, they were not bound to order the making of that rifle, nor to accept delivery of it when it was made. As a matter of fact, the order for the making of Mark III Ross rifle was given by the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) and not by a member of the Liberal Government. So, if my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) did not catch what I said a few minutes ago, perhaps he will understand it when I now repeat it: When he made the statement he did attempting to throw responsibility upon the late Government for making an inefficient rifle under the control of this Government, he was attempting to mislead and deceive the public as to the facts of the case.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Nobody believes that, not even the hon. gentleman himself; he has more intelligence than that.

Mr. OLIVER: I accept my hon. friend's interruption, considering the source from which it comes. Now, my hon. friend has rested his case on the two points, of responsibility of the late Government, and the assertion that the report of Sir John French did not condemn the Ross rifle. Before I touch these points, let me say, as I said

the other night, that the responsibility for ensuring that the troops of Canada were efficiently armed and equipped rested upon this Government and not upon the Government of Great Britain, upon our military department, and not the military department of Great Britain; and our friends have no right, either in constitutional practice or as a matter of right, to attempt to shelter themselves behind the officers of the British military administration. We maintain a Militia Department for the purpose of ensuring efficiency in the conduct of our military affairs. We cannot call Sir John French before the bar of Canadian public opinion to condemn him for what he says or does. A system of responsible government is supposed to prevail in this country, and we look to the Minister of Militia and to the Prime Minister of our Government to see that efficiency is maintained. My hon. friend attempted to be funny over the idea that I had used a contradiction of argument in speaking of the necessity of our making our equipment conform with the British requirement, and at the same time holding the Government here responsible for inefficiency in the equipment. I can see no contradiction in those arguments; on the contrary, it appears to me that they are in entire and proper sequence. I leave the question as to the merits of that to the judgment of the committee and of the public. I say, therefore, that this Government had no right to wait until Sir John French reported as he did with regard to the Ross rifle. They had a right to inform themselves—it was their first duty on behalf of the people of Canada and of the soldiers of Canada—in regard to the efficiency of that weapon upon which the lives of our soldiers, prestige of our country and the success of the Allied arms depended. They did not do it—that is confessed and admitted; there is no argument about it. Not only did the Government not attempt to inform themselves as to the efficiency of the Ross rifle, but the ex-Minister of Militia has assured us on the floor of the House that the rifle was and is absolutely efficient. It would be absurd to suggest, in view of the attitude of the ex-minister in regard to the rifle, that the Government used due diligence; that the Government was not guilty of absolute negligence concerning the efficiency of this weapon. They are all the more guilty in the matter because amongst their own followers were men who for years had persistently criticised that weapon as manufactured under Liberal administration. Those critics were either satisfied that a different and superior rifle was in the hands of the troops, or they were willing to submit their criticisms and opinions to political exigency. I do not wish to accuse hon. gentleman on the other side, or indeed, any good citizen of Canada, of being willing to submit such a question as that, involving the issues that it did, to political exigency. I believe that they believed that our troops were armed with an efficient rifle. They had a right to believe that, and today when it is proved that our troops were not armed with an efficient rifle they have a right to hold the ex-minister of Militia and the members of the Government absolutely responsible for the consequences that resulted, terrible though those consequences were.

My hon. friend rests his whole case on the assertion that Sir John French reported in favour of the efficiency of the Ross rifle. On my reading of the report, the hon. gentleman's assertion—his argument, his special pleading—has absolutely no foundation; the report of Sir John French can be read only as a condemnation of the Ross rifle as an efficient weapon in the field, based on the experiences of Sir John French in connection with the operations that were under his direction and control, and for which he was responsible. We judge of what a man thinks by what he does, and the higher and more responsible his position, the more that holds true. When Sir John French, without reference to the Canadian Government or to our Militia Department, Lee-Enfields being as scare as the Prime Minister and the Solicitor-General have said they were, disarmed the First Canadian Division of their Ross rifles and re-armed them with Lee-Enfields—doing so, as he specifically says here, because he did not wish to send them into a certain important battle armed with the Ross rifle—I say that if he had covered a hundred pages with apologies for or explanations of the Ross rifles it would not alter the reasonable and proper conclusion which may be drawn from what he actually did, and the reasons why he did it. My hon. friend reads certain sentences from Sir John French's report and he ascribes to them certain interpretations that, in my humble judgment, with all due respect, I do not consider that the language permits. In his report to the War Office in London on June 19, 1915, Sir John French, speaking of the committee of investigation, said:

> The proceedings of this committee were laid before me on the eve of a serious offensive

operation in which the Canadian division was to take part, and I was at the same time informed that over 3,000, or more than one-third of the infantry, of this division had already succeeded in re-arming themselves with the Lee-Enfield rifle without any authority having been given for them to do so.

(1) To the unanimous opinion of my committee that the Ross rifle could not be relied upon to work smoothly and efficiently in rapid fire with any ammunition other than that of Canadian manufacture;

(2) to the fact that no ammunition of this nature was available in this country, and that sufficient supplies could not be obtained from England.

Further on he said:

I did not feel justified in sending this division into battle with the Ross rifle, and ordered the re-arming of the infantry of the division with the Lee-Enfield rifle, which was carried out before they went into action on the 15th inst.

I submit that there is only one conclusion to be drawn from those words; and yet by picking other sentences out of the report, sentences which are not governing in their character, sentences which I am bound to suppose were put there for the purpose of letting down easily the Canadian Department of Militia, the Prime Minister and the Solicitor General have endeavoured to create the impression that Sir John French did not report against the Ross rifle. Sir John French quotes the report of the committee of which he speaks. In his first report he says, in section 7:

I have expressed and acted upon my opinion that, so far as I could test, the ammunition of British manufacture is not suitable for use with Ross rifles, that there is a large and growing feeling of want of confidence in their rifles on the part of the men in the Canadian division, which is amply justified by the report of the committee.

Now, that is a report on the rifle, and that is what Sir John French says. I submit that when the Solicitor General undertook to read another meaning into that report, he was not fair to the House or to the country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I read the report.

Mr. OLIVER: Carefully edited. I will take the liberty of calling the attention of the House again to some portions of this report of the committee:

Opinion of committee: A unanimous opinion was expressed that Canadian manufactured D.A.C. 1914 Mk. VII ammunition only, of those tried, was suitable for rapid fire with the Ross rifle.

That deals with the question of ammunition, and it points out that only a certain brand of Canadian ammunition would work satisfactorily in the Ross rifle. He says:

That provided a sufficient supply of Canadian manufactured ammunition of this type could be supplied.

But he did not suggest that it could be provided, it had not been provided, and there was no reason to believe that it would be provided.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman forgets that the War Office stated at the very same time in reply to that letter that it was provided.

Mr. OLIVER: This is the report of the committee on which Sir John French based his report. I am reading it to the House. It was upon Sir John French's report that my hon. friend tried to justify himself, it was not on some other report of some body else, it was on this report; and this report explicitly says that the Ross rifle did not work satisfactorily except with a certain kind of ammunition which was not available in sufficient supply.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Read it, it was with re spect to the future.

Mr. OLIVER: He stated:

That provided a sufficient supply of Canadian-manufactured ammunition of this type could be supplied.

Provided it could be supplied, but it had not been supplied and Sir John French gave no indication of his expectation that it could or would be supplied.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The War Office did it.

Mr. OLIVER: That is another story. This is the report which my friend was taking up and upon which he rested his whole case. He edited it carefully and I am giving it exactly as it is. He says, and I would like the committee to listen to this feature very carefully:

The other defects apparent were not sufficient to condemn the Ross rifle in view of the present shortage of rifles generally.

They were sufficient to condemn the Ross rifle if other rifles had been available. Is that the proper meaning of these words? There is no other meaning that can be attached to them, and if that is not a straight and square condemnation of the Ross rifle on its merits, then the English language has lost its significance at the hands of my hon. friend. It goes on:

The committee were practically unanimous in advising that the Ross rifle should be employed on the lines of communication, and

that if possible, the Canadian troops should be armed with the British rifle.

The merry jest of the right hon. the Prime Minister the other night that the Ross was a rifle for peace and not for war, under the Liberal make, is borne out by this report of the committee that it was good for some places where fighting was not expected, on the lines of communication, but that the troops should be armed with the British rifle. Does my hon. friend attempt to justify the action of this Government in asking this House to vote $2,660,000 to make 80,000 more of these rifles that were specifically condemned in these terms by the authority to which he deferred as being absolute in this matter? The committee sat on the 5th June, 1915, and the report of Sir John French was made on the 19th of June. You will observe that the difficulties and delays which have interfered with the action of this Government in dealing with this matter of rifles did not interfere with Sir John French forwarding his report in a very short time after he got the opinion of the committee to investigate the rifle. There was no delay on the other side of the water; there has been nothing but delay on this side of the water.

Just to go into some of the details of this report, I will ask any man who cares to bring his judgment to bear what conclusion he could possibly reach other than that reached by the committee and transmitted by Sir John French to the War Office.

With regard to the following specific points which the committee was asked to answer, the questions and answers are as stated below:

1. There are frequent reports that the bolt action jams after about 5 rounds.

Now that is not a question of ammunition, that is a question of construction and mechanism, and that is the first statement that the committee made, "there are frequent complaints that the bolt action jams after about 5 rounds," and the Solicitor General tells this House and this country that the report of Sir John French justifies the Government in refusing to take action to replace the Ross rifle with a more efficient weapon as they should have done, and could have done under the contract. The committee go on to say:

2. Full value of rapid fire cannot be developed unless:

(a) Ammunition of Canadian manufacture is used.

(b) Rifle is perfectly clean.

It will be observed in this No. 2, the question of ammunition is considered, and it is stated that the rifle is better adapted for use with ammunition of Canadian manufacture than that of British manufacture. That has nothing whatever to do with the first clause, which said that the bolt action jams after about 5 rounds.

Mr. HANNA: Why did it not jam when they fired 100 rounds in the trial?

Mr. OLIVER: I do not know.

Mr. HANNA: You had better read it.

Mr. OLIVER: Does my hon. friend know??

Mr. HANNA: Yes, it was because they were using Canadian ammunition. They fired 100 rounds and it did not jam.

Mr. OLIVER: That is not what this report says, and I can only give what the report says.

Mr. HANNA: It is exactly what it says.

Mr. OLIVER: This is what my hon. friend the Solicitor General rested his case on, and I am willing to rest my case upon it also. I ask the House to read that section, and to take it as it stands, and as it was meant to stand. The second part of section 2 is that the rifle must be perfectly clean. That is a condition that cannot be maintained in trench warfare, and the rifle whose efficiency depends upon perfect cleanliness is not an efficient weapon in trench warfare such as prevails to-day. That has been the contention all the time. It was reported from the front by the first men who went there, and it is borne out by this statement by this committee. The report goes on to deal with the question of ammunition:—

That English-made ammunition is slightly larger than Canadian so that immediately the cartridge exploded the cartridge case fills the chamber so tightly as to cause a jam.

That is not in place of the other disabilities; that is in addition to the other disabilities. No. 4 reads:—

That orders exist that on no account are troops to take out their magazine as it necessitates stripping the rifle.

That is the objection. Then:—

(b) Unless the magazine is unloaded every 24 hours and the spring action eased, the magazine fails to respond.

That had nothing to do with the ammunition.

(5) That dirt accumulates easily in the bolt head and also in the receptive thread in the breech of the rifle. Owing to difficulty of cleaning jams are caused.

That has nothing to do with ammunition:

(6) The screw of the bolt expands under heat and renders it difficult to open the breech (presumably due to the number of bearing surfaces affected.

That is to say, under rapid fire the bolt heats and causes jams.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I know that my hon. friend does not desire to mislead the committee, but what he is doing is this: he is reading the questions as if they were answers, while the answers are given below. He has apparently become greatly confused. The first twelve of these questions raise points which the committee were to investigate, and he is reading them as if they were the reports of the investigators.

Mr. OLIVER: Precisely.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The reports of the investigators are further down, 1, 2, 3, 4 and up to 12. So let us understand what the situation is, and not run away with the idea that what the hon. gentleman is reading is the report of the committee. What he is reading is matter submitted for the consideration of the committee.

Mr. OLIVER: That is absolutely correct, but the answers themselves do not give an intelligent knowledge of the matter.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If my hon. friend wants to give an intelligent statement of what the committee did find, he should read the points which he mentions and then read the findings of the committee on them. He has not been doing that.

Mr. OLIVER: I will follow the Prime Minister's suggestion.

(1) There are frequent reports that the bolt action jams after about 5 rounds.

The answer to that is, "yes."

(2) Full value of rapid cannot be developed unless: (a) ammunition of Canadian manufacture is used.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER: The second is:

(b) Rifle is perfectly clean.

The answer to that is:

Full value of rapid fire can be developed with ammunition of Canadian manufacture only. (b) This point was not tested.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the second.

Mr. OLIVER: Yes. The third is:

English-made ammunition is slightly larger than Canadian.

That is of course the contention in regard to the ammunition. The answer is:

The British-made cartridge case appears to be of a slightly thicker gauge than that of Canadian manufacture and the diameter of the cartridge immediately under the rim appears to be slightly greater than that of Canadian manufactured ammunition. This may be the cause of jamming.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER: But it does not say that it is.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER: This may be a very jocular matter to some hon. members, but the question is asked specifically, and the answer is made by a responsible committee who say it may be. They do not say it is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What does Sir John French recommend?

Mr. OLIVER: That the rifle be taken away.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all; just read his recommendation.

Mr. OLIVER: I am going to read it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He recommended that we enlarge the chamber, and that is just what we did.

Mr. OLIVER: He took the rifles away and replaced them with Lee-Enfield rifles; what he argued about is a matter of minor consideration. Remember, what he did, he did on the strength of this report.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: That was his interpretation of the report.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Until the chamber was enlarged, and we got Canadian ammunition.

Mr. OLIVER: Not at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly.

Mr. OLIVER: Then the hon. member is in this position, if he says that, he says that Sir John French did not know his business.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, no.

Mr. OLIVER: Because, after the chamber had been enlarged, Sir Douglas Haig reported on it exactly as Sir John French had reported. Therefore, either Sir John French did not know his business, or he did not report as my hon. friend suggests he reported.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The report is there.

Mr. OLIVER: I am telling him that it is there, and the report is—I will read it again. It says:

There is a large and growing feeling of want of confidence in their rifle on the part of the men in the Canadian division which is amply justified by the report of the committee.

Can there be any plainer language than that. Then he says:

I did not feel justified in sending this Division into battle with the Ross rifle, and ordered the re-arming of the infantry of the division with the Lee-Enfield rifle, which was carried out before they went into action on the 15th instant.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He gives the reasons; you are afraid to give the reasons.

Mr. OLIVER: I am reading the reasons; I am not afraid of them. I say that the reasons are ample. Either they are ample, or Sir John French was not fit for his position. Now, I do not think that either my hon. friend or myself is in a position to criticise Sir John French. The ex-Minister of Militia may do so, but I do not think we are in that position.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Or the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell).

Mr. OLIVER: Possibly, but when Sir John French on this report takes certain action and says that he takes certain action on this report, I am bound to believe that he did what he did for the reason that he gave, and the reason which was good enough for him ought to have been good enough for this Government.

(4) That orders exist that on no account are troops to take out their magazine as it necessitates stripping the rifle.

The answer to that is: "Yes".

The next is:

4. (b) Unless the magazine is unloaded every 24 hours and the spring action eased, the magazine fails to respond.

The answer is:

Possibly this is the case, but the committee were unable to test this point.

Next:

5. That dirt accumulates easily in the bolt head and also in the receptive thread in the breech of the rifle. Owing to difficulty of cleaning jams are caused.

The answer is:

This may be so, but the rifles were not tried under dirty conditions.

Next:

6. The screw of the bolt head expands under heat and renders it difficult to open the breech (presumably due to the number of bearing surfaces affected.)

[Mr. Meighen.]

The answer is:

The expansion of the bolt head was not apparent when firing 100 rounds of Canadian-manufactured ammunition.

Next:

7. The Ross rifle sight is defective because of its delicacy and the smallness of the figures which make it difficult to adjust the sight easily.

The answer is:

Admittedly the figuring of the sighting is small and difficult to read as compared to the British Lee-Enfield rifle.

Next:

8. The magazine case is too thin and is dented easily. This causes a jamb as the spring cannot work.

The answer is:

The magazine case is flat and any dent therein would seriously affect the spring therein.

Next:

9. The foresight is not good for service work. The circular cover easily gets filled with mud and is difficult to clean.

The answer is:

The committee did not consider that any great amount of difference existed in this respect in comparison with the British rifle.

Next:

10. A hole has recently been bored in the base of the magazine to enable the cleaning of the magazine to be carried out without stripping the rifle.

The answer is:

This hole should be covered by a small revolving plate, adjusted by a screw.

Next:

11. It is far easier to load the Lee-Enfield rifle than the Ross rifle with a clip of ammunition. A Lee-Enfield rifle takes 10 rounds, a Ross 5 rounds.

The answer is:

Undoubtedly the loading of the Lee-Enfield can be carried out in half the time, mainly owing to the fact that the guide for the clip on the British rifle is directly over the magazine chamber.

Next:

12. That the shape of the fore part of the chamber of the Ross rifle is different to that of the Lee-Enfield. That this does not allow of the same expansion and is the cause of the jam.

Undoubtedly there is a difference of the shape of the fore part of the chamber, but the committee was not able to decide that this was the cause of the jam.

And this is the representation upon which my hon. friend rests his case, that the Government was justified in enlarging the chamber of the Ross rifle as a means of

preventing jams, instead of ordering a new rifle at that time, as they were entitled to do under the terms of the contract made by the Liberal Government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Did not Sir John French recommend us to enlarge the chamber?

Mr. OLIVER: I am reading the report of the committee appointed by Sir John French.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why does not the hon. gentleman answer my question? Did not Sir John French recommend us to enlarge the chamber, and not abandon the rifle at all?

Mr. OLIVER: I am not discussing what Sir John French said. I am discussing this point: We have been considering the reasons why the rifle jammed, and it has been contended by hon. gentlemen opposite that the rifle jammed because the chamber was too small, or that Sir John French believed it jammed because the chamber was too small. The Government delayed more than a year from taking measures to secure an efficient rifle under the contract, because of the statement of Sir John French. And here we have a report of the committee appointed by Sir John French, and that report states that the committee were not able to decide that the bore of the chamber was the cause of the jamming.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why did Sir John French recommend us to enlarge the chamber? And he having so recommended, will the hon. gentleman say that we should not have followed his recommendation?

Mr. OLIVER: In a case where the credit of Canada is at stake, where the lives of our men and the success of our armies depend upon the efficiency of the rifle, and when Sir John French reports that he disarmed our men of the Ross rifle, as he did, before he dared send them into action—in such a case I would most certainly take what he did before what he said, even if he said what my hon. friend says he said, for if he said it, he said it without the authority of the committee he had himself appointed to report. The report of the committee, I assume, was available to this Government along with Sir John French's report. It was sent by Sir John French with his own report for the information of this Government, and they are responsible for not giving due consideration to the report of this committee, whatever Sir John French saw fit to report.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Does the hon. gentleman contend also that the British Government should have thrown away the Lee-Enfield rifle, instead of enlarging the chamber as they did?

Mr. OLIVER: I know nothing about the Lee-Enfield, and have no idea what the British Government ought to do. I am talking for the soldiers of Canada and the people of Canada. That is the business that is under the hand of the Prime Minister, and that is quite sufficient to absorb the attention of the best of us for the present. I do not know what the British Government did, why they did it, or what the result was. But I do know that this Government delayed a full year in ordering an efficient rifle, which they should have ordered and could have ordered under the contract, while they were enlarging the chamber and tempering the bolts; and at the end of that time Sir Douglas Haig found, as Sir John French had found, that the rifle was inefficient, and that the troops had lost confidence in it. As a matter of fact, the slaughter of Canadians, armed with the Ross rifle, under Sir Douglas Haig's command in 1916, was greater than the slaughter under Sir John French's command in 1915.

Mr. WRIGHT: The same rifle?

Mr. OLIVER: Absolutely the same.

Mr. WRIGHT: And the slaughter was greater?

Mr. OLIVER: More men were engaged.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The German slaughter was greater, too.

Mr. OLIVER: Possibly; I do not know. I am not seriously concerned about the German slaughter. What I am seriously concerned about is this: When I know that Germany is equipped with the best arm that science can devise and money supply, it is up to the Government of Canada not to delay or question or haggle, but to make sure that the soldiers of Canada, too, have a weapon as good as science can devise and money supply.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. gentleman knows that the Germans are armed with the best weapon that science can devise and money supply, why does he recommend this Government to order Lee-Enfields?

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend is good at conundrums, and I will let him answer that himself; it is really not material. I was desiring to recall some parts of my

hon. friend's suggestions in regard to myself, but they have slipped my memory, so I will not trouble the House with refering to them.

We have spent a great deal of time here in discussing this question of the Ross rifle, and for my part I have no apology to offer for having done so. What has struck me most seriously in this connection is the fact that this Government, charged with this stupendous responsibility, could consent to take up the line of argument and the form of discussion that it has seemed good to them to follow. To the damning conditions that exist they set up the plea of due diligence in the effort to amend those condiitons. There is, to my mind, a most striking resemblance in the attitude of the Government in regard to the making of efficient rifles in Canada to that which prevailed a year or more ago in regard to the making of munitions of other kinds in Canada, such as shells and fuses and other articles of a like character. Our hon. friends must accept the position that the attitude was taken that Canada could not do this and Canada could not do that, but Canada did do this and Canada did do that in regard to other munitions of war, munitions that had never been manufactured before in Canada, that had never been manufactured before on this side of the Atlantic. We were able to establish factories, to secure capital, to train men, to enter upon forms of industry that we had never before seen or heard tell of almost: but we were not able to secure the skill or the capital or the energy or we were not able to take the measures that necessity called upon us to take to give our soldiers an efficient weapon with which to meet our enemies in the field of battle. I cannot imagine how any Government can accept such a position as calmly as they have done, and particularly I cannot understand how, in the face of all that has been said, of the fact that they have not been able to make out a case for themselves before the country, they can come before this House and ask us to vote $2,660,000 for the manufacture of still more of these rifles which the British Government practically refuse to allow them to send over to England and which they refuse to allow our armies in France to be armed with further.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the hon. gentleman aware that the British Government has ordered 100,000 of these rifles and that it has refused to cancel the order, is still taking delivery of them and will be for months to come?

Mr. OLIVER: I am not concerned about the British Government; but now the hon. gentleman has risen to his seat, he reminds me of that little matter which slipped my mind and so I shall be able to refer to it. The committee will pardon me if I bring this matter to their attention. The committee will recall that my hon. friend was very strong on the point that the Government of Canada had on the 15th of May ordered the arming of our troops with Lee-Enfield rifles.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Authorized, if Sir Douglas Haig approved.

Mr. OLIVER: What my hon. friend tried to convey to the country was that an order had been issued for the arming of the troops with Lee-Enfield rifles.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say that.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend did not say that and now he says he does not mean what he said.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I said meant exactly what I said, exactly what I intended, namely, that we had authorized the change if in the judgment of Sir Douglas Haig it was the best thing to do. That is exactly what I stated and what is true.

Mr. OLIVER: On February 2 my hon. friend the member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) read to the House from the papers that were laid upon the Table a cable message from the Governor General to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The message, which is dated Ottawa, June 5, 1916, is reported on page 410 of the Unrevised Hansard and contains the following:

Secret.

Following from Prime Minister for Sir William Robertson. By reason of rumored dissatisfaction with Ross rifle I held consultation with General Hughes on 15th May and sent unofficial message to Commander in Chief that we were prepared to leave matters to his judgment after making all necessary tests of both rifles under such conditions as are experienced at the front.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just what I said.

Mr. OLIVER: I think my hon. friend conveyed the impression that he had sent an official message, not an unofficial message.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say whether it was official or unofficial.

Mr. OLIVER: That is precisely the point. My hon. friend did not say that he had

sent an unofficial message. He did not say that he had sent a message that could be withdrawn under certain circumstances.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was not withdrawn.

Mr. OLIVER: No, it was not withdrawn.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the difference, then?

Mr. OLIVER: What my hon. friend did was to put before the House what he desired the House and the country to understand, namely, that the Government had taken the responsibility at that date of ordering the troops to be armed with Lee-Enfield rifles.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I did not.

Mr. OLIVER: Now he admits that he did not do so on that date.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly I never said so. I said exactly what you read.

Mr. OLIVER: Never meant to say so?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Never meant to say so and never did say so. I said exactly what is stated in that cable message.

Mr. OLIVER: No, my hon. friend will have to withdraw a little of that because "unofficial" is stated in this cable message and he did not state "unofficial".

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not pay a bit of attention to it. Will my hon. friend tell me what difference it makes as long as the message was not withdrawn?

Mr. OLIVER: It is not a question as to whether it was withdrawn or not. It was a question of the intent of the message, and the intent is as plain as day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Without withdrawal, the effect is the same.

Mr. OLIVER: This leaves open the privilege of withdrawal.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was not withdrawn.

Mr. OLIVER: It was not an order?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I never said it was an order; I said it was an authorization.

Mr. OLIVER: We are quite in agreement. All I wanted was to get the position of the hon. gentleman as it is and not as he desired it to appear to the country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I desired it to appear just as it is.

Mr. OLIVER: Was that the last telegram that was sent in this connection?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, there was one on 5th of June, one on the 24th of June and several since.

Mr. OLIVER: Was there not a reply to this telegram received from Sir Douglas Haig?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not that I received.

Mr. OLIVER: There was a despatch from Sir Douglas Haig?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He reported to the War Office.

Mr. OLIVER: Yes, he reported to the War Office in pursuance of that communication.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I presume so. Perhaps he had another communication from the War Office. I do not know.

Mr. OLIVER: I think it is very likely he had, but anyway he reported on the 28th of May, and he reported specifically without equivocation for the re-arming of the Canadian troops with the Lee-Enfield rifle.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We had authorized him to do what he thought best before we got the report. That report was sent to the War Office and by them it was transmitted to Sir George Perley and sent out to us in July. But the troops had been re-armed already, and this was done with our authority.

Mr. OLIVER: I think the telegram I have reference to is in Hansard, but I cannot put my finger on it at the moment, and I will not delay the committee. As a matter of fact, the Government did not accept the report of Sir Douglas Haig.

Mr. MEIGHEN. He did not report to us, but to the War Office.

Mr. OLIVER: This Government sent another despatch which insisted that in their opinion the Ross rifle was an efficient rifle.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We sent on the 24th June, before we had seen Sir Douglas Haig's report, submitting the same proposal to him—that a change should be made if in their judgment it seemed best. And we got that report in July.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. gentleman may have got confused about a letter of 31st August, page 425 of Hansard.

Mr. OLIVER: On 7th June, the Prime Minister sent a despatch to the War Office, containing the following sentence:

> The Ross rifle is the only one we are at present equipped to make in Canada, and we believe it to be efficient if properly handled.

To this Sir Douglas Haig replied on 21st June:

> After consultation with the officer in command during recent heavy fighting, the experience of commanding officer in this fighting was that the Canadians of Third Division at least had lost confidence in their rifle. I must therefore adhere to my recommendation that the 2nd and 3rd Canadian Divisions should be re-armed shortly with the short Lee-Enfield rifle, and I would recommend that the necessary steps to give effect thereto be taken without delay.

Sir Douglas Haig had reported on 28th May in favour of re-arming the troops with the Lee-Enfield rifle. On 7th June this Government reported against that report in the terms that have been read.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. gentleman listened to what I said, or if he goes by the document, he must be aware that that statement is not correct. Sir Douglas Haig's report was made on 28th May. I have stated that it was written to the War Office. This reached us through Sir George Perley in the month of July. We did not protest against the report of Sir Douglas Haig when we did not get it, of course.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend may, perhaps, recall that on 17th May last I had the honour to bring to the attention of the House a certain extract, a letter addressed by General Alderson to General Gwatkin and published in the Ottawa Citizen. The Prime Minister said that before that date he had cabled to Sir Douglas Haig for a report on the Ross rifle. I am bound to suppose that the Prime Minister received a reply.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have explained to my hon. friend over and over again that I sent the message through the same channel as that through which I received communication. The telegram came from Sir Max Aitken, on the 13th or 14th, and on the 15th I sent a message to Sir Douglas Haig through the person through whom I had got that message.

Mr. OLIVER: Is this the situation? Having received a telegram dated 12th May from Sir Max Aitken to the Minister of Militia of that time, saying that a serious condition had arisen in regard to the Ross rifle, the Prime Minister stated to the House that he had cabled to Sir Douglas Haig, through Sir Max Aitken. And do the Prime Minister and the Solicitor General tell this House and the country that they never heard any more about that matter until July?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We heard nothing more except what is contained in the correspondence brought down.

[Mr. Oliver.]

Mr. OLIVER: I am assuming, for the credit of the Government, that the report of Sir Douglas Haig, made on 28th May, was in response to the cablegram sent by the Prime Minister, as stated. If that is not the case, and if they did not hear from Sir Douglas Haig until July, I can only say that the Government is absolutely condemned for not using due diligence in securing information as to the condition of the Ross rifle. They had received an urgent and special message from their special agent in regard to a serious condition on the field of battle, and they still tell this House that they heard no more about it until July? Well, if that is the measure of this Government's sense of its responsibility in regard to a matter so grave as this, we may as well close the discussion. This Government expends tens of thousands of dollars to keep a military staff in Canada and in England, and to maintain communication between them. We can get everything attended to, apparently, except this Ross rifle business. But it is the most important thing that claims our attention. Either that report of Sir Douglas Haig was in response to the cablegram of the Prime Minister, or it was not. Either the Government heard of it, or it did not. If they did not hear it, if they got no response, that means that they did not use due diligence to gain a knowledge of the circumstances to which the despatch of their agent refers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What about the cablegram that followed?

Mr. OLIVER: If they did receive Sir Douglas Haig's despatch—and I am bound to believe that they did—then they did not accede to the arming of our troops with Lee-Enfield rifles until they had put in the protest which I have read, until Sir Douglas Haig had made his reply, repeating his first recommendation, and until the War Office had communicated with this Government ordering them, in effect, not to send any more Ross rifles to England.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the use of explaining anything to the hon. gentleman if he ignores both the explanation and the facts that are clearly stated in the documents?

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend will have to take the facts as I give them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You do not give them.

Mr. OLIVER: I give the facts as they are.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You refuse to listen when I tell you about the telegrams that were sent.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend insists that I have not stated the facts. I will give place to him in order to afford him an opportunity of stating the facts as be believes them to be.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have already done so two or three times, but if the hon. gentleman wants it again, I will give it to him.

Mr. OLIVER: Again, please.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A cablegram came through Sir Max Aitken saying that a serious condition had arisen. Immediately on its receipt a cablegram was sent to Sir Douglas Haig, through the same channel. Sir Max Aitken, placing in the judgment of Sir Douglas Haig the question as between the Ross and Lee-Enfield rifles for the Canadian troops, in the very terms that the telegram sets out. The next thing that was done was the sending of two cablegrams on June 5, one to Sir George Perley and one to Sir William Robertson, particularly repeating the position that we had taken on May 15. we having heard nothing in the meantime. We repeated on June 24. Later in July we received from Sir George Perley correspondence that had passed in the meantime between Sir Douglas Haig and the War Office—not between Sir Douglas Haig and us—part of which correspondence was a letter from Sir Douglas Haig to the War Office dated May 28, and part of which was a letter of June 21 to the War Office. Then there were letters from the War Office to Sir Douglas Haig and from Sir George Perley to Sir William Robertson. All this was transmitted to this Government by Sir George Perley in a letter dated July 5; so that is the first that we knew of the correspondence that had passed. What is the use of talking about our protesting in our cables of June 5 and June 24 against what Sir Douglas Haig said on May 28, when what he said reached us only in July.

Mr. OLIVER: I will take from my hon. friend just what he has said, and I ask him what position the Government is in when, having a High Commissioner in London who was a member of the Government, having this special agent there with all the necessary paraphernalia at hand, they could not get an answer to a question as important as this? I say that the Government is absolutely condemned for lacking diligence in dealing with this matter. My hon friend says that on May 15 they gave specific instructions for the re-arming of the troops with Lee-Enfield rifles, subject to Sir Douglas Haig's opinion. On the 7th they again wrote to the War Office saying:

> The Ross rifle is the only one we are at present equipped to make in Canada. We believe it to be efficient if properly handled.

They were not leaving it to Sir Douglas Haig.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes, we were. Read all of it.

Mr. OLIVER: I am reading this part of it, which carries its own meaning.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, it does not.

Mr. OLIVER: The meaning of that paragraph was that this Government desired a report in favour of the Ross rifle—some such report as they got from General French. But they did not get it from Sir Douglas Haig; that is the only difference. They tried to get it, but they were not successful.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What nonsense.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend is to be congratulated on his parliamentary courtesy. The fact remains that we are called upon to vote this money to a Government which, on its own confession, from start to finish, has convicted itself of absolute lack of diligence on the most important subject under its consideration. They have convicted themselves of leaving in the hands of our soldiers an inefficient rifle after they knew it to be inefficient, and when the terms of the contract with the rifle company enabled them to change that inefficiency to efficiency whenever they desired to do so.

The CHAIRMAN: The resolution before the committee is to be considered in the same manner as a resolution of Supply. The amendment that the member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has proposed does not seem to be in order, for the following reasons: The Governor General having given his consent to the resolution under consideration, it is not competent for this committee to do otherwise than to agree, reduce, negative, supersede or withdraw by leave. May, in the 11th edition, under the heading, "Committees on Exceptional Expenditure," says:

> "Procedure in a Committee of the Whole House appointed to consider expenditure not included in the Estimates for the year's supply follows, in principle, the procedure of the Committee of Supply.

Under the heading, "The Committee of Supply," the same author says:

Each resolution for a grant forms a distinct motion, which can only be dealt with by being agreed to, reduced, negatived, superseded, or, by leave, withdrawn.

I could quote Bourinot, who, page 427, expresses the same opinion. A decision of the same nature was given during the last session by the Chairman of Committees and may be found in Hansard of May 15, 1916, page 3944. Therefore, in my judgment, it appears that the amendment is not in order, and I so rule.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not question your ruling, Mr. Chairman, but I think that this motion was put to the committee once by the Chairman to-night. Members on the other side cried "Lost" and it was, I am almost sure, declared lost until an hon. gentleman rose to make a few additional observations. I am not quite sure that once a motion has been put to the committee the chairman can very well rule it out of order.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment was not declared lost, but, for the reasons stated, the amendment has been ruled out of order, and so I declare it.

Mr. GRAHAM: For reasons which have been explained to me by the Prime Minister, I think it wise to allow this resolution to get into the bill stage, with this understanding of course, that no gentleman who wishes to discuss this further in the committee stage of the Bill will be thought to be retarding the passage of the measure. That is not our object at all. Several gentlemen on this side, thinking the discussion would last so late to-night that the resolution would not be passed, went home. They have some observations to make on other phases of it, and I should like the Prime Minister to fully understand that in agreeing to the passage of this Resolution it is understood these gentlemen will not be thought to be taking up the time of the House unduly or taking advantage of the situation if they discuss the Bill.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have a great deal of sympathy with the hon. members who have gone home, and I should be the last to desire to restrict them in discussion when we come to Committee on the Bill. Some information has been asked for which I shall be very glad to give when we come to the committee stage of the Bill, and there will be exactly the same opportunity of discussion then that there has been upon the Resolution.

[The Chairman.]

Mr. PUGSLEY: I should like to say a few words when the Bill gets into committee, more especially with regard to the equipment which was supplied to the Canadian troops and which was discarded when they reached England. I asked a question with regard to the Oliver equipment, but the Minister side-stepped the question by converting it into a motion for a return. I should like to get the information before the Bill reaches the committee stage.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: All of these political stories about large sums having been lost to the country through equipment having been discarded will be found to have very little foundation. Information on that subject can be given to my hon. friend. I made some pretty careful inquiries into it, and I shall have the information for my hon. friend.

Resolutions reported, read the first and second time, and agreed to.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 24, for granting to His Majesty aid for military and naval defence.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

On the motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at 12.40 a.m. Tuesday.

Tuesday, February 6, 1917.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS OFFICIALS.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had directed the Clerk of the House to lay upon the Table his recommendation and the Clerk's report respecting the promotion of Mr. A. C. Campbell, of the Hansard staff, and of Mr. Harry E. Oliver from committee reporting staff to the Hansard staff, and of the changes in grades thereby required under the Civil Service Act; also his recommendation and the Clerk's report in the matter of the appointment of Mr. D. L. Desaulniers, supervisor of the blue-book translation staff of the House of Commons, to the position of chief translator of the House of Commons; and also his recommendation and the Clerk's report in connection with the appointment of Mr. L. Boulet as chief of pages on the staff of the House of Commons.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the recommendation of the Honourable the Speaker, laid on the table of the House on

the 3rd instant, relative to the yearly increase in salary to certain officers, clerks and employees of the House, pursuant to section 37 of the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908, be approved.

Mr. MARCIL: I ask the Prime Minister what the Government intends to do in respect to the sessional employees during the adjournment?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The subject has not been brought to my attention; I really could not answer my hon. friend.

Mr. MARCIL: Would the hon. gentleman give the matter of these sessional employees some consideration? He understands what I mean.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I shall ask his Honour the Speaker to take the matter into consideration, as this is a subject more particularly coming under his jurisdiction, and that of the Commission on Internal Economy.

Motion agreed to.

STATEMENT BY SIR SAM HUGHES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir SAM HUGHES: I observe that in one of the morning papers I am credited with having mentioned the name of General Stanley Von Donop as as ordnance officer in connection with certain matters that I referred to last night. I neither directly nor indirectly mentioned General Von Donop; nor did I refer to him—I do not know how the name got into print.

I observe also that the hon. Solicitor General in his opening remarks yesterday—following, I assume, the lead of certain distinguished statesmen, who wish to balance one against the other and show that they are always taking a middle course—stated:

> At the same time we are attacked by the ex-Minister of Militia because we authorized this substitution too soon.

I shall be pleased if the Solicitor General, who is not in his seat now, will show where I have attacked the Government on this matter. I was not aware that I attacked him. When I attack the Government, I will realize it, and I think they will too.

WESTERN COAL MINING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: With reference to an inquiry which was made yesterday by the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Buchanan) with regard to the strike in the coal mines in Alberta and British Columbia: the information which has been received indicates that the men resumed work yesterday in all the mines except Coalhurst, and that they were to resume work in that mine to-day.

Mr. BUCHANAN: Is the Prime Minister acquainted with the terms of settlement? I have been advised from Lethbridge that the coal strike has been settled on the basis of a war bonus of $1.75 per week per man from the middle of November last to the end of March, the Government to indemnify the operators for the bonus.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The terms of the settlement will be made known when the Minister of Labour returns; he is expected to arrive here to-morrow. In the meantime, I do not think it desirable that I should make any statement on the subject.

MONTREAL POSTMASTER.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: I do not see the Postmaster-General in his seat, but I should like to ask the Government if it is their intention to appoint a postmaster in Montreal at an early date? I am told that the service there requires the appointment of a postmaster at the earliest possible moment.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Postmaster General has not brought the matter to my attention. I shall direct his attention to what my hon. friend has represented.

156TH BATTALION—THE NOVA SCOTIA HIGHLAND BRIGADE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. A. E. KEMP (Minister of Militia): The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) referred on Wednesday last to a matter concerning the 156th Battalion. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) referred on the same day to the matter of the Nova Scotia Highland Brigade. On Thursday a cable message was sent with regard to these matters to the Minister of the Canadian Overseas military forces. An answer was received on Sunday, and did not reach my desk on Monday until after I had left for the House. The answer is:

> At an early stage instructions were given for absorption of 156th Battalion into 109th Battalion, but subsequently in order to aid recruiting in district from which raised and in view of 5th Division being formed order was cancelled, battalion reconstituted and

allotted 5th Division. It was impossible to allot all battalions Nova Scotia Highland Brigade to fighting formations; 85th Battalion selected for service with Canadian corps, France; 185th posted to 5th Division; remaining two battalions absorbed into 17th Reserve Battalion Highlanders for purposes supplying reinforcements to 85th, 185th and other Nova Scotia battalions in the field.

THE CARE OF RETURNED SOLDIERS.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In pursuance of what I said yesterday upon the motion of the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee), it is my purpose to-morrow to move as follows:

That a committee of nine members be appointed for the purpose of considering, inquiring into and reporting upon:

(a) The reception, treatment, care, training and re-education of the wounded, disabled and convalescent who have served in the Canadian expeditionary forces;

(b) The provision of employment for those who have been honourably discharged from the Canadian Expeditionary Forces and the training and re-education of those so discharged who are unable to engage in their former occupation.

I shall not make this motion to-day, but I should be glad if the member for West Lambton would give consideration to its terms. I have asked my right hon. friend to name four gentleman on that side of the House who, with five whom I shall name, would constitute that committee.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF CONFEDERATION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I suggest to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that it is expedient to appoint a committee of nine to consider and report upon the arrangements which should be made for the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the foundation of this dominion. It seems to me to be proper that a committee should take that subject into consideration; possibly it might be advisable that a committee of the Senate should also be appointed. I do not intend to suggest that there should be any expenditure of public moneys—certainly not any considerable expenditure—but in order that an appropriate form of celebration may be adopted, it seems to me that a committee of the House might very well be appointed, if my right hon. friend has no objection.

So if my right hon. friend will be good enough to give me the names of four hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, I shall make the motion to-morrow.

[Mr. Kemp.]

DAVIDSON COMMISSION REPORT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY: I see that the right hon. leader of the Opposition made inquiry in my absence as to the production of the report of Sir Charles Davidson, the Commissioner to inquire into war purchases. Last Tuesday there were laid on the table of the House three reports covering the submarine investigation, the sale of small arms ammunition, and allegations that unsuitable military cloths were furnished. There was also laid on the Table the entire evidence taken by the Commissioner with regard to the other matters to be reported upon. As the Commissioner explained in his introduction to the first of these reports, quite considerable delay was caused by vicissitudes in his health. I am glad to say that he has quite recovered, and my information is that he is continuously at work and that we may hope to have reports coming in now almost from day to day.

HON. DR. BELAND, M.P.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) asked whether any efforts had been made to secure the release of a colleague, with whom I am sure we all most heartily sympathize, Dr. Béland, in connection with the release of Baron Von Polenz and Baron Mundhein. Baron Mundhein has never been released; he is still in internment at Fort Henry. I understood my hon. friend to base his inquiry upon the statement of a newspaper in regard to Baron Mundhein.

With regard to Baron Von Polenz; at the time of his release conditions were such that the effecting of any exchange would have been absolutely impossible, and I believe that these conditions as regards individual exchanges have continued since. I think I may add, and this has already been practically recognized, that every endeavour this Government could make to bring about the release of Dr. Béland has been made; and were there any further effort that could be made, certainly the Government would be glad to make it. At the time it would have been quite impossible to connect up the two things, and the case of Baron Von Polenz had to be dealt with on its own merits. In view of the particular circumstances of the case, I may add that every precaution was taken to satisfy absolutely the police authorities that the action taken in his case was one that could

be taken without in any way exposing the public safety.

THE 60th BATTALION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir SAM HUGHES: I was not in a few moments ago when the Minister of Militia made a statement regarding the disposition of some of the battalions in England. Was anything said concerning the 60th Battalion which was at the front fighting?

Mr. KEMP: I do not think there was anything in this despatch regarding the 60th.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Has the minister any data on the subject?

Mr. KEMP: No, but I can get it.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I have received several cablegrams that have been addressed to other people to ascertain why they have been taken out of the firing line, and some other battalions, I do not know what they are, substituted for them. Would the minister look into the matter?

IMMIGRATION REGULATIONS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. SINCLAIR: Some days ago I drew the attention of the Prime Minister to hardships that were being experienced by Canadians returning from the United States through their children being detained at the border. I mentioned the case of the wife of a Canadian soldier who was visiting her father in Brooklyn, New York, and who arrived at the Canadian boundary with a child six months of age, but was refused admission to Canada because she had not a certificate of health for the child as required by the Interior Department. The objection I saw was that instead of returning the mother to a distant point in the United States some arrangement might have been made by which the child might have been examined at the border. This occurred at MacAdam Junction. When the case was drawn to my attention I laid it before the Prime Minister who said he would submit it to the Minister of the Interior. Would the minister explain how the matter stands and if anything has been done to relax the rule first adopted in regard to this matter?

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Minister of Interior): In reading the hon. gentleman's remarks in Hansard I gathered the opinion that he was under the impression that this was a medical examination enforced against immigrants coming into Canada. That is not the case. The hon. gentleman will remember that last fall there was a very severe epidemic of infantile paralysis particularly in the city and state of New York, which spread to the other neighbouring states, and some of the United States municipalities had actually an embargo against their city of New York. For the protection of our children in Canada it was considered necessary to have an embargo placed against those states in which infantile paralysis was epidemic, we therefore insisted upon any person coming into Canada with children having a certificate from a medical doctor that the children had not been exposed to any case of infantile paralysis within thirty days. The transportation companies were informed as to this requirement, so that any person purchasing tickets to Canada was or should have been informed by the ticket agent as to the necessity of providing certificates of this kind. My hon. friend will see that it would be of no use to have Canadian medical men at the boundary to give such certificates. I may say, however, that this embargo has been removed by reason of the suppression of the infantile paralysis epidemic.

WAR LOAN—$500,000,000.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister) Bill No. 24, for granting to His Majesty aid for military and naval defence was read for the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Mr. ROCH LANCTOT (Laprairie and Napierville) (translation): Mr. Speaker, before this Bill is passed, I wish to enter once more my protest against this policy which is ruining the people of this country.

I may state that I am not at variance with the ends pursued by the Allies, but solely with the manner in which this war is managed by the Government.

Hon. gentlemen possibly may enquire whether I am alone holding such views. In answer, I might quote from some London papers, statements to the effect that Great Britain, during the year 1915, would never ask for 150,000 men from Canada, realizing that such a sacrifice would be too heavy for us; and, in those papers, it was further stated that Canadians working in the fields

were helping the Allies' cause as much as those who were fighting in the trenches.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, quite recently a French lieutenant, after spending twenty-eight months in the trenches, having returned to Canada, on leave, to recuperate, made the following statement:

"On learning that Canada was to send forward 33,000 men, we said to ourselves: what a noble deed? When, later on, we were informed that a second contingent was to be sent overseas, we considered it as a sublime act of patriotism. When, still later on, in January, 1916, the Prime Minister of Canada stated that he would send 500,000 men, we exclaimed: That is madness!"

Now, Mr. Speaker, such being the case, it seems to me that Canada having sent to the front 50,000, 75,000, or even 100,000 men at $1.10 per day, might have stopped and taken up the manufacturing of munitions, though not for the exclusive benefit of the friends of the Government, but in every Canadian centre; and moreover might have utilized Government works for the manufacturing of munitions at cost price, or at a nominal advance of 10 or 15 per cent, whereas it is found that scandalous profits of 400 and 900 per cent have been secured thereon by friends of the Government.

I repeat it, the Government might well have made use of their own plants to turn out war munitions, and supply work to all comers for the purpose of meeting the requirements of the Allies. What happened since this war has broken out? What was the slogan of Lloyd George, the present Prime Minister, when addressing the House of Commons a short time ago? Munitions, munitions, munitions! In fact, this war is nothing else but a war of munitions and guns. So much so, that Great Britain, after sending men over to France to fight in the trenches, recalled home a number of them to turn out munitions instead. Such being the case, I am not at all certain, as a business man and a merchant, and also as the head of a family who has provided for his children by holding the plough, I am not at all certain, I say, whether this Government is doing the right thing towards the people of this country, by sending over to France and Flanders, to wage war, Canadian boys at $1.10 a day, when Great Britain has as many recruits as she is able to send over at one shilling a day. In the meantime, Great Britain is bound to keep at home a fairly large number of men physically fit, for the purpose of turning out munitions. Once more, may I inquire why Canada should commit the egregious mistake of sending her men overseas, instead of keeping them here to turn out munitions for the Allies, who are so much in need of them.

Mr. Speaker, I stated last year in this House and throughout my constituency whenever an opportunity offered, that if it could be shown that by means of 200,000 men drafted from Canada, we might win the war, I would not object to our making such a sacrifice. But, considering that Russia, with a man power of twenty-five or thirty million men, has not enough rifles or munitions to equip one third of that number, while here in Canada we are in need of all our people, I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is high time to put a stop to this sending of troops overseas. We have thinned our ranks to quite a sufficient extent; we have sent over rifles, though they are not any too good, if we are to judge from the statements made in this House for a few days past.

There must have been something in the wind last year, when the right hon. Prime Minister shot his bolt about sending 500,000 men. It is not my intention to cast any aspersions on him, but if we are to judge from the speeches which have been delivered on the Address, it is quite credible that its intent was to enable some fanatics, such as the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), to impugn the province of Quebec and assert that she is not living up to her obligations. Mr. Speaker, it is claimed that the province of Quebec it not fulfilling its duty. What happened when the war broke out? Frenchmen answered their country's call; so did the Belgians. Should not Englishmen who have been here for one, five, or even fifteen years, have answered as well the call of their Mother Country? Such was not the case, however. A number of them enlisted in the Canadian army at $1.10 per day, because the pay was higher with us than at home, and they are welcome to it. The province of Quebec has not received many immigrants from the British Isles; the greater part of these have gone to Ontario and the West. Is it not a matter of course that these people being newcomers in Canada, should answer their country's call, as recruits either for the British or the Canadian contingents? These late arrivals reading in the newspapers that the Huns had thrown bombs on British unfortified cities, were impelled to enlist with the object of defending their relatives at home.

As regards enlisting in the two provinces of Ontario and Quebec, comparisons be-

tween these two provinces are not in order, for the reasons I have stated. If reports in the press are to be credited, Ontario claims 110,000 British born, out of a total of 152,000 enlistments. How many are there in the province of Quebec? I cannot say, but there should not be many of them, British immigrants having kept aloof of our province.

Moreover, I say that this vexed question as regards enlistments, which is being constantly thrown in our faces, with the object of showing that the province of Quebec is disloyal, is very despicable business. It should not be brought up in this House, and the right hon. the Prime Minister should refuse to countenance any attempt of that kind.

Now, I shall take up another point. I was surprised to hear the hon. Minister of Finance, in his speech of January 30 last, refer to the country's prosperity, to the fabulous figures our exports have reached to, and in a general to the prosperous state of business. Of course, I have not been trained to speech-making, neither have I presided over trusts; I am only a farmer and a merchant. However, I am aware that when a town corporation or a school board in the province of Quebec make up their minds to borrow $1,500 or $2,000, they are called upon to refund the amount within twelve months, or even within thirty or ninety days. Now, I wonder whether the Minister of Finance at whose request the House voted 800 millions for 1917-18, would be in a position to refund that amount within ninety days, as the aforesaid corporations do. I believe that the people of this country, who are being deceived day in and day out by the government organs, would consider that the war comes high, should the Minister of Finance some day come out with some, such statement: We are in need of 800 millions, and the loan will have to be refunded within ninety days. In the province of Quebec, families with ten or twelve children are no exception, and they have to be provided for in any case. I wonder whether the people would take stock in any statement made by the minister or his colleagues, as regards the prosperity of the country, if the head of a family, with ten or twelve children to provide for, were called upon to contribute $1,400. How could the people of this country foot the bill? There would not be found 25 per cent in a position to liberate themselves. The ministers hailing from the province of Quebec went through that province last year and attempted to make the people believe that we were actually prosperous, though it is known that it is all the outcome of the manufacturing of shells and guns, with the object of making fodder for guns, as the ministers themselves asserted in 1910. So I say that we should not rely on that prosperity, which is only fictitious, and will be a source of disappointment, once the war is over.

Mr. Speaker, before closing my remarks, I wish to call your attention to a question which is being mooted: I mean conscription. La Patrie, of Montreal, suggested yesterday that it might be enacted very soon. Whatever will be the outcome of it, Mr. Speaker, I wish to state right here that I am not in favour of conscription, not any more than I am in favour of sending men overseas. I repeat it, if the Government had at heart the interests of the people, the Prime Minister, previous to embarking for Europe, would state in this House that recruiting will stop at once, in order to enable the youths of Ontario to remain in that province, and the young men in other parts of Canada to remain also where they are, including those from St. Rose, in the county of Dorchester, who were called upon to cross the boundary, should ever conscription be enacted. Of course, should the United States enter the war, these people might be induced to return home. So I say that it is incumbent on the Prime Minister to state that conscription will not become law, and that voluntary enlistments will continue to be the rule. We should keep our own in the country, to raise crops of all kinds, and to turn out butter, cheese and all the foodstuffs required for the provisioning of the Allies.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not delay the House any longer, reserving my right to take up the subject anew when the budget comes under dicussion.

Mr. MACDONALD: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the House must regret, in view of the adjournment to-morrow, that the Government in introducing this measure, which in its general nature has the support of the House in its entirety, has not seen fit to give some information to those who are particularly interested in the welfare of the boys overseas as to the statements made in the report of Dr. Bruce, and in the report of Dr. Baptie and his colleagues with reference to the statements of Dr. Bruce. In the press of the country there have appeared from time to time excerpts from these reports, and certain statements have been made of a nature to excite the

public mind with reference to them; but, so far as the House is concerned, we have not received any information whatever. It is true that an order of the House was passed for the laying on the Table of both these reports, but, so far, that order has not been complied with. I submit that there is no valid reason why it should not have been complied with, because I have no doubt whatever that these reports were contained in printed documents which were in the hands of the Prime Minister, or the Minister of Militia, and could have been placed upon the table of the House without any difficulty whatever. It would be in the public interest to know exactly what the statements were, and to know what the real situation is in regard to this very important matter. I hope that before we adjourn to-morrow, the Government will, for the satisfaction of those who are intensely interested in this matter, give the House and the country the exact reports as they have come to them from the different bodies that have been making these investigations.

If one is to judge from the newspaper reports in regard to these matters, Dr. Bruce, about whose standing there is absolutely no question, was appointed by the Government for the purpose of making an examination into the medical conditions which existed on the other side. As I have said, about his standing and ability there can be no question. In these newspaper reports we find it stated that there was no medical inspection of Canadian soldiers in the military hospitals in England by the Canadian Medical Service, that there was no efficient medical inspection of any kind made of our men in the Canadian hospitals, previous to the time when Dr. Bruce took up his duties and made his report. If that statement is correct, it seems to me that a very grave state of affairs indeed is disclosed. We have there the men who have been wounded in France, taken to England, and distributed among the various hospitals all over Great Britain, and yet we are told that they were under no supervision or inspection by the medical men who went over from Canada. Dr. Bruce is authority for the statement that no inspection whatever by any recognized Canadian medical officers was made of those men of ours who were in the military hospitals, and that no efficient inspection of any kind was made by our men of those who were in the Canadian hospitals. As has been pointed out in the newspaper reports, the consequence has been that soldiers have been retained in hospitals who should have returned to duty, thus disclosing gross neglect in the whole matter. The newspapers state that men were retained who should have been returned to duty; and that a great many others should have been returned to Canada where they could have been more economically treated. What is the answer to this? Is the House and the country not to know whether or not these statements are true? My hon friend the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) went to Toronto shortly before his resignation, and was reported in the Toronto press as having stated that our Canadian soldiers were allowed to come under the knife of first year medical men in charge of the hospitals in England, when qualified doctors were available.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I never said first year medical men; if I did I meant first year doctors after they had graduated.

Mr. MACDONALD: I assume that my hon. friend will refer to this matter. I am merely quoting from an extract in a Toronto paper.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I never read it.

Mr. MACDONALD: It gives his address in Toronto.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I never heard of the statement before.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am simply taking it from the report in the Toronto newspaper.

An hon. MEMBER: What paper?

Mr. MACDONALD: The Toronto Mail.

An hon. MEMBER: Of what date?

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend can satisfy his curiosity by looking it up in the library.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am not finding any fault with the hon. member. I may have used the words which he quotes; I will not say that I did not use them, but what was in my mind, and what we objected to, was that first year doctors, not students, should have been put in charge of these hospitals.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: First year after graduation?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes, some of them within six weeks of graduation.

Mr. MACDONALD: That is what this report states that my hon. friend said, "first year medical men."

Sir Sam HUGHES: You said first year students before that.

Mr. MACDONALD: I did not call them students; I read to the House what my hon. friend was reported to have said.

Sir SAM HUGHES: We took the ground that those first year doctors were not fit for the job. I never endorsed those fellows being there, and I wanted to put them out.

Mr. MACDONALD: What the country is particularly interested in is not what my hon. friend was unable to accomplish in regard to this matter, but whether or not the condition of affairs reported by Dr. Bruce existed in England. That is a matter which I assume my hon. friend can discuss.

This report also discloses the very important fact that many soldiers had been sent to England who were unfit and who should not have been enlisted at all. That statement implies a lack of care and of proper management on the part of the medical service of the Militia Department. If large numbers of men were enlisted and sent to England without proper examination, to become a charge upon the country, it will be agreed that it is another very improper condition of affairs. It is stated in that report that in every battalion which arrived in England it was found after medical inspection that from five to fifteen per cent of the men were medically unfit. An instance is given of a particular battalion, the Canadian Pioneer draft, which had 57 unfit men out of 254 which constituted the whole draft of officers and men.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What is the statement?

Mr. MACDONALD: The statement is that the Canadian Pioneer draft, composed of 254 officers and men, had 57 men who were medically unfit for duty, and were pronounced to be unfit when they reached the other side.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What date is that?

Mr. MACDONALD: It is in the report of Dr. Bruce.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: At what date?

Mr. MACDONALD: I cannot tell my right hon. friend. If we had the advantage of having the report before us we would know exactly about it. In addition, the statement is made in that report, as reported in the newspapers, that 50 per cent of the permanent base duty men in England have never been at the front, and that 56 per cent of the men who were discharged in England as being medically unfit never went to the front. These are statements based on evidence given in this report, and they show conclusively an absolute lack of control in regard to the whole question of medical examination in this country. We are told that men who were physically unfit were sent overseas, thus imposing upon the exchequer of this country an enormous burden which it should not have been called upon to assume, while coupled with that is the question of pensions, which also raises a very grave problem.

Then the statement is made, and a list is given of men on permanent base duty who should never have been enlisted, the number being 846. The list is as follows: Men over age, 413; men under age, 128; extreme flat foot, 90; defective sight, 78; extreme varicose veins, 40; chronic rheumatism, bronchitis and asthma, 81; missing fingers, toes and other deformities, 16, making a total of 846 men on permanent base duty in England who, according to Dr. Bruce, should never have been enlisted at all or sent to the other side. An instance is given in the report of a boy who was enlisted on March 31, 1916, a Pembroke boy, 16 years of age, who weighed only 80 pounds, who had had infantile paralysis, and who had undeveloped muscles in the right hip and thigh. He never did a day's military duty. That boy is over in England and has been in hospital continuously almost since his arrival there. It is incomprehensible how it would be possible, if you had any reasonable medical supervision in Canada, that that boy, apparently one of those who ought never to have been allowed to go across, but rather to be in some institution, should be permitted to pass the various medical examinations that are prescribed resulting in a condition by which he could go across the ocean and become a public charge instead of going to fight. Then Dr. Bruce goes on and charges that methods of handling infectious diseases have been most unsatisfactory. He charges that there was not the slightest regard paid to economy in the management or operation of the medical services generally. In addition to these specific charges he makes nineteen other charges—an arraignment against the medical service. The other day, my right hon. friend, in giving his statement as to the proposed expenditure for medical service this year, stated

that it will cost $4,000,000 inclusive of all the other charges which go to make up the account. There are allegations made in regard to the question of sending men to what are known as V. A. D., or Voluntary Aid Detachment, hospitals. I think that some very worthy people raise the point that a great Imperial issue is at stake and that our Canadian boys should be practically compelled to go to the V. A. D. hospitals in order that their faith in the Empire may not be impaired. To say that the Imperial spirit of these poor Canadian boys will be impaired unless they are associated with and lie beside boys from other parts of the Dominion seems to me to be the veriest twaddle.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I did not catch that.

Mr. MACDONALD: The statement that the Imperial spirit of the sons of this country who go over to fight must be increased by their being taken to the V. A. D. hospitals and lying alongside of men from various other parts of the Empire, seems to me to be the veriest twaddle. If the sons of this, or any other overseas dominion, have gone to France, have fought and have been wounded, to say that the patriotism of these people is such a tender plant that it requires nurture that must come from being inured in a hospital with some person from some other part of the Empire seems to me to be a ludicrous position.

Dr. Bruce attacks these methods of dealing with the hospitals in that way. He advocates taking care of all the men in hospitals which the Canadian Government provides. It would seem to be only human nature that the touch of the hand of a nurse from Canada to the boy from this land, or the knowledge that he is being treated by some one from his own country —that smallest touch of home in a foreign land, after all, would add much to the interest and feeling of the young man who is away. It, after all, is a sentimental question, but the problem is a serious one as to whether the sons of Canada who are going over there are being properly treated.

Then, again, the allegation is made that in regard to this and other questions the Canadian organization is being interfered with by the British system. It is asserted that British interference in regard to medical matters exists as well as it does in regard to other matters. That this interference with the authority of our Canadians over there is going on is quite evident. One hears of it every day from those who have been over. Let me give an illustration that occurred at Witley Camp not long ago. There is a camp made up practically and exclusively of Canadians. There is a canteen maintained at Witley by a British contractor, a contractor with the British authorities, and a canteen where liquor of all kinds is sold. On one occasion not very long ago the orderly officer of the day—a Canadian officer—in the performance of his duty, insisted that this canteen should be closed in the interest of the preservation of order amongst the men, and he was told by the contractor that it did not make any difference about what he said, that he had a contract from the British Government, that the British Government had all the say and that the British Government would continue to say that he might sell whatever he wanted to. What has taken place in Canada? Those of us who have had the opportunity of visiting the various camps know that an entirely different system is followed and it is a very proper system. Under this system, wherever there are canteens, the regiment or the battalion runs its own canteen, and whatever profits are made by the canteen go to the regimental or battalion funds, as they should. That is not so in England. Why is it that such interference is permitted? Why is it that liquor is allowed to be sold to our troops by British contractors in camps in which Canadians are excluded from engaging in such a business? The ex-Minister of Militia has made some strong statements in the letters that he has made public, but having had indisputable evidence from an officer who has been in England, I began to realise that some of my hon. friend's statements were not as extreme as some of the public thought they were.

A remarkable statement is made too in this report in regard to the conditions that exist in the hospitals in France. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman to lay on the table, if it is at hand, a report of the French hospitals. This report of Dr. Bruce refers to French hospitals Nos. 7 and 8. These are two hospitals which were sent over to France by the Government equipped with a thousand cots. Yet, I am informed by a gentleman who visited France within the last few months, and whose position in this country could not be questioned, that in one of these hospitals, when he saw it, they only had 314 cots. He informed me that the other hospital at Gravel never treated a person, although maintained at the country's expense, until Dr. Bruce unearthed them. I would like the right hon. gentleman also to lay on the table of

the House a statement with regard to the hospitals at Taplow and Luton Hall and Lymphcastle and the Perkins-Bull Hospital. Information comes to Canada from those who have been over there in various capacities, which goes to support the conclusion formed by Dr. Bruce in regard to this matter and which is incorporated in twenty-three deliberate assertions in regard to the conditions there which do not reflect any degree of credit upon the medical service in charge. What are the facts? What is the answer of the Government in regard to it? It is said that a committee of medical men, over which Dr. Baptie presided, went into this report of Dr. Bruce. If one is to judge from what one sees in the press, with some of the conclusions of Dr. Bruce's report, Dr. Baptie and this committee agreed. In how far did they agree with Dr. Bruce's conclusions and in how far did they disagree? All these things, I submit, Mr. Chairman, are of the most vital interest to the fathers and mothers of the boys who are over there. The thought of a dear one being wounded in France and being brought to England coupled with the slightest manner of doubt, such as that which has been raised by Dr. Bruce's assertions, brings an agony and a woe to the hearts of the father or mother of the boy such as few hon. gentlemen can appreciate.

This is a question which is over and above every consideration except the one thing as to whether or not in these respects everything is being done that ought to be done. Does Doctor Baptie seriously answer in any way the statements made by Doctor Bruce; and if so, in what respect? No hon. gentleman in this House who is interested in the boys who have gone overseas would be doing his duty to them if he permitted this House to adjourn without insisting upon this Government giving the House and the country a full explanation in regard to the whole matter. We have seen the newspaper battle that has raged around the question whether Doctor Carleton Jones was this, that, or the other thing, and whether or not he was to be retained in the service. I do not think any Canadian cares tuppence whether he is retained in the service or not so long as we are satisfied that the boys who have gone overseas are being properly treated in the hospitals by the doctors in charge. If Doctor Carleton Jones is doing his duty, let the committee know it; and if he is not doing his duty, let him be removed and some one else put in his place who will do his duty. If it be that the charges made by Doctor Bruce have no justification whatever, it is significant that Doctor Bruce has not been removed. The very fact that Dr. Bruce, instead of being removed, has been promoted to a very important position in France, gives an inference of strength and certainty to his report. If the statements made by Dr. Bruce are not true, he should not be retained in the medical service; if they are true, we want to know from the Government what steps they have taken, are taking or intend to take, to bring about a better condition of affairs in Great Britain and France where those hospitals are being maintained by this Government, and where this Government is paying for the care and attention bestowed upon our soldiers who are sick or wounded.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend has called attention to what is suggested in certain reports that are not yet before the House in their entirety, and are only known in so far as their contents have been published in the press. I may say that the printing is being expedited as much as possible. We cabled to Great Britain to ascertain whether any printed copies of the Bruce report were available, and we are informed that forty copies have been mailed. The other report, as I have said, is being printed with all possible expedition. I do not purpose entering into a discussion of the reports before they are on the table of the House and can be examined in their entirety, but some of the suggestions made by my hon. friend are worthy of a moment's attention.

With regard to the lack of inspection of Canadians in Imperial hospitals, I am not qualified to speak from a medical standpoint nor as having any special experience in such matters; but I suppose that the inspection of Canadians in such hospitals would be left to the Imperial authorities, just as the inspection of Imperial soldiers in Canadian hospitals would doubtless be left to the Canadian medical authorities who have control of such hospitals.

My hon. friend has spoken as if the medical service overseas, whether in British hospitals or in Canadian hospitals, was of a very inferior character.

Mr. MACDONALD: I quoted Dr. Bruce's report.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think it is most undesirable to spread an impression of that kind amongst the people of this country. I visited forty-three hospitals,

Canadian and British, last year, and I did not see one of them that, so far as I could judge, was not well organized and well carried on. I saw the Canadian hospitals in England; I saw a very large number of British hospitals, and I found the medical men and others in charge of those hospitals keenly alive to their responsibilities and anxious to do everything possible for the comfort of the men under their care.

Mr. MACDONALD: Dr. Bruce does not say so.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am speaking at the moment of my own experience and not of Dr. Bruce's. As far as one could judge from such an inspection as I could make of the condition of patients in any of those hospitals, the care and attention that was being bestowed upon our men and upon men from the Mother Country and the other overseas dominions, was, in all those hospitals, as perfect and thorough as one could expect. It is very easy to find fault, and I do not intend to discuss or criticise the report of Dr. Bruce in advance of its being laid upon the table of the House; but I was impressed with the fact, that so far as I could observe he gave no credit for the good work that had been accomplished in the Canadian hospitals overseas. The report was purely critical and did not give reasonable consideration, so far as I could observe, to the very good work which undoubtedly had been done. The reports will be laid upon the table of the House and it will be for hon. gentlemen to come to a conclusion with regard to the whole question.

It is desirable that the Committee should have information as to the personnel and qualifications of the board of which Sir William Baptie was chairman. The gentlemen who constitute that board were men of great experience and high standing. At the head of that board was Surgeon-General Sir William Baptie. He graduated from the University of Glasgow in 1880, entering the Army Medical Service in 1881. During the international occupation of Crete he served as senior medical officer, 1897-98, and received the honour of C.M.G. In South Africa he was on the staff of the Natal Army and was present at all the actions for the relief of Ladysmith and subsequent operations in Natal and Eastern Transvaal. He was mentioned in despatches, promoted to be Lieut.-Colonel, received a medal with five clasps and also received the Victoria Cross. He became Assistant Director General of the Army Medical Service in 1901, continuing in that position until 1906. He was appointed Inspector of Medical Services in 1907, serving in that capacity until 1910, when he became Deputy Director of Medical Services. In 1913, he was appointed Director-General of the Medical Service of India. At the present time he is Director of Medical Services at the War Office. Therefore, if one may judge from the record presented by that career, he is a man whose experience and ability would amply justify his appointment to a position at the head of that board.

The other gentlemen who constitute the board were Canadians, and it might be proper to inform the committee and the country as to their qualifications. One of them was Col. E. C. Ashton, Officer Commanding the Canadian Training Division at Shorncliffe. He has the Colonial Auxiliary Forces Officers' Decoration. He has passed the Militia Staff course. His services are as follows: He was Officer Commanding the 38th Regiment, Canadian Active Militia, and he was placed on the Reserve of Officers in 1912. He was recalled to the Active list in 1915, to assist in the organization of the 13th Brigade, Canadian Field Artillery. He was given command of the 32nd Battery, Canadian Field Artillery, and subsequently he commanded the 36th Battalion, Canadian Expeditionary Force. At present he is Officer Commanding the Canadian training division at Shorncliffe, England. In civil life he is a prominent physician resident in Brantford, Ontario, where he has been a well-known medical practitioner for fifteen years. He has been an alderman of Brantford. He is a graduate of Trinity and Toronto Universities.

Another gentleman who served is Col. J. F. Fotheringham, C.M.G., Assistant Director of Medical Service of the Second Canadian Division, Expeditionary Force. He is a graduate in arts and medicine of Trinity College and of the University of Toronto, and is also a distinguished physician and writer. He was formerly professor of therapeutics in Trinity University, and is now associate professor of medicine in the University of Toronto. He is head of one of the medical services in Toronto General Hospital and consultant physician to the Hospital for Sick Children. He has been for many years associated actively with the Army Medical Corps, and has held several high administrative medical appointments in Military District No. 2.

Another gentleman who served on that committee is Colonel A. E. Ross, C.M.G., Assistant Director of Medical Services, First

Canadian Division, Expeditionary Force. Colonel Ross is a well-known Kingston physician and citizen. He is a graduate of Queen's University, Kingston. He is professor of medical jurisprudence and materia medica in Queen's University. He was mayor of Kingston in 1908 and is at present a member of the Ontario Legislature. For many years he was connected with the Army Medical Service, having been appointed Major in command of No. 6 (later No. 3 Cavalry Field Ambulance), when this was organized in 1906. He went overseas as commanding officer of No. 3, Canadian Field Ambulance. His work in this unit proved so commendable that he was given the honour of C.M.G. When the Second Division reached France and Colonel Foster became Divisional Director of Medical Service, Canadians, Colonel Ross succeeded him as Assistant Director of Medical Service for the First Division. Through his efforts the health conditions of our First Division have been only equalled among the British forces by those of the Guards Division. Colonel Ross served in the South African War, as I am informed.

The fourth Canadian who is a member of this committee is Lieut.-Col. J. M. Elder, No. 3 General Hospital, Boulogne. Col. Elder is a distinguished Montreal surgeon and teacher and writer upon surgical subjects. He graduated from McGill University in arts and medicine. He has been surgeon to the Montreal General Hospital since 1897, and is assistant professor of surgery of McGill University. He is head of the surgical section of No. 3 (McGill) Canadian General Hospital at Boulogne, France. He has been for years connected with the Army Medical Service. He went through the Northwest Rebellion of 1885 and was for twenty-two years surgeon to the Second Regiment, Canadian Artillery, previously the Montreal Garrison Artillery. For these services he possesses the Northwest Rebellion and Long Service medals. Owing to his position at No. 3 General hospital he has had a larger surgical war experience than any other Canadian surgeon. He, also, has the Colonial Auxiliary Forces officers' decoration.

So, this board which, I believe, did not agree in some respects with the report of the board of which Dr. Bruce was the head is composed of men in whose judgment, I think, the country might reasonably have confidence. I do not for a moment desire to cast reflections upon the board of which Dr. Bruce was the head, nor upon Dr. Bruce himself. That gentleman is undoubtedly a surgeon who stands at the very forefront of his profession in Canada; and I have not the slightest doubt that he was perfectly sincere in his criticism and in his recommendations. I do not think, however, that he has had the same length of experience in connection with the Army Medical Service as some of the gentlemen I have named, as shown by the records that are placed before me. However, the reports will be placed before the House in due course, and doubtless they will give rise to a discussion upon the conditions in the British and Canadian hospitals overseas.

So far as one could gain any knowledge through a very limited experience, I was impressed on my visit overseas with the excellence of the British transport system, the British commissariat, and the British medical service. I remember that when I came back from my visit overseas the impression in my mind as to these services was very strong.

My hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) has asked for a statement with regard to the unfit—I suppose those who have gone overseas though medically unfit. In the zeal for recruiting which has undoubtedly animated many commanding officers in the organization of regiments, there have been some regrettable features in the sending overseas of men who, when they arrived, were found to be physically unfit. I am not disposed to think that the mere absence of a finger or some slight defect should necessarily cause a man to be regarded as unfit for service at the front. I remember very well that in the summer of 1915, a man came to me who had fought through the second battle of Ypres, or, as it is called, St. Julien. He had not a single finger on his right hand except a stump of the forefinger, enough to enable him to pull the trigger of his rifle. Yet I was informed that he was the best shot in his regiment. He lost his fingers when he was but a year old, through the act of a child a year or two older who placed a red-hot poker in his hand. We hear of rejections also on account of flat feet. I am not sure that it is wise in every case to observe the strict letter of the regulations with regard to flat feet. It is said that some men working in the lumber woods are apt to contract flat feet. Yet I venture to say that these men, if put on the march with others whose feet were normal, would come out a long way

ahead at the end of the day. I was told that a large number of lumbermen in one of the battalions were being rejected for the reason that they had flat feet. It seems to me that it would be desirable to try these men out, and see whether in endurance upon the march they would not be quite as capable as others who in this respect would be accepted for enlistment. The memorandum which my hon. friend asked for some time ago as to the unfit enlisted for overseas service has been placed in my hands, by the Deputy Minister of Militia and is:

The records of the department show that the following were returned to Canada during the years 1915 and 1916 as being medically unfit: 2,701 in the year 1915; 3,651 in the year 1916.

These figures, of course, include a number who left Canada fit, but who contracted disease during their training in England. The figures for 1915 also include any wounded returned that year.

The balance of those not found fit for service at the front, such as those with slight defects, over age, etc., are being retained for light duty in England, and it is also understood that two Construction Battalions have been organized from these men.

As to the cost, it will not be possible to state the cost with any degree of accuracy without taking up each individual case, owing to the varying periods of service and the various ranks held, and this would take months to furnish.

The estimated cost per man in the Canadian Expeditionary Force is $1,000 a year.

My hon. friend asked also with regard to No. 7 Hospital and No. 8 Hospital. No. 7 Hospital is at Le Treport, in France. I do not remember the exact complaint made with regard to Le Treport Hospital. I visited that hospital last year on my way from Paris to Folkestone. I spent the greater part of a day there, and, as far as I could judge, the hospital seemed to be well organized. Has my hon. friend any particular information as to its defects?

Mr. MACDONALD: How many cots are there in that hospital?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really do not remember the number of cots; it is a very large hospital. In fact, there are two hospitals there. One is a British hospital, which is located in a very large hotel overlooking the sea and which was built, I was informed, by a German syndicate a year or two before the war. Shortly after the war broke out it was expropriated by the French Government and placed at the disposal of the British authorities. It is a very large and well-equipped hospital. The Canadian hospital was located in tents and huts immediately adjoining. There were a large number of patients in the hospital when I was there, and a large staff of nurses was employed. The hospital was under the command of Lieutenant Colonel Bridges who was attached to the Canadian Permanent Force.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That was near Dieppe?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: At Treport. I recollect that when I first went to France there was a gathering of the officers of all the Canadian hospitals in that vicinity, officers from the staffs of five Canadian hospitals, including the hospital at Treport; and there was present, also, the chief medical officer in the British service who had jurisdiction over the district in which these hospitals were situated. The highest possible compliment was paid to the organization of the Canadian hospitals by that officer in speaking at a dinner which was given by Lieutenant Colonel Murray McLaren and the officers under his command.

No. 8 hospital is at St. Cloud, near Paris, France.

The number of beds laid down for general hospitals is 1,040, with an establishment of 46 officers, 73 nursing sisters, and 201 n.c.o.'s and men.

It, however, frequently happens that after an hospital has been located, the accommodation is from time to time increased, and as a consequence, the staff. There is no information available in Canada as to the present standing in this respect of the hospital at Treport. If particular information is required it will have to be obtained from overseas.

No. 7 is at present used for the accommodation of casualties of the British Expeditionary Forces.

No. 8 was offered by the Canadian Government to the French Government, as a complimentary contribution towards the cost of France's share of the war, to be used for the accommodation of French casualties, but it remains under Canadian control.

Both these hospitals are doing exceedingly good work.

I asked Colonel Mignault, who had to do with the establishment of No. 8 hospital, to give a statement with regard to it some time ago, and I might read one or two quotations from a letter which he has written to me on this subject. He said:

No. 8 Canadian Hospital was sent to France on the 23rd of November, 1915. It took the months of December, January and February to erect it, on the Racing Course at St. Cloud, property of Mr. Blanc. It is built with barracks which were furnished by the French army at a cost of 250,000 fr., but put up by our own men.

On the 1st of March, 1916, the hospital was ready to receive patients, and on the 17th of the same month, the first trainload of wounded from Verdun reached us, and then the hospital was filled up rapidly. It has a capacity of five hundred and twenty (520) beds.

Hospitals in France are divided into three categories, namely A, B, and C, according to the importance and seriousness of cases. Thus, Class A stands for "Les grands blessés"; Class B for "Les blessés moyens," and Class C for "Les petits blessés."

Three hospitals are classified in Paris in Class A. One is the Val de Grace Hospital in Paris (1,000 beds). The second is the American Hospital (600 beds), which is kept up by the generosity of individuals of the great Republic. The third one is the St. Cloud Hospital, No. 8 Canadian General.

So this stands among the three chief hospitals of Paris at the present time, according to the report given to me by Colonel Mignault. Colonel Mignault continues in his letter:

The above-named three hospitals are the only ones classified in Class A, that is to say, they are so thoroughly equipped with surgical appliances, etc., as to be able to take care of all cases, whatever may be their severity or their importance.

With regard to segregation or otherwise of the Canadian wounded, I do not think that there ought to be a policy for segregation or a policy against it. I think that these matters must be determined according to the military exigencies. There is a great deal to be said in favour of Canadians being among their own people and living under the care of Canadian nurses. On the other hand, I think there is much to be said for that fellowship and comradeship which comes from the association of men from this Dominion with men from the Old Country and from the other Dominions in hospitals and convalescent homes. I saw Canadians in our own hospitals; I saw them in British hospitals in many parts of the country; but I never found any complaint whatever from any Canadian or from any soldier in any hospital with respect to the care and attention which he was receiving, and I have heard no complaint from any Canadian who was in a British hospital as to his desire to be placed elsewhere. It may be that some of them would like to be more among their own people. That is quite possible, because I know they were very glad indeed to see the face and hear the voice of some one from home.

With regard to what my hon. friend has said respecting Witley Camp, the statements which he has made come to me for the first time. If he will give me further particulars I shall make it my business to inquire and to see that any such condition is remedied.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What is that point?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: He said that although a Canadian officer at Witley Camp desired that the canteen should be closed for the welfare of his men, the British contractor, who had some authority from the War Office, disregarded his wishes and insisted upon keeping the canteen open. I think the desire of a Canadian officer in respect of such a matter ought to be respected, and I shall be very glad to take the matter up.

Mr. MACDONALD: I shall very gladly give to the Prime Minister the name of the officer who gives me that information, but if my right hon. friend thinks that the whole question is whether the wish or will of that particular officer who was the orderly officer of the day should be respected is the issue involved in that question he is much mistaken. I fail to see for one moment what possible right the British Government has to lease to any contractor over there the right to sell whisky and rum to Canadian soldiers in a Canadian camp, or to do anything else in a Canadian camp. That is the question involved, and in that regard the problem is very much larger than the mere question of whether the orderly officer of the day is to have his authority flouted and disregarded by a man who happens to be a contractor.

My right hon. friend suggests that there should be no discussion of the Bruce and Baptie reports until the reports come down.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not say that. I said we could discuss it more effectively.

Mr. MACDONALD: Let us see what the facts in this matter are. This examination of Dr. Bruce's into the Canadian hospitals, according to the information which has unquestionably come from governmental sources, was inaugurated by the ex-Minister of Militia, and the report of Dr. Bruce was made to the ex-minister previous to his retirement.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Made to the then Minister of Militia.

Mr. MACDONALD: This is technical, I will accept that. This was made to the Minister of Militia, not in England or the acting Overseas Minister of Militia in England; it was made to Major General Sir Sam Hughes, Minister of Militia of the Dominion of Canada, before he resigned last fall. Now for what reason or purpose does my right hon. friend come here and, in the month of February, 1917, and as an excuse for not presenting that departmental report to the House, say that he is waiting until he receives some copies of the report from England? And then he undertakes to intimate to me that it is most undesirable for me to discuss this question, when that report must be in the possession of this Government, must be here in Ottawa, and must have been here for some time.

My right hon. friend, having had before him a report which he does not bring to Parliament, introduced a commission presided over by Sir William Baptie which goes out and examines this report of Dr. Bruce's. Again I assume that the report of Sir William Baptie with re erence to the statements made by Dr. Bruce is in the possession of the Government. And yet my right hon. friend intimates that it is undesirable that we should discuss it in this House. How long are we to wait before these reports are brought down? It seems to me that we are the last people on earth before whom this Government desires to place anything. Statements are given out to the press, but nothing is given to Parliament, and we are told it is not desirable to discuss these things in Parliament. It is said to be undesirable to open one's mouth in regard to the interests of the boys overseas. That seems to me a most remarkable position to take. There are many people in this country who have no kith or kin at the front, who are very good at lecturing people who say a word on behalf of the boys who have gone overseas. So far as I am concerned, I do not propose to take lecturing from people of that sort. The men who have gone overseas look to us as representatives of the constituencies in Parliament to ascertain the facts in regard to conditions overseas. What is the good of my right hon. friend saying that a certain number of K.C.M.G.'s sat on a commission to consider Dr. Bruce's report? We know that Dr. Bruce is a Canadian surgeon of high standing, that no one would venture to impute anything against him. That being so, he having made two or three charges in regard to the administration of the hospitals of this Canadian Government overseas, the representatives of the people, speaking for the boys who have gone overseas, I submit have a right to discuss this question before Parliament. It is our duty to find out what these reports were and what the truth was. My right hon. friend has not told us just where we stand in regard to this matter. What answer is it to give to the mothers and fathers of the boys who have gone overseas to say that a gentleman with K.C.M.G. tacked to his name has sat on a committee and made a report that we have not yet had placed before us in Parliament? That is where we are in regard to this question.

I submit that this House is entitled to some expression of opinion by the responsible Government of this country as to whether or not they regard the statements of Dr. Bruce's report as having been true, and whether or not they regard the statements of Sir William Baptie's report as true. That is the situation in regard to the men overseas, and that is what I want to know.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The matter of the canteen has come up. When the Canadian division went to England first, in the fall of 1914, I crossed over, and, in my innocence under the British military law and under the Canadian military law, I thought that I had some say still in the affairs of our troops. I was politely informed that I had nothing whatever to do with the canteen or rationing or feeding of the men, that General Alderson had let that to certain English contractors, and that Canada had no right to interfere, as it was outside our military sphere, that the contracts had been let to some company not only for the Canadians, but for the forces in England, and that contracts could not be interfered with. I protested against it. We had learned at Valcartier that as much as $33,000 in one case had been made by one of the contractors in a period of six weeks, and there were upwards of one hundred of these gentlemen. It was the first time that we learned that so much money was being distributed. We set to work to run the canteens under regimental boards, and the result was a saving of upwards of $1,000 a month. There is a regimental fund, money belonging to the men themselves for their own distribution and maintenance. I wanted this plan carried out.

Mr. MARCIL: Did they not try to institute a dry canteen over in England?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I will come to that in a minute. I tried to institute a dry canteen, and I was informed in a gentlemanly way that I had no jurisdiction. General Alderson told the men with a great hurrah and bravado in the only speech he ever made except when he read to them a little book which he once published about how not to do things——

Mr. MACDONALD: Who was that?

Sir SAM HUGHES: General Alderson. He told them he was going to make them free men and, as a slap at the Minister of Militia in Canada, he said he was going to give them a wet canteen.

Mr. MARCIL: Is it not the fact that liquor is given to the men every day in the trenches? I have heard objection made in Montreal by parents who would not allow their sons to go over there because they were afraid that they would get into the habit of taking liquor which they had not been in the habit of taking before they went away.

Sir SAM HUGHES: In the trenches, when men are standing up to their waists in water, they get a little rum, not as a beverage, but as a stimulant; and, although I may be regarded as a fairly temperate man, I certainly would not object to any officer, non-commissioned officer, or man getting his tot of rum, as they call it, when he is standing up to the waist in water in the trenches.

Mr. MARCIL: Is this done at all times, or only when they are about to go into action?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am not discussing that question.

Mr. MARCIL: I am merely asking for information.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend's (Mr. Marcil) remarks might be misconstrued. I have never heard that the rum is given to the men when they are going into action. What I have heard is that when men are exhausted, and wet and cold, a very small proportion of rum is given to them merely as a stimulant, for the time being, to prevent unfortunate results from cold and wet. As to rum being given to men going into action, that is something I have never heard of, and I do not believe it for one moment.

Mr. MARCIL: I understand that it is the practice to give the men a little liquor in the trenches—

Sir SAM HUGHES: In South Africa where the climate is very hot, we had rum issued to us, but we never used it except when going into some hazardous exercise. I have no hesitation in saying that when the boys wanted it they could get it. If I were running the show to-day, I would say that when men are standing in the trenches up to their waists in water—and I think I can claim to be as practical a temperance man as there is in Canada—I would have no objection to them having their tot of rum. I regard it, under these conditions, as a medicine and not as a beverage. This extraordinary piffle about rum being handed out in the trenches, and all that sort of thing, comes from people who do not understand what they are talking about, and who are simply trying to create an agitation in that regard. I take second place to no man in Canada in supporting the cause of temperance, but I do not like any of this piffle served up when the boys are fighting and dying in the trenches.

Another question which has come up is the question of fallen instep. There are three grades of fallen instep, as I am told by medical men. In the third grade the men are really unfit, and I do not think there are many of that class sent over. There was one fellow who came into Edmonton and was rejected. He wrote to me, and I had a doctor examine him. He had walked from Peace River to Edmonton, and yet he was rejected as unfit. However, I sent him over, and he was rejected over there. He told them that I had sent him, and I arranged that he should go to the front. He went into the trenches, and is one of the best marchers to be found anywhere. Any man accustomed to wearing moccasins is certain to suffer from fallen instep. Nearly all the woodmen are in the habit of wearing moccasins and they often suffer from a fallen instep. I think that the medical regulations should have been relaxed a little in that respect, and I did relax them in the case of two or three who were in the first and second stages of fallen instep, but in the third stage a man cannot march very far.

Then there is the question of segregation, which has been referred to by the Prime Minister. I think that if he reads Dr. Bruce's report the right hon. gentleman will see that he himself agrees exactly with Dr. Bruce. I have not read the report, but Dr. Bruce talked over the matter with me and his views and those of the Prime Minister are exactly the same. I look at the matter purely from a business point of view.

I could never see why our men should be hauled from say Folkestone to the north of Scotland, when we have hospitals of the right class near Folkestone where they could get better service and where $40 or $50 could be saved in each case over sending them to other places. Nor could I see why our men should be sent to the V.A.D. hospitals. These hospitals are presided over by the most charming women in the world; I am not saying a word against them—such nice little girls with five or six weeks' training in some St. John's Ambulance affair or something of that kind as helpers; the dearest little creatures in the world for smoothing brows and holding hands,—but I did object to Canadian soldiers being sent there, and to paying three shillings a day to keep our boys when we had our own highly skilled nurses. The hands of our skilled nurses might be a little rougher, and not so smooth on the brow, but I wanted our boys to get the attendance which could be given by our own nurses who had had at least three years of experience in our hospitals. That is what Dr. Bruce objected to, and that is what I object to. He also objected to having our men kept there when they should be in the trenches. There was one of these V. A. D. hospitals that had a baseball team as you will find it mentioned in the report and the men were kept playing baseball when they should have been in the trenches. When Dr. Bruce was examining these hospitals Colonel Jones, or General Jones, managed to rake up in a very small circle around London, 700 men, and shoved them back into convalescent camps immediately. In 1915 when I was over there and when the Prime Minister was over there, I inspected a battalion at Shorncliffe one day. They had only about 200 men. I asked for the parade state, and it showed that there were about 1,200 men. I wanted to know where they were, and I was told that so many were convalescent, and so many were here, and so many were there. I said, "What are these convalescents doing here, they should not be here." I said that we wanted no men in the battalion except fit men, and so I ordered that the convalescents should be kept all in one place by themselves, and not mixed up with the rest of the camp, the plan being to have them in one camp and divided into six or seven classes, those just out of the hospital, those convalescing, and so on in the various stages up to the last class which would be fit to go back to their battalion and take their places in the trenches. That was the plan which we arranged and carried out until the new overseas minister sent them back, I understand; and now they are rambling all around England. We had hundreds and hundreds of men rambling around England. We were returning from 8 to 10 per cent of our men, while the British regulars were returning about 60 per cent and Kitchener's men were returning about 30 per cent until I arranged that convalescent plan. Then in the similar periods we returned 60 per cent. I am not reflecting on General Jones—I want to let him out—but if this agitation is going to be carried on by the V. A. D. people, fourth grade society dames in London, the facts are going to come out. I do not want to hurt General Jones; I have stuck to him as far as I can.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the ex-minister read the letter written by Lady Drummond on that subject?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Lady Drummond sent me several letters. I am not aware that Lady Drummond or any other society lady was authorized to run our hospitals. There was also Sir William Osler; he wrote several letters. The dear creatures who hang around the outskirts of society in England wrote a great many letters, and interfered, but I was not aware that it was any of their business. I thought that Canada should manage her own affairs. All the agitation has come from these hand-holders and brow-rubbers.

Mr. MACDONALD: What about General Jones?

Sir SAM HUGHES: When I got to England in 1915, and knowing that the Prime Minister was desirous of visiting the hospitals, I got General Jones to furnish for him a list of the hospitals where the boys who had been wounded at St. Julien were placed. It took three weeks to get the list, but I got it and gave it to the Prime Minister. It stated that there were about 200 of the boys at Cardiff. On the way there I happened to get off at Oxford to have a look around, and I found fifteen or sixteen men there. I met one boy who had just the day before passed the "cannot recover" stage, and he said that as soon as he was well again he was going back to the trenches. I said, "You will be of no use in the trenches," He said, "I cannot get cold feet because I have only one foot to get cold." I have seen him since tripping along with a cork leg, about as good looking a boy as

there is in the country. At Cheltenham, I found a Canadian nurse and a number of Canadians in the hospital there. The name of not one of them was on the list of General Jones. At Cardiff, I found that there were three Canadians in the hospital, whereas 200 were reported on the list. At Aberystwith I found a number not reported, and I saw that by following Jones' report I would not get anything, and I paid no further attention to it. I was looking at the matter from the business end, and the convalescent system that I established in 1915 during the first year saved Canada $6,000,000, by restoring men to the fighting line who otherwise would have been lying in hospitals in England holding hands and having their brows smoothed as I have pointed out. The very first day on which I let Dr. Bruce loose in England, 700 men were picked up and sent back, and every week they kept going back. There was no system of getting reports about these men at all until I established the convalescent system. I told the Prime Minister this; I told him that Jones' statement was no good. In 1916 I went over intending to look after the business end of things; I was not interfering with the medical end. I challenge any members of this House to find in Dr. Bruce's report any criticism of the doctors. There is an etiquette among doctors, which I am sorry to say, is not observed among politicians, that they must not blackguard or expose each other. I could not induce the doctor for love or money to expose any malpractices. I could not get him to expose those fellows at all.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Perhaps there were none.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am not saying anything about that. However, I could not get Dr. Bruce to make any report on that aspect of the case. I do not say that there were many cases of that kind but he would not touch the matter. What he reported on was the way in which we could bring about an improvement in the operation of the hospitals. I selected Dr. Bruce in order to reorganize the business end of the service. The year before I had taken up the financial end of it. I do not know that it interested me very much to hear the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) tell the House the other day—it seemed a sort of a left-handed compliment—that he found things pretty good over there. I did not appreciate him telling me that, because I knew that things were good over there. I knew that the medical end of it under Dr. Bruce would be improved over there and that it would be pretty good here too. The right hon. the First Minister has given us a comparison of a lot of extracts from the statements of those fellows; they are all good chaps—those Canadian officers who had to do with the Canadian end of it. I picked out Col. Ashton as a fighting officer. I did not know what he was as a medical officer but I knew he was a good fighting officer. Col. Fotheringham is a good man; Col. Ross, none better; Dr. Elder—the very best—he stands head and shoulders over Dr. Baptie in ability. Dr. McKeown, head of St. Michael's College, is one of the brightest men in Canada. He had a record unsurpassed in the history of the world for hospital work. Four or five of these gentlemen on Colonel Bruce's committee, I understand, are among the twelve Fellows of the Royal College of Surgeons of England living in Canada. There are Drs. Bruce, McKeown, Scott, and Hunter. Dr. Hunter is an Edinburgh man, now belonging to Winnipeg, who is one of the greatest physicians that it has been my privilege to meet. Dr. Wilson, I understand, comes from St. Catharines and he is one of the ablest and best administrators whom it has been my privilege to fall in with. Taking the Canadians on both lists, they are the pick of the fellows we have over there in the medical service. As far as Dr. Baptie is concerned, I am not going to say a word against him only that he may be a little prehistoric.

Mr. MACDONALD: Were the gentlemen whom the hon. member has named, associated with Dr. Bruce in his examination?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Dr. McKeown and the others?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Drs. McKeown, Scott, Hunter and Wilson.

Mr. MARCIL: All good men.

Sir SAM HUGHES: There is nothing to touch them in Canada. I picked out the very best, the most highly qualified men that I could get. There is scarcely a man amongst those whom I have mentioned who had not a practice of from $30,000 to $150,000 in Canada. They gave their practices up to go over there. I do not know Dr. Baptie and I am not going to say anything against him, but, the fact that he was a medical officer in 1881 does not impress me a particle. He would naturally favour the

V.A.D. hospitals. That is where the whole trouble came. Sir George Perley favoured the V.A.D. hospitals, but I did not feel that we were getting the best use of them. When the doctors would demand that the men should be sent to convalescent homes they would be told by the ladies in charge of them that they had been told by Dr. Carleton Jones that they should keep these men until others were sent to take their places. If others were not sent there immediately the men were kept because these places had to be kept up. We were paying three shillings a day for these nurses, while our own nurses were employed on English cases.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who authorized Sir George Perley to do that?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I did not anyway.

Mr. GERMAN: Will the hon. gentleman tell me if Dr. Bruce made a report directly to him as Minister of Militia?

Sir SAM HUGHES: He did.

Mr. GERMAN: When was that report received?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not remember exactly when it was received. It was in the month of September, but it is in the department and it will show.

Mr. GERMAN: I presume that report is in the department and is available?

Sir SAM HUGHES: It was in the department when I was there. It was kept. The matter has never been taken up. I left the report there when I moved out.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the ex-minister permit me to call attention to a letter I have received from the mother of one of my constituents who is now in a convalescent home in England. He has been two years in the army, and was thirteen months in the trenches when he was rescued after being buried and was taken to the convalescent home. He belongs to the 26th Battalion and is at present in hut 25, H. Division, Woodcote Park, Epsom, England. He contends that he has been quite fit to go back to work for months past, but that he has been held back. He has asked his mother to find out if he can be sent back to Canada to assist in recruiting or instruction work, as he is tired of staying in the convalescent home.

Sir SAM HUGHES: We used to get many requests of that nature.

Mr. MARCIL: Does it not strike the ex-Minister of Militia as unusual that a man who is fit for the trenches should be held back in a convalescent home?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Did he send his mother the doctor's report that he is fit for the trenches?

Mr. MARCIL: He says he is fit.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am afraid he is not fit for the front or he would not be asking to be sent home. I cannot give the initials at the end of all these gentlemen's names, but the report of McKeown Scott, Hunter and Wilson will commend itself to any thinking officer in Canada against the report of Baptie, Ashton, Fotheringham, Ross and Elder. I am not saying a word against these gentlemen. Ross deserved the Victoria Cross scores of times while he was at the front, Fotheringham is a first class fellow; Ashton is a bonny fighter, and Elder is one of the best from McGill College. The only weakness that I can find in regard to Dr. Babtie is that he received his medical schooling in the old school, and he is now behind the times as the British Medical Service has been completely reorganized in this war. I am ready now or at any other time to discuss the system of handling convalescents. I introduced that system and it has been adopted by France, Russia, Italy, and even by Germany and Austria in this war. The system is that of bringing the convalescents gradually back to a stage when they will be ready for the front line trenches. I had not completed the business end of the medical system when I left England, and I do not know in what condition it is to-day, but Colonel Bruce will soon be here and will be heard from. We had planned to save millions upon millions of dollars by a system of segregating the men as far as possible. Some say it is impossible to segregate the men at the front but it is very strange how men of certain battalions manage to reach certain hospitals. If you happen to be at the front when they are passing the wounded along, you will hear someone cry: Where are these for? And the answer is: "Matrimonial Bureau No. 1", and they are taken to a certain hospital. When another batch comes along, the order is to send them to "Matrimonial Bureau No. 2", and they are taken to another hospital. That is the way in which they have the hospitals all labelled, according to the opportunities there are for matrimony for the boys. We are to-day paying, separation allowances in Canada for scores of little girls who have married with these boys in England, through the brow rub-

bing and the hand-holding in the hospitals, I never interfere in regard to that sort of thing; but if a girl is going to have a chance, I want one of the Canadian nurses with three years' training to have it with the boys.

Mr. NESBITT: Mr. Chairman, the Government is asking us to vote $500,000,000, a sum which a few years ago would have staggered our imagination. I have no objection personally to the vote if it is necessary, but I think the least the Government could have done would be to give us a detailed statement of expenditure made during the last two and a half years in connection with the war. That statement was asked for last year by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell); but it should have been given even if it had not been asked for, because when the first vote was passed at the short Session of August, 1914, the Prime Minister, as I remember very well, promised that this vote not having been made in the usual manner, we would have a detailed statement of how the money was expended, and a similar promise was made when the next vote was passed. We have received no such detailed statement of what has been done with the money, and it is our right, as the representatives of the people, to know what has been done with the money so that we can hand the information on to our constituents. We have not those details and we are not likely to have them before this vote is passed. Therefore, while there are a great many rumours in the air of over-expenditures, of expenditures that should never have taken place, there is no way in which they can be contradicted, because we have not the facts before us. Personally, I have no desire to circulate any rumour that is not absolutely correct, nor have I any desire to get any political benefit from any statements which may be made against the administration of this Government since the war started. I have no doubt the Government have sins enough to answer for without anything that is wrong being stated in regard to those expenditures, then if the rumours were wrong, we would know how to correct them; but the Government have not done so and the rumours continue. There is no doubt that the men coming back from the front say that unnecessary and exorbitant expenditures have been made, and while there may be some exaggeration in what the ex-Minister of Militia has told us this afternoon, there is a great deal of truth in what he has said. We know that expenditures have been incurred in connection with men who should never have enlisted, who, a blind man almost could tell were too old to enlist or who were suffering from rheumatism, men who everybody knew were not fit to be enlisted, but who were enlisted, and who, after having been kept in Canada for several months, were taken across the water, and we have been paying them their daily wage and also separation allowance, and the Patriotic Fund even has been mulcted to a certain extent. The medical officers who examine recruits ought to have instructions not to take on men of that class because, while such men may be perfectly willing to fight, their enlistment means an unnecessary expense to the country, and in addition to that, they are taken away from their ordinary vocations, and after their return, it takes them some time to settle down again. In fact, some that I know of have not settled down yet since they were taken away. To illustrate my point, I have a memorandum here of some of the battalions that crossed over in the Fall. The 111th Battalion of Galt had 190 men, or a percentage of 29 out of a total of 635 men discharged on arrival in England. The 142nd ("London's Own") arrived in England with 561 men and lost 164, medically unfit, over age, etc., a percentage of 29. The 160th Battalion of Walkerton had only 13 per cent of discharges. Out of a total of 997, only 140 were discharged. The 161st of Clinton made the best showing of the quintette, only nine per cent or 67 of the 740 men with which they arrived in England having been turned down. The 148th of Woodstock, like the 160th, had a percentage of 13. This battalion has rejected 87 men out of a total of 604. Add these up and you will find the number rejected was over 600, a very high percentage. They had been trained all summer in Canada, at Borden Camp or elsewhere, and we had borne the expense of that training. That should not have happened.

5 p.m.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Is not the hon. gentleman aware that each man was passed first by the doctor of the battalion and that at Borden Camp every man was afterwards inspected by a full board of physicians? What further precautions could have been observed?

Mr. NESBITT: That is not speaking very highly of the ability of the physicians. Some of these men would have been rejected on their looks by any member of

this House. I know some of the men who were enlisted, and have known them for years, and in the cases I have in mind no medical knowledge would be necessary to lead one to reject them as unfit for overseas service. I am not particularly blaming the Government, except that I think they should have taken care that the medical inspectors were of a high enough class not to pass men simply because they came up for inspection. There is no necessity for the state of affairs that existed; the fact that it exists shows that there is something wrong somewhere.

I wish to say a word or two about the medical report to which my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) referred. I can easily see that the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) need not be so far apart. Every one who knows anything about Col. Bruce knows that he is as capable a man in his profession as can be found, and absolutely fearless. The Prime Minister saw the hospitals as a visitor, and perhaps he would not know much more about a hospital than I, and that would not be very much. He would be admitted to the hospital as a visitor and the Prime Minister of Canada. Besides, the medical authorities of the hospital would know that he was to make a visit at a particular time. Even with the little knowledge of the world that I possess, I can easily believe that nothing wrong would appear in that hospital that could possibly be hidden that day. But Col. Bruce visited the hospital on a different mission. He was sent as an inspector, not to approve of everything, but to disapprove of what was wrong. With his expert knowledge, he would easily see that things were going wrong where an ordinary visitor would think they were going right. I do not think that any man should condemn Colonel Bruce for setting forth the details of this hospital work and telling the exact truth. The Government should have felt obliged to him for telling them of anything that was wrong in the hospital. I think if I had been in their place, I should have felt grateful to Colonel Bruce for his services. As to the men from the front, I agree with other hon. gentlemen that I have never met one who made a complaint about the hospitals; on the contrary, they always give the highest praise for the way they were treated, whether the hospitals were conducted by British or by Canadians. But that does not alter my views as to the position that Colonel Bruce occupied, nor by belief that he could easily see shortcomings which would escape the eyes even of patients. I believe that Colonel Bruce did his duty, and I do not see why the reports should not have been brought down. I doubt that there was anything to hide in the matter. The particular incident mentioned by the hon. member for Pictou might be the only one of its kind. I can easily understand that Dr. Bruce's report would be quite correct, and yet that by the time the Babtie investigation was made the local people might have got busy and corrected any fault that existed, and so the Babtie report might be reasonably correct too. Both these reports might have been honest; I am quite sure that the Bruce report was, anyway.

Now, it is not fair to us that these large votes should be passed without a statement being given showing what has been done with the money already voted, that we as representatives of the people, may know what we are talking about when we are asked what has become of the money. We know, of course, that there must have been expenditures which would not have been made had we had better knowledge beforehand. These are things that the people can easily excuse, as we on this side of the House can excuse them. But there is no possible excuse for some of the expenditures that, according to rumours we hear, are constantly taking place. It is a great shame that money voted by this Parliament to fight this war to a finish should be improperly spent. For this expenditure will be a great burden upon the people of this country. We cannot be careful enough in making these expenditures. Yet, according to statements that are made, and judging from knowledge that we have, expenditures have been made which are nothing but a criminal shame.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance): It chanced that I was in England at the time when the commission of inquiry was appointed by Sir George Perley and the Government. I am acquainted with the circumstances in which that action was taken. I may say that I have had some experience in connection with hospitals, and with members of the medical profession. For many years I was on the Senate and Board of Governors of the University of Toronto. For a considerable period I was one of the governors of the Toronto General Hospital. I was chairman of a committee at

one time which re-organized the staff of the Toronto General Hospital, and I then got to know something of the medical and surgical profession. I found that it was possible for doctors of the highest eminence to disagree, and to disagree quite honestly. I know Dr. Bruce; he is a personal friend of mine, and a man of high standing in the Canadian surgical world. That is, I think, well known by all members of the House. When I went to England I found that Dr. Bruce, acting upon the instructions of the ex-Minister of Militia, had made a report upon the hospital situation in Great Britain and was engaged in attempting to carry out the recommendations of that report, under instructions from the minister and, I believe, with the sanction of the Military Council which had been established in London. I found that great tension, very strong feeling, existed in London, as well as on the Continent, with regard to the Bruce report and his proceeding to carry it out. I took the opportunity of talking with men high in the Canadian medical service, with officers and men of impartial judgment, and I found—I desire to make an absolutely fair statement respecting the matter—that while it was admitted that there were many good points in Dr. Bruce's report, it was in many respects impracticable to carry out its recommendations. I believe that is a fair statement of the opinion of the Canadian Medical Service and of official military opinion of London with respect to Dr. Bruce's report. I do not mean to say that that was a unanimous opinion. Dr. Bruce had some strong votaries and supporters; on the other hand, Dr. Jones had many equally strong votaries and supporters. I found the opinion prevailing very widely that Dr. Jones had been done some injustice, that the difficulties with which he had been obliged to contend had not been taken into account, that as the war had developed burdens had been cast upon him and upon his organization, which had not been foreseen and which could not have been fully and adequately prepared against. We found the opinion prevailing widely among eminent members of the medical profession and among military men that Dr. Jones had done exceptionally well, having regard to all the circumstances surrounding his task. As I have said, it was thought by many—and in this I agreed—that there were many excellent points in Dr. Bruce's report. I believe that Dr. Bruce proceeded with his work in all good faith. He had not been a military man, and to that extent would not be acquainted with the practical difficulties which might stand in the way of carrying out some of the recommendations which he made. In London a newspaper controversy had been proceeding with regard to the question of so-called segregation. It was contended by some that Dr. Bruce's plan provided for the segregation of the Canadian troops—that the Canadian troops should not be allowed to mingle with the troops of Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand in the Canadian and British hospitals, but that they should be gathered together as Canadians in Canadian hospitals, and be treated by Canadian physicians and Canadian surgeons. I found a very strong feeling prevailing in London that it would be an unwise policy, an improper policy, to segregate the Canadians in their own hospitals and to deny to wounded British, Australian and New Zealand soldiers the privileges of Canadian hospitals. I think it is unfortunate that that controversy arose, because in reality—and I know that this is the opinion of Sir George Perley—the truth lies between the two extreme opinions. I do not regard it as necessary that Canadian soldiers, in twos, threes or groups of half a dozen, should be sent to remote parts of the United Kingdom for treatment. On the other hand I think it would be an unmixed misfortune, contrary to Canadian and Imperial interests, if a hard and fast rule were laid down that Canadian soldiers should be segregated in Canadian hospitals and not be allowed to mingle with the wounded soldiers of Great Britain, New Zealand and Australia. While I was in the United Kingdom I visited many Canadian and British hospitals. I took the time to go about among the wards of those hospitals—I think it was one of the most interesting experiences of my life— and I asked many Canadians in those wards as to the treatment which they had experienced since becoming patients there and as to what they thought of the question of segregation. I state the substance of the answers truthfully to the committee when I say that, without any exception, they all spoke in the highest possible terms of the medical, surgical and nursing treatment which they had received in those hospitals. That was true also of the Canadian soldiers whom I saw in the British hospitals.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Having regard only to the main question of segregation, would the Canadian soldiers prefer to be segregated, or otherwise?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Canadian troops, according to the opinion of those

with whom I discussed the matter, would prefer a condition under which, while there would be a considerable number of Canadian soldiers in a hospital, there would also be soldiers of New Zealand, Australia, South Africa and Great Britain. I myself observed that here would be a Canadian in one bed, here an Australian next to him, there an Irishman and so on. I heard a story when I was at Cliveden that illustrated precisely what I have in mind. A Canadian was engaged in an animated discussion with an Australian about some matter over which they differed. It became heated, and the Irishman interposed in order to compose the difference. He said to the nurse: "This is the first time in the history of the world that an Irishman has been found making peace instead of breaking it." That is typical of what you find in all these hospitals. If in a hospital containing 1,000 beds there are two, three, four or five hundred Canadians, the Canadians will not be lonesome. On the other hand they do like to mingle with the Australians, the New Zealanders and the soldiers from the British Isles. It gives them a wider interest than they would otherwise have; it makes for breadth of view and of sympathy; an exchange of ideas continually goes on among these patients. I talked with hundreds of Canadians in the hospitals which I visited and I never heard one single complaint with regard to their treatment, or in respect to the medical, surgical or nursing services. On the contrary, they all spoke in the highest possible terms of the treatment which they have received in these hospitals. As I say, I think it unfortunate that this question of segregating should have arisen and to say the truth, I do not believe myself that Dr. Bruce had it in his mind that Canadian hospitals should be shut to all except Canadians. I think he had it in mind that a policy should be inaugurated that would aim at getting as many as possible of the Canadian soldiers in to Canadian hospitals. In my view as has so often happened in the case of these controversies, the truth lies between the two extremes. I know that that is the opinion of Sir George Perley, and that is the policy now being adopted. Instead of sending two, three, or half a dozen Canadians to a distance in Great Britain, they will, wherever possible, be sent to Canadian hospitals. So then we shall have a situation in which, in a hospital say of 1,000 beds we may have 300 or 400 or 500 or 700 Canadians, and the remainder British or Australians or New Zealand soldiers. As I say, there was a controversy in London with regard to this question. Lady Drummond had taken up the matter in the Times newspaper, and I desire to say with regard to Lady Drummond and the other ladies whom I saw in London, that they have laid this country under a debt of gratitude for the unselfish service which they have rendered to our soldiers.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Lady Drummond has maintained, I believe at her own expense, an establishment in London through which she is in communication with practically every Canadian soldier in Great Britain. That is a great service. I found the same with regard to other Canadian ladies in London. I do not believe we can speak too strongly or too highly of the service which these noble women are rendering in the cause of humanity there in London. I do not know anything that fills me with greater pride than the work being done by Canadian women in London and Great Britain.

There was the tension then that arose by reason of the feeling widely held that Dr. Bruce's report had not taken sufficiently into consideration the difficulties with which Surgeon General Jones had to contend, and that it did not do Surgeon General Jones the justice which it was thought by the Canadian forces he was entitled to. There was also the tension caused by the controversy over the question of segregation which I have discussed. Then there was further question, and this was a most important matter, that many members of the Canadian Medical Service and a good many of the leading officers of Great Britain, did not believe that Dr. Bruce's recommendations could be carried out practically. They did not believe that, having regard to conditions that existed at the front, and at the base hospitals, and the mode of transporting the casualties to the hospitals, that Dr. Bruce's recommendations could be carried out. That is to say they did not regard them as practicable. I talked with Dr. Bruce on one or two occasions in London, and I desire to be absolutely fair to him. As I say, he is a personal friend of mine. He is a surgeon of high standing, and in my view there are many excellent points in his report; but I do think that some of the recommendations which he made were impracticable, and I believe that the carrying out of them in their entirety or in large measure would have gone far to disorganize the Canadian Medi-

cal Service in Great Britain and on the continent.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was he not promoted by the British War Office?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am not touching on Dr. Bruce's technical skill except to say that it is of a very high order. Dr. Bruce is the head of one of the services of the Toronto General Hospital. He is an associate professor of the University of Toronto, and I speak in the highest terms of his ability as a surgeon. What I am saying is that an opinion widely prevailed in military circles in Great Britain that it was not practicable to carry into effect many of Dr. Bruce's recommendations made in absolutely good faith—there is no question about that. That was the situation with which Sir George Perley was confronted, and it was a serious situation.

Mr. MACDONALD: At what time was that?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In November. It was a serious situation, and it had to be faced. Sir George Perley was obliged to act. This matter was given the best consideration of which we were capable. We reached the conclusion that in order to resolve the difficulties—because there was a clear cleavage of opinion, military and medical—we should have to appoint a board of inquiry in whom the people of Great Britain, including our own military men there, officers and men, and the people of Canada would have complete confidence. I know that the selection of the personnel was approached in that spirit, and in that spirit only, because I myself advised with regard to some of the appointments. We thought it advisable to have a representative of the University of Toronto, a representative of Queen's University, Kingston, and a representative of McGill. The idea was to get a representative board in whom our military men, both officers and troops in Great Britain, would have confidence, and in whom the people of Canada would have confidence. Let us see whom we chose. I do not believe that a better or fairer board could by any possibility have been selected than that presided over by Dr. Baptie.

Mr. MACDONALD: To-day I learned for the first time of those other medical men who were associated with Dr. Bruce. I assume that the minister's statement is accurate in regard to the other men, and that they assume responsibility for his statement.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think the position is this, that Dr. Bruce made the report, but I believe that some of these other gentlemen assisted him, obtained information for him, and reported to him. Dr. McKeown is a surgeon of high standing, who is connected with St. Michael's Hospital in Toronto. Dr. Wallace Scott is another physician of good standing connected with St. Michael's Hospital in Toronto. I say nothing against the ability of those men; they are well qualified surgeons.

Mr. MACDONALD: Was the direction given to Dr. Bruce merely or to these gentlemen associated with him?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: To Dr. Bruce.

Mr. MACDONALD: But they joined in the report?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not know that they joined in the report, but I think that Dr. Bruce made use of their services for the purpose of obtaining information, and no doubt embodied some of their conclusions or findings in his report.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is it not rather humiliating to think that Dr. Bruce, a man of outstanding ability, having been ordered to investigate, should, after that, have been succeeded by another board to investigate him?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am explaining the circumstances which made the appointment of that board absolutely imperative if the Canadian medical service was not to be disorganized. I have explained all the circumstances which prevailed when the board was appointed. The board had to be appointed in order to deal with the acute differences which had arisen, and I want to refer for a moment now to the personnel of this board. I say that if the Government had tried for six months they could not have obtained better names than were obtained for the board which went into this matter at the instance of Sir George Perley and the Government in order to make a report for the purpose of settling these differences which had arisen, to ascertain whether these findings were correct and practicable. Who are the men of that commission? Who is Dr. Fotheringham? He is associate professor of medicine in the University of Toronto.

Mr. MACDONALD: Nobody questions that.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Dr. Fotheringham is on one of the medical services of Toronto General Hospital. Dr. Fotheringham is a consulting physician of the highest standing in the city of Toronto. He is a man who has been connected for twenty or thirty years with the militia of Canada, a man of the highest possible standing. You could not select a physician in Toronto to-day who has in greater measure the confidence of the people of that city than has Dr. Fotheringham. So that no question arises as to him. Who is the other? Dr. Ross, of Kingston. The standing of Dr. Ross of Kingston is of the highest. He is a splendid man, a man who has the confidence of the people of Kingston and of Central Ontario, and I believe of most of the members of this House. Who else? Dr. Elder, of Montreal. Hon. gentlemen from Montreal will know him. No one can impeach his standing. I had the pleasure of conversing with Dr. Elder going over from Boulogne to Folkestone. He is the leading surgeon, I believe, at the McGill Hospital at Folkestone, one of the best, if not the greatest hospital that this war has produced. He is the leading surgeon there, and does any one suppose that he would join in a report in which he did not believe? Does any one suppose that Dr. Elder would make a report with regard to the question of Canadian wounded for any ulterior purpose Is there any hon. member who will raise that question against Dr. Elder?

Mr. MACDONALD: No one is raising a question against Dr. Bruce.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am contending that the men on this commission were men of the highest standing.

Mr. MACDONALD: No one is questioning that.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The ex-Minister of Militia has spoken, and spoken quite properly, in high terms of General Ashton. Then there was Sir William Baptie.

Mr. TURRIFF: Does my hon. friend think or say that the men on the Baptie Commission were any better than Dr. Bruce and the men who were working with him?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: At the outset of my remarks I paid as high a tribute as I could to the surgical ability and standing of Dr. Bruce. I said that I had been on an hospital board long enough to know that doctors differ and honestly differ. If I should have any criticism to make of Dr. Bruce, who is a personal friend of my own, it would not be on the ground of any lack of surgical skill, but on the ground that he had not the military experience which some of the men on that Commission had. I have a high opinion of Dr. Bruce's capabilities, and I said at the outset, and I say now, that he made his report under instructions from the Minister and acted in all good faith.

Then we have Sir William Baptie recommended to Sir George Perley by the British medical authorities. No one can challenge his standing. What happened? We have a report upon a report. We have Dr. Bruce's report, and we have a report on Dr. Bruce's report by five of the ablest medical men that could be selected.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We have not the reports; that is the trouble.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Well, we are talking about them.

Mr. GERMAN: We cannot talk about them until we see them.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Then why are we discussing them? The reports have been made, and I am relating the circumstances under which they were made. Let us look for a moment at the V. A. D. question. I desire to say that Canada is under a debt of gratitude to those women who work late and early without regard to hours in connection with these hospitals. Why did the British authorities utilize these V. A. D. hospitals? It was for this reason, that they have had casualties on a scale undreamt of a year ago. How many beds are in those V. A. D. hospitals? There are 53,000 beds, equivalent to 53 hospitals. The British medical authorities would tell you: "why of course we would rather have military hospitals, but we have to do the best we can, having regard to the exigencies of a situation in which casualties are coming by the tens of thousands when we expected them by the hundreds." They are only too glad to make use of these V. A. D. hospitals with 53,000 beds because they have not sufficient hospital accommodation otherwise. These are the facts.

So far as the Baptie Commission is concerned, I have indicated the condition that existed in London, the controversy in regard to segregation and the strong feeling that was prevalent in the Canadian medical service in connection with the propos-

als to carry out the recommendations of Dr. Bruce's report. I have told the House the reasons which influenced Sir George Perley in appointing the Baptie Board of Inquiry. I have also informed the House, although most of us are aware, of the high standing of the members of that board. Until the two reports are tabled, it is quite impossible for the House to form its conclusion upon them, but I desire to say that from numerous conversations which I had with men, with officers, with members of the Canadian medical service, with distinguished medical practitioners in London, and with other prominent people there, I am absolutely of the opinion that in no war in the history of the world has there been anything like the high excellence of medical treatment of the soldiers as has been given to the troops of Great Britain and the Dominions overseas in this war. I desire to say this further, that of the hundreds of men with whom I talked in the hospitals which I visited, Canadian soldiers and Canadian nurses, from almost every constituency represented in this House, all spoke in the highest possible terms of the medical and surgical treatment and of the nursing which has been furnished to the wounded, and I came away with a feeling that all was well in connection with the treatment which had been accorded our Canadian soldiers in Great Britain. Further than that, the Canadian soldiers in Great Britain, while they desire to see a large representation of Canadians in the hospitals, in so far as I was able to gather their opinion from conversation, and from hundreds of letters from Canadian soldiers, do not desire segregation. They do not desire that Canadian hospitals should be maintained exclusively for Canadian soldiers. They want a percentage, a large representation, but they certainly do not desire the doors of the hospital to be closed to the soldiers from New Zealand, Australia, Scotland, England or Ireland. They want to talk with these men. They find it interesting to talk with them. I believe that the association of our wounded soldiers with the wounded soldiers from Australia and New Zealand and other parts of the British Empire will make greatly for the promotion of Imperial sentiment.

Mr. MACDONALD: Will this lying alongside of an Australian or a New Zealander in a hospital impart any more of the Imperial spirit to the heart or the soul of a man whose loyalty was staunch enough to impel him to fight for the Empire.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: All these influences contribute to the development of Imperial spirit. There is a comradeship which they greatly value. I never saw a soldier who intimated a contrary opinion. They value the comradeship of the men from the British Isles from New Zealand and Australia. They value the comradeship of their own fellow Canadians and they want to be with them but they do not desire that the Canadian hospitals should be wholly for Canadians. I do not wish to labour that point. I repeat, what I said a few moments ago, that the truth in regard to this matter, as it does in so many cases, lies between the two extremes. On the one hand, I think it is a mistake to send Canadians in small groups to remote parts of the United Kingdom, but, on the other hand, I do not believe that Canadian hospitals should be solely for Canadian wounded. You might have a Canadian hospital with a thousand beds and five or six hundred Canadians in it. Are you going to say that the unoccupied beds shall not be available for wounded soldiers from England, New Zealand or Australia?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does Dr. Bruce say that?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No, he does not say that. I said before the ex-Minister of Militia came in that I did not believe Dr. Bruce had that in mind. I said that the policy which I understood him to put forward was that we should, as far as possible, have our Canadian soldiers in the Canadian hospitals. I think it is unfortunate that this "segration" controversy should have arisen in London. I know that Sir George Perley's view is that the truth lies between the two extremes and I think the matter is now satisfactorily adjusted.

Mr. McKENZIE: I understand that there were two commissions, and each commission, I presume, made recommendations. Will the minister tell me if there was anything done to implement any of the recommendations made by either commission?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I understand from the Prime Minister, who has had the matter more immediately in charge, that the recommendations of the Baptie Commission are being carried out.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Wherein did the recommendations of the Baptie Commission differ from the recommendations of Colonel Bruce's Commission?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not propose to go into the details of Dr. Bruce's report. The ex-minister was absent during the major part of my remarks this afternoon. I stated among other things that some of the recommendations made by Dr. Bruce were, in the view of the military authorities, impracticable. With reference to the details of the Baptie report, as the matter is not particularly under the jurisdiction of my department, I do not propose to enter into it. I have taken up the time of the House this afternoon because I think it would be unfortunate in the last degree if the impression should be created erroneously in this country that Canadian wounded are not receiving proper treatment in Great Britain. I believe they are. I believe they have been well treated, that they have had the benefit of the highest medical skill and the best nursing possible, and I have never heard a contrary opinion put forward by any soldier or officer either here or in Great Britain.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Except by Colonel Bruce.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am speaking of the men with whom I talked.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was Dr. Bruce's promotion recommended by Sir George Perley to the War Office?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I understand it was the British service that he was recently appointed to, although I am not informed as to the truth of the report to that effect.

Mr. LEMIEUX: On whose recommendation?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There was a newspaper report that Dr. Bruce was to enter the Imperial service to act in the capacity of consulting surgeon in France. I should imagine that Dr. Bruce would be highly qualified for a position of that kind.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is it not extraordinary, after his having been taken to task by Dr. Baptie, that he should be promoted by the Imperial authorities?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not think there is anything extraordinary about it. If my hon. friend has had as much experience of physicians and surgeons as I have had, he will know that they differ and honestly differ. You frequently have men of the highest standing and ability who differ, but that does not mean that they are unqualified in their profession. My opinion is that Dr. Bruce would make an excellent consulting surgeon.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I observed in the report which purported to be issued by the Baptie Commission that an "if" came in; that so long as it was decided that the Canadians and the British and others should mix together they did not think they should be segregated. If I remember aright, this report contained a condition that "if" it was decided to keep the Canadians, Australians, and British soldiers together, then they would agree with Dr. Bruce's report, but otherwise they would not agree.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have no information as to that.

Mr. WILCOX: It has been reported that my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) made a statement that a soldier who was returning from the front by the name of Private G. Walton, of Windsor, invalided home—

—was without overcoat or gloves, and had his hands frozen at Quebec. He is being cared for in the London hospital, and his case should receive such attention as will make similar cases impossible.

Then the hon. gentleman continues:—

That is one concrete case, and, I have no doubt, there are hundreds of similar cases.

I desire to say to my hon. friend that, in regard to this statement, I have received the following telegram:—

Windsor, Ont., Feb. 6, 1917.

O. J. Wilcox,
House of Commons.

Re Pardee newspaper story, Private G. Walton frozen hands account; no issue coats and mitts absolutely false; was met by Sportsman Patriotic Assistant Secretary. Writing particulars.

M. G. Campbell,
President.

I simply allude to this fact to show how careful hon. gentlemen ought to be in reading these newspaper trashy reports as actual proof of conditions.

Mr. PARDEE: I simply told the House that I was reading from a newspaper. I did not take it upon myself to say whether it was true or not; I was simply pointing it out.

At six o'clock, the Committee took recess.

After Recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.—Mr. Blain in the Chair.

On section 2—payment of $500,000,000 may be made.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): Mr. Chairman, I realize that it is desirable to make any observations that I have to make on this Bill as brief as possible. I did intend to speak upon the resolution; but time did not permit last night, and it was agreed, I understand, that the same discussion could be carried on in committee on the Bill. The field for discussion which this large vote opens up is very inviting, and my sole purpose in addressing you, Sir, at this juncture is to discharge what I regard as a serious duty to my own constituents, in explaining to them the salient points of this Bill. The Bill itself in a concise way sets forth its purpose. It involves the voting of an enormous sum of money, I suppose the largest individual vote that has ever been before the Parliament of Canada; at all events the largest within my memory of any transactions of this kind in this House. The preamble of the Bill says:

Whereas a state of war exists between His Majesty and the German Emperor, the Emperor of Austria, King of Hungary, the Sultan of Turkey, and the King of the Bulgarians; and whereas it is necessary that measures be taken for the common defence and security, and to this end it is expedient that aid as hereinafter provided be rendered to His Majesty: Therefore His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

The second section of the Bill, which is the important one, says:

From and out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund there may be paid and applied beyond the ordinary grants of Parliament a sum not exceeding five hundred million dollars towards defraying any expenses that may be incurred by or under the authority of the Governor in Council during the year ending the thirty-first day of March, 1918.

It is important for the people of this country to have some understanding as to what is to be done with this enormous sum of money. The subdivisions of section 2 set out what those different matters are, and as they are all highly important, I desire to refer to them for a few moments. They are:

(a) the defence and security of Canada;
(b) the conduct of naval and military operations in or beyond Canada;
(c) promoting the continuance of trade, industry, and business communications, whether by means of insurance or indemnity against war risk or otherwise;
(d) the carrying out of any measures deemed necessary or advisable by the Governor in Council in consequence of the existence of a state of war; and
(e) payments made for the said purposes during the fiscal year ending the thirty-first day of March, nineteen hundred and seventeen, in excess of the amount authorized by The War Appropriation Act, 1916.

Speaking for my people, I am not finding fault with this vote; far from it. I am heartily in accord with it, and the only advice which I would attempt to submit would be that the money should be applied carefully and properly to the different subjects enumerated in subsection 2 of this Bill. Liberal as I am, and a true follower of a great Liberal leader, I could not be anything other than in entire accord with proper expenditure being made and proper steps being taken by this Parliament and this country in support of the position which we have so proudly taken in this war. Some attempts are being made in certain quarters to show that the Liberal leader and those who follow him are not doing as much as they ought to; that they are not sincere in their support of the Government in war conditions, and, in fact, that the leader of this great party is not in favour of participation in the wars of Great Britain at all. I was particularly struck by an article which appeared a few days ago in a Conservative paper published in the province of Quebec. La Patrie, I understand, is a stout advocate of Tory principles, a paper which is edited by bright, capable, business young men who understand the politics of this country and who are familiar with the history of the different political parties. I feel gratified that they take a proper view of the position of the great Liberal leader in connection with military matters in the Dominion of Canada, and of his judgment and of the judgment of his party in regard to the relations which Canada should have with matters political and matters imperial in the old land. I think it was about the 25th of January last, when party politics in the province of Quebec were at a high temperature, that La Patrie tried to find fault with my great leader and to hold him up as a man who was not in line with the ideas of the Conservative party, because this paper said:

If Sir Wilfrid Laurier were in power should we participate in the present war? Certainly. It was Sir Wilfrid Laurier who first defined this policy of participation in 1897 at the Jubilee of Queen Victoria in London. "When the hour of battle strikes," he said, "light your beacon-fires on the hills, sound your trumpets and Canada will answer your call in sacrificing the best of her blood."

In 1899 for the first time the Canadian Government took part in an Empire war. The

Laurier Government sent the contingent to Africa.

In 1910 Laurier brought about the adoption of the Navy Bill, affirming this constitutional truth: "When Britain (England) is at war, Canada is at war." This navy should be Canadian in peace time and Imperial in war time.

It is Sir Wilfrid Laurier who is the sponsor of military Imperialism in Canada.

That is the position taken by the leader whom I am proud to follow, and it is represented in La Patrie, which intended to put this statement forward as an offence to my great leader and as something which would not be acceptable to the Conservative party in the province of Quebec, particularly in regard to the election going on in the county of Dorchester, and this particular quotation was published for the purpose of rendering matters difficult for the candidate of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in that constituency. I say, therefore, that the expenditure of this money, if it is properly expended in support of King and country in connection with the situation in which we find ourselves, is perfectly satisfactory to me as a humble follower of my great leader.

We had an opportunity of hearing eloquent discussions upon the various phases of the management of the war since it commenced down to the present hour, but we did not hear anything from the Treasury benches that would strengthen our confidence in the manner in which war appropriations have been spent in the past I am sorry that in this discussion no evidence has been given either by the Minister of Militia (Mr. Kemp) or the Secretary for War (Mr. McCurdy)—if that be the proper title—of ability or willingness to explain the matters placed in their charge. One Minister of Militia has been dismissed. One would naturally suppose that the reason for that dismissal is that the Prime Minister thought he had not sufficient grasp of the affairs of his department, especially in view of the tremendous responsibility we have undertaken in participating in this desperate struggle now going on in Europe. And in selecting a man to take the place of the Minister whom he dismisses, one would suppose that the Prime Minister, especially as he has such a wide clientele, so to speak, from which to select, would choose a man having at least a fair knowledge of the subject in hand, and ability to give to the House a business presentment of how the money voted by Parliament had been spent, and a reasonable explanation of the plans of proposed expenditure. I have no fault to find personally with the hon. member who has been selected to be

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Minister of Militia. I have sat in this House with him for some years and have always found him a genial gentleman. But I had hoped that when the House met this year he would show some knowledge of the business for which he was selected, and would give a business account of what is being done by the department. I know that the gentleman appointed as Secretary for War—still assuming that to be the proper title—is a business man, and I expected that he would give some business idea of what was being done both upon this side and upon the other side of the water. But to my amazement—and I speak sincerely—I find that both the minister and his lieutenant are as dumb as oysters, and, assuming that they know anything about the affairs in their charge, refuse to share with us their store of knowledge. It does not require great eloquence to give the House a business idea of what expenditures have been made and what the plans for future expenditure in connection with this war may be. It surely is a surprising thing that it should be thought necessary to have a special pleader in the person of the Solicitor General to tell this House what is being done. To me it is always an indication that things are not what they ought to be when the Solicitor General is called in to give a statement to the House—one, as the Shakespearean phrase has it to make the worse appear the better reason. I do not now find fault with the way in which the Solicitor General puts the case; what I say is that it is not his case, it is not his business. A few years ago, we in this country were putting through a big transaction in the Transcontinental railway, and we were scoffed at by the present Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), then the leader of the Opposition, because, forsooth, we had lawyers on the Commission. He said we had no business to have lawyers handling such matters. He must have changed his mind; because now, even when dealing with military matters; with the making of ammunition; with rifles, and differentiating between one rifle and another, or between one class of ammunition and another; with tactics on a battlefield; this House must pass over the Minister of Militia and the Secretary for War, and must pass over an ex-Minister of Militia as well, and learn from the Solicitor General what is being done in these matters. Surely the Prime Minister will remember how he used to attack us for trusting to lawyers business that he said belonged to Parliament. I want to be honest with myself. Of men

who are not specialists in any business that is to be dealt with, the lawyer has as much opportunity of knowing about that business as anybody. For, if he has any practice in the courts, he has to deal with every kind of business, and, while, he is master of no trade, he will know something about a great many.

We are called upon to hand over this huge sum of money to the Governor in Council. Well, we all know who the Governor in Council are. But will any of these hon. gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches say that he knows anything about war matters? I do not think there is one of them who would venture to cast the first stone at the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) if the accusation were that that hon. gentleman did not know enough about military affairs. There is the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White). He is a splendid speaker. But because a man is a good speaker it does not follow that he is a good financier or a good business man. If I had any advice to give the hon. Minister of Finance, it would be to pay less attention to the rules of elocution and more to the multiplication table. If I have any weakness about the Minister of Finance it is in thinking too much of him. I suppose that I still have some of the old regard that men always feel for an erring brother, based, I suppose, on the hope that he will complete the circle and some day find his way back to the Liberal fold. Perhaps the Minister of Finance is too easily dissuaded from his purposes. I think it was on the evening of the 30th of last month that the hon. gentleman was speaking when the House rose at six o'clock. At that time he was going strong in a certain direction and talking pretty straight about the ex-Minister of Militia and his manoeuvring in his department.

When he came back after dinner, he saw a great light. Our Saul of Tarsus had become Paul the Apostle, and he had little, if anything, to say against the manipulations of the ex-Minister of Militia. I have a third quotation here, the words of which clearly indicate that they were uttered after dinner. I am not now suggesting that a dinner in Ottawa means very much, or that any reason of that kind resulted in a changed view on the part of the Minister of Finance. However, when he came back he said:

> I repeat that if you take all the nations that are engaged in this war, and have regard to the scale of their operations, the mode of purchase, the administrative acts which have been taken, their financial operations, having regard also to the proportion which must be observed between their operations and ours, in my belief there has been less waste in connection with the administration of the Militia Department and this Government of Canada than in connection with the administration of any other belligerent in the world. I say that not only with regard to the present war but in regard to any war of the past.

That is a most extraordinary statement for the minister to make. The Minister of Finance never went through a war before this one, and I never heard of any book being published which made comparative statements respecting wastefulness in matters connected with war. I am at a loss, therefore, to know how my hon. friend is in a position to say that the conditions prevailing in Canada since the war began have been economically superior to anything that has ever happened since the world began. One would hardly suppose that a careful, cool, calculating mathematician such as the Minister of Finance ought to be would make statements of that kind without having the very best proof to back them up. This statement was made by the Minister of Finance after the ex-Minister of Militia had spoken on the same evening, and no doubt it was with the statement of his expert in mind that the Minister of Finance made this declaration of economy. If hon. gentlemen will refer to Hansard of January 30, page 279, they will find the following:

> Mr. Pugsley: Before my hon. friend leaves that matter, could he say what was the value of the equipment which was thrown away?
>
> Sir Sam Hughes: I forget; it was millions. We did not look at the value; we were so busy swearing.

That is the evidence upon which the Minister of Finance reached the conclusion that the greatest economy and thrift ever known had been practised—a declaration by the ex-minister that he could not look at figures, never knew anything about the multiplication table—he was too busy swearing. I should not care to go to a jury with evidence of that kind and ask them to give me a verdict according to the evidence. That, Sir, is one reason why I find fault with the Minister of Finance and one reason why I should hesitate, if the case were not as urgent as it is, to put $500,000,000 into his hands to be expended as may be deemed proper by him and those associated with him—for I assume that the counsel of the Minister of Finance will have to prevail in matters affecting the disbursement of this money.

I had intended to quote a few gems from the speeches of the ex-Minister of War. I

realize that the ex-minister is not such an authority to-day with my friends opposite as he used to be. I have recollections of seeing during the last five years my distinguished friends across the way making most elaborate salaams to this dignitary, with palms in their hands. But now I observe that only one member on that side of the House pays the slightest attention to the ex-minister, and that is the hon. member for Chateauguay, a gentleman who, I understand, is engaged in the business of manufacturing and selling tombstones. This is explained by the old saying: "Where the carcass is, there the eagles will gather". I want to give the Minister of Finance further evidence of the kind of economy that was practised during the five years that the ex-Minister of Militia was in office. I find that the ex-minister, as reported on page 511 of Hansard, after making some extensive observations regarding the wastefulness that he said was being practised on both sides of the water, says:

> This is the way this humbug goes on, up and down.

He says further, on the same page:

> There is no doubt that the world put two and two together. Nobody could know of the conspiracy in my department, and this was part and parcel of the conspiracy from start to finish. And yet these gentlemen are there to-day.

He intimates that while he was in office some men in the department evidently had nothing to do but conspire to defeat him in some of his purposes—laudable purposes, no doubt—and he says that those who were conspiring, are still there. That circumstance is not such as causes me to have great confidence in the administration of the Governor in Council. He says further, speaking about the kind of ammunition that was being made:

> Yes, they are on record.

That is, the nature of the different kinds of ammunition.

> The three brands were defective and no rifle could have fired them. One of them was so deadly that to have sent men to the firing line with it would have been simply murder. We found an ordnance officer attached to Canadian headquarters issuing that ammunition to the extent of 5,000 rounds which were placed in the pouches of one battalion after the blow-up. I have no hesitation in saying that that ordnance officer should have been led out and shot, and if I had been running the show I would have carried that out. I protested, and demanded his dismissal, but he is there yet.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What does he mean by calling it a show?

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not know, perhaps a sort of zoo he was running, but I do not know what he means by it. It seems there were some parties concerned in the show who did not dance to his pipe, and he certainly finds fault. But this is too serious for me to pass over without calling the Prime Minister's attention to it. There is somebody somewhere for whom the Prime Minister is responsible who was putting ammunition in the pouches and bags of Canadian soldiers, and the giving of that ammunition to them was, according to the ex-minister, equivalent to murder. That is a very serious matter, and I heard no explanation and no contradiction by the Prime Minister, or the Minister of Militia, or the Secretary of War; they have allowed this to go by the board and made no explanation of it at all. If I should be asked by my constituents: Have you consented to giving $500,000,000 to that group of gentlemen to be expended by them? Did you find out if that sort of officer is yet in charge? Is that same officer, who, according to the ex-Minister of Militia, should have been shot, and who he says is still in the employ of the Government, is he yet there and is he still going to have charge of the ammunition to be given to our boys to defend themselves? I cannot say. The hon. gentlemen on the other side are not very communicative. They will not tell us. But this is what the ex-Minister of Militia has said, and we have no reason to suppose that he has said anything but the truth.

He gave us another pathetic statement about the Highland Brigade, and he disclosed the truth, which is really pathetic, about the condition of things which existed in the camp. A good deal of fault has been found in the province from which I come in respect to that Highland Brigade. It was promised, as the ex-minister has said, that these men would be kept together. He says that he had the authority of the Prime Minister in making that statement. On the strength of that statement the very best men that we have in the province of Nova Scotia went out recruiting. I may mention as one Bishop Morrison, of the diocese of Antigonish. Bishop Morrison went out among his people with this promise in his hand, that young men would be kept together, that they would not be broken up, that brothers, relatives, neighbours would be together and it would be a sort of outing for them where they would not be separated. On the strength of that promise he got many Scotch Highland Cath-

olics in Antigonish and all through his diocese to join. What will Bishop Morrison say to-day to the fathers and mothers who come to him and say: Bishop, you promised our boys would be kept together; we took your word for it, and they went out; but now we find that they are broken up, sent hither and thither, and there is no unity in the regiments as you promised. I think the Prime Minister should have some regard for the obligations and the feelings of gentlemen of that class who went forth believing the Government would do what they promised to do and represented to the people that that would be the case; and that certainly the word of the Government, as presented by the Prime Minister, would not be departed from. I am sure that for myself I should be quite willing to take the Prime Minister's word for such a statement, as for almost anything else; but I am sorry to say that his residence in Ontario and his commingling with such people as he associates with does not help him along the lines of stability and veracity. What the ex-Minister of Militia said is this:

When the Highland Brigade of Nova Scotia was organized I felt a little keen in regard to the matter because of what had happened and I took the matter up with the Prime Minister. With his authority I gave my solemn pledge to the officers of the brigade and to the committee that had helped to organize it that it would be kept intact. The Prime Minister may recall that on one occasion he spoke to me about the 58th Battalion. I said, "for heaven's sake let us carry out one pledge which we have made to the people of Nova Scotia."

It was, of course, very pathethic. The ex-minister says: "everything else has gone; we have made thousands of pledges, we have broken them, they are gone, but this one thing, stand by the pledge that you and I gave to the people of Nova Scotia". But no, they did not stand by it, it is gone.

The ex-minister comes to the question of financing again. He calls to account the Prime Minister and others for their system of financing the brigades, and he says that there were more men drilled at Camp Borden, Camp Valcartier and elsewhere in Canada than are being drilled on the other side. Then he says:

Why all this paraphernalia should be introduced in London I have never been able to find out.

The Prime Minister is familiar with our Statutes in Nova Scotia, and he knows that our Probate Act refers to paraphernalia. Paraphernalia is something that is never considered worth mentioning in an inventory and although it is the property of the dead man there is nothing said about it. I do not know whether that is the sort of paraphernalia that the Minister refers to here. However, he does not give any description of it beyond the statement that there is a paraphernalia and that paraphernalia exists in London. He says:

General Carson, with Colonel George Murphy, and thirty-one assistants, ran the business—

That is during his regime.

—and when any hon. gentleman asked for any news of his friends at the front he got an answer within a few days. When any hon. gentleman asked if any one was wounded or wanted a report about any one, he got his answer in a very few days from General Carson. To-day you get nothing. General Carson with only thirty-one officers could keep the work going, train men, and send them to the front and win battles, whereas to-day I am told there are 700 assistants, costing $6,000,000 a year, as the result of the action of the Minister of Finance when he ordered the Prime Minister to appoint an overseas minister; I forget what he was going to do. We find all that saddled on the country, and I presume to-night the Minister of Finance is preaching thrift and economy to the people of Ottawa.

He is, on one hand, squandering the money of the people of Canada, and in his line of talk going around preaching economy. That is what his colleague or the man who was his colleague for the last five years accuses him of. That, sir, to some extent is the testimony upon which the decision of the Minister of Finance is based when he tells this country that there never was in this world (or almost in the world to come) any such high-class economy as was practised in Canada. I find here a letter from the ex-Minister of Militia to the Prime Minister bearing date 13th of May, 1915, which was put on record by himself I am going to quote only a few lines from it. He said:

I wrote a letter to the Prime Minister on May 13, and I presume there is no objection to my reading it. The faults complained in it have been rectified by the War Purchasing Commission, and I think it is in justice to myself that I should place it on record to show the life we had to lead in the Militia Department:

May 13, 1915.

Dear Sir Robert,

Since my return from England last November, I have repeatedly notified you that owing to the interference and plans of the "so-called" sub-committee and to the repeated hold-ups and needless obstructions of some of my colleagues in the affairs of this department, the Contract Branch has been very much hampered and practically blockaded; delays have been very prolonged; the cost has been greatly enhanced and the goods supplied have been, in many cases, inferior. Indeed, the most ardent agents of the German Government—

This is the part to which I desire to call the attention of the Prime Minister particularly:

—indeed the most ardent agents of the German Government could scarcely have been more successful in holding up the proper equipment of our forces, had they been in control.

That, Sir, is a tremendous indictment. We are told by the ex-Minister of Militia that even if the most ardent agents of our arch enemy had been in charge of matters in the Militia Department and of the Government, they could not have been more successful in obstructing and blocking our success than those who were in charge. That goes without a reply. It is not for me to say it is not true. I believe if it was not true it would have been contradicted. I notice that the special pleader, the learned counsel, who comes forward to save the ship when there are rocks and breakers in sight, steered clear of this piece of dangerous and hazardous navigation. He did not tell us anything about that. I will be asked by my constituents: were you a party to handing over to the Government $500,000,000, and I will have to admit that I was. I consent to it because, for the present, they are the only power. I will have to plead theology, and say that the power is from the Lord, although the party in power are rather poor representatives in exercising it sometimes. But I will have to say that for the present they are the power, and I will have to plead my theological knowledge in voting them the money in the hope that they will do better things, and that no minister, or any other man who may have inside knowledge of the working of this Government, will ever again be in a position to say that this Government, or a certain wing of it, was more successful in blocking the preparations of war than any agency of the Germans could have been if they had had the matter in hand. I trust that the outgoing of the Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) will have the effect of stirring up the Prime Minister and those who support him, and of ensuring that matters will be better handled in the future than they have been in the past.

If we were to go upon the evidence, and if the occasion would permit us to cause any delay in granting the money, I would feel justified in supporting that delay and stopping the supply if that were possible. But the matter is too urgent, and the occasion is too grave and I am sure that the people who sent me here would rather take the grave risks of having the money spent, perhaps recklessly and ineffectively in some regards, than have me for one moment interfere with the voting of the money. I am sure there are many people in my riding who will regard this expenditure as very large. As I said at the beginning it is, so far as I know, the largest vote that ever came before a Canadian Parliament. It involves the payment of $62.50 by every man, woman and child in the Dominion of Canada, and of $312.50 for every family of five in the Dominion. These are large amounts, but still the cause is worthy, and we are heart and soul behind this thing. We can only hope that we shall get proper value for the expenditure of the money. There must be a landmark from which the Prime Minister can start afresh, turn a new page; and if he cannot turn a new page in everything, he can surely turn a new page in regard to the question of patronage. This is an opportunity for him to start a fresh page in the matter of patronage. I am speaking only about the province of Nova Scotia, for I know very little of what is being done elsewhere. I have told the Prime Minister over and over again, and I take the responsibility of telling him again, that there is not the slightest difference between the expenditure of war money, so far as patronage is concerned, and the expenditure of any other vote that passes this House. It is well known that in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, in the Department of Public Works, and in the Department of the Interior, though they have not very much patronage in the Department of the Interior, the expenditure is strictly along party lines and is distributed among party friends and party favourites. I take the responsibility of saying, and I challenge contradiction from any member of this House, or from any one outside of this House, to say that in the province from which I come there is the slightest difference between the expenditure of war moneys that we vote in this way, and other moneys that are voted. I submit to the Prime Minister that this would be a good occasion for him to make a fresh resolution to start anew and spend this money in such a way that nobody can find fault and so that Grit and Tory, saint and sinner, shall have an equal opportunity of giving value for the money which has to be expended.

I have not very much more to say in connection with this matter. I hope that we shall get good returns for this very large expenditure, and that those whom the

Prime Minister has called to his council, his Minister of Militia, and his Secretary of War, will take this matter in hand and try to learn something about it. So far, they have not given us the slightest evidence that they knew anything about it at all, and I think it is a pity that we should be called upon to pay handsome salaries to ministers and their secretaries, when we have not the slightest evidence that they are taking any interest in the matter, but, on the contrary, are leaving it entirely to parties outside. I presume we should not expect very much from them this session, but when we meet again after the adjournment I hope that they will have learned something about their departments, and about this business, and that when questions are asked concerning matters pertaining particularly to the War Department we shall get an answer first-hand from the proper source, and not have to take it second-hand from people who are not supposed to know very much about it, and who try to cover up the crevices of their ignorance by the continuous flow of their eloquence.

Before I sit down, I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to a case that has been brought to my attention concerning a soldier who enlisted at Windsor, in the province of Nova Scotia. A young man by the name of H. Bruce Hawkins was enlisted by Lieutenant Fielding at Windsor on the 25th September, 1916. He was examined by Dr. Keddy—I presume of Windsor—and passed the examination. Lieutenant Fielding told him that his pay would begin on the day that he was passed by Dr. Keddy. On the 4th October, 1916, he was given transportation to St. John, N.B., on arrival there was examined by a board of examiners, and directed, after he had passed the examination, to join the company of Lieutenant Blair. From there he went to Montreal. Arriving at Montreal, he was again examined by a medical board, passed and put on duty. When pay day arrived he was not paid and the paymaster had no record of his joining the company. He was told that he had been reported by Lieutenant Blair as being in the St. John hospital. That is an extraordinary condition of things. Lieutenant Blair took him to Montreal, passed him over to some other officer and then reported that he was in the hospital in St. John. It was about the 24th October, 1916, that this young man went looking for his pay. Then he was re-examined by a board of examiners who found that there was a small piece of his little finger that was slightly touching on the third finger and for that reason he was discharged and sent back with no clothing except what he had when he left home and without a cent of money. I am informed that he was obliged to pawn his watch in Montreal with a man by the name of Heller, at 217 St. Lawrence street. Hon. gentlemen from Montreal will know whether I am giving a true account or not. Mr. Heller took his watch in security for a little money to take him home. He was obliged to go back home and was not paid for the month or more that he was in the service. He had passed the medical examination three times—first by Dr. Keddy, then by the board at St. John, and then by the board at Montreal. He did everything he could do to enlist, but from the time that he offered himself to the present he has not been paid anything. I just want to draw this to the attention of the right hon. the Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Militia in the hope that they will take some steps to do justice to this poor young man and see that he gets the little money that is coming to him for the time during which he served. This information was sent to me and I was asked to bring it to the notice of the minister. I have done so in this way, because, the time being short, I have had no opportunity of calling upon the minister.

Mr. KEMP: Will my hon. friend be good enough to give the name of the battalion in which he enlisted so that we can trace it in that way?

Mr. McKENZIE: I may be able to get that information, but I do not have it in my hands at the present moment. That is all I have to say on that matter . In conclusion, let me express the hope that wise counsels will prevail across the way, that this bickering and fighting, now that the ex-Minister of Militia has gone, will pass away and that we will learn that there are other people in the world who can do something besides the hon. gentleman who has left the Cabinet. Of course, in times of war, I suppose we will be disillusioned in a great many directions. For 4,000 years we have been under the delusion that the Lord had created the heavens and the earth, the firmament and the waters under the earth. Now, we are all disillusioned, because we find that all these things were done by Sir Sam Hughes himself. However, we are learning and we hope that the Prime Minister and the rest of them have not lived in vain with this great man for the last five years.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There were one or two observations made in the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the committee (Mr. McKenzie) that I would like to refer to. With respect to the Nova Scotia Highland Brigade, it would have been a most desirable thing if it could have been kept together overseas. It was my strong desire that that should be done. The officers, I think, were consulted about the arrangements, and I understand that, with the exception of some modification which has been made recently, they were reasonably satisfied that the exigencies of the situation made necessary the course which was adopted. I trust my hon. friend will take into account the fact that conditions at the front may sometimes make it necessary to depart from the course that was intended in the first instance. I think he also realizes how undesirable it would be for persons sitting here in Ottawa to undertake to control the military authorities at the front in respect of such matters. My hon. friend has spoken of the remarks of the Solicitor General with respect to certain matters under discussion, and he seems to have arrived at the conclusion that no lawyer ought to speak on such a subject. I am afraid that my hon. friend and I would both be debarred if that were the case. He also made the observation that a lawyer does not always know what he is talking about. Perhaps in one or two of my hon. friend's observations he was endeavouring to exemplify that truth, because I observed that he was under the impression that the officer of whom the ex-Minister of Militia spoke was in the service of the Canadian Government. I did not so understand it and I think that my hon. friend, if he reads Hansard, will find that he is mistaken. My hon. friend also spoke of the idea that has been more or less current in the press, that

9 p.m.

a great deal of Canadian equipment has been scrapped or destroyed overseas. Most extravagant, unfortunate and unwarranted statements have been made in that regard, and I took it upon myself some months ago to endeavour to ascertain what the facts were. I think it due to the committee that I should give a summary of what the result of my inquiry was. I am informed, in the first place, as to the general service wagon:—

General Service Wagons (Bain).

All Canadian General Service (Bain) Wagons supplied to the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th Divisions have either gone to the front, or have been retained where found necessary for local transport purposes, in camps or barracks in England. Generally speaking, such wagons have gone to the front, but many are still in use in England, and so far as is known are giving satisfactory results.

That is the information which I received from the responsible officers of the department. Then, in regard to harness, we have heard and read doubtless about the scrapping and destruction of harness overseas of the Canadian Expeditionary Force. The memorandum which I have here on that subject is:—

Lumber Harness. This harness has been used in England for local transport purposes both for Canadian and War Office services, in fact, the War Office purchased from the Canadian Ordnance all of the lumber harness that could be spared from the Canadian supplies, paying full price for the same. The purchase of the harness by the War Office might be looked upon as pretty conclusive evidence of the utility of the harness, and that it had not been consigned to the scrap heap.

Saddles. The saddles, supplied to the Canadian troops going overseas, are identical with War Office pattern, and no complaint has ever been received by this department. They were not consigned to the scrap heap.

Then follows the Oliver equipment; but as I am going to read a fuller statement with regard to that, I will pass over it for the moment:

Clothing. All articles of clothing of Canadian manufacture, as supplied to the Chief Ordnance Officer, C.E.F., are taken to the front by units and individuals proceeding on active service.

It is quite untrue that any of the clothing has been scrapped or destroyed, so far as my information goes, and I have endeavoured to get reliable information and I have got it from the officers of the department who are responsible for the statements they make.

Other equipment. All other equipments of Canadian manufacture, embracing wheeled and motor vehicles, harness and saddlery, signalling stores, engineer and artillery technical stores, are considered equal in manufacture to, and in conformity with similar articles of War Office equipment and have gone across to the front with the Canadian Expeditionary Force.

Motor trucks. Second Division. The Kelly Motor Truck was considered by the War Office as up to the Imperial standard and has been accepted in exchange for Imperial trucks loaned to the Canadian Forces.

It is true that the motor trucks did not arrive in England in time to equip the Second Division. The trucks for this division were borrowed from the War Office, and replaced by our trucks on their arrival in England. No detention of Second Division in going to France was ocasioned. The Government lost nothing by this, as the trucks supplied by Canada, while just as efficient as the Imperial ones, cost less money.

Motor cars and motor ambulances. These vehicles were accepted by the War Office as efficient and quite suitable for service at the front.

In conjunction with the report made by Col. Hallick on his return to Canada from England, with regard to the equipment mentioned in the statement which I have just read, the following remarks are extracted from a report by Colonel Murphy:

All clothing, underclothing and boots, and all equipment, including transport, vehicles and harness, which are issued to the troops in England, are of Canadian manufacture. For the last nine months I have been carrying on the duties of the Quartermaster General of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and am therefore in a position to make the above statement.

With regard to the Oliver equipment, as there has been a great deal of discussion in the papers, it seems advisable that I should give the report of the responsible officers of the department in that respect, as well as certain information that I have obtained from Sir George Perley, to whom I sent a message by cable on the subject. The memorandum which I am reading is signed by the quartermaster general, Major General D. A. Macdonald, and was enclosed to me by the Minister of Militia a day or two ago. It reads as follows:

Memo for the Information of the Minister.

Re "Oliver" equipment.—The pattern of dismounted equipment authorized for use by the Canadian Militia up to the commencement of the war was known as the "Oliver," which was issued to all dismounted soldiers, and at the commencement of hostilities such of this equipment as was available was collected, issued to the 1st Division, C.E.F., and taken by it to France: it however was replaced subsequently (in 1915) by British "web" and without expense to Canada when it was returned here to be converted and was taken into further use. This was the same equipment as was issued to the Canadian troops who served in South Africa.

The mobilization of the 2nd Division and reinforcements for both the 1st and 2nd Divisions, up to a maximum of 108,000 men followed rapidly and for this number (108,000) ninety-seven thousand sets of "Oliver" equipment had been provided for in the fall of 1914, as follows:

1914.

Aug.....	30,000	sets for	1st Division C.E.F.
Sept....	2,000	" "	additional units for 1st Division.
Sept....	35,000	" "	reinforcements.
Oct.....	30,000	" "	2nd Division, C.E.F.
Total....	97,000		

But as in January, 1915, the G.O.C. Canadians, England, reported that "Oliver" equipment was not as satisfactory as the War Office web equipment, steps were taken immediately to provide for the conversion of the "Oliver" equipment to a "Valise" equipment, approximating as closely as possible the War Office pattern. At this time it was not possible to obtain the War Office web equipment either in Canada or elsewhere, as the War Office was unable to meet its own necessities.

Some time in February, 1915, the honourable the Minister (Sir Sam Hughes) conducted a demonstration for Militia Council, of four patterns of dismounted equipment, viz.—

(1) "Oliver" equipment.
(2) "Oliver" equipment converted (as referred to above).
(3) War Office "Web".
(4) War Office leather.

at which it was decided to proceed with the conversion of such "Oliver" equipment as was possible.

Subsequently it was ascertained that the 2nd Division had had its converted "Oliver" equipment replaced by "web" when going to the front, and as more equipment was required for the C.E.F. on increase of establishment, a pattern of equipment, which it was considered would be acceptable to the War Office as suitable for service in the field and producible in Canada was given consideration.

A pattern known as "1916 dismounted equipment" was adopted late in the year 1915 and was issued to all C.E.F. in Canada; very many battalions trained with it in Canada and on the whole it proved satisfactory. When the 4th Division, C.E.F., left England for the front it was in possession of this equipment, but later War Office "web" was issued to replace it, without expense to the Canadian public, the reason of the G.O.C. in Chief B.E.F., being as below:—

'That though the Canadian equipment was made of excellent material it did not give the same measure of comfort on the march as the "web" and was less suitable for carrying ammunition in charger clips.

That the "gas helmet" could not be tucked away under the soldier's jacket collar properly or rapidly owing to the wide strap which fits close on the shoulders.'

In conclusion it might be said that when the war commenced the department had no other equipment to issue the men and that as War Office could not meet its own necessities then, or during the following 18 months for the continually expanding British army, "web" could not be obtained for the C.E.F., as it has never been made in Canada. Further, that though the Canadian equipment has not had much use in the field for war purposes, the whole that has been purchased has had hard and constant use for training purposes, and at this moment is continued in use in England and Canada until the men are placed under orders as reinforcements for the front, when it is replaced by "web" to accustom the men to its use. That the Canadian equipment issued to the overseas units when leaving Canada had on their arrival in England been scrapped or otherwise destroyed is without foundation in fact.

(Sgd.) D. A. Macdonald,
Major-General, Quartermaster-General.

Then I asked Sir George Perley for a statement, and he has given me the following statement in a cable message under date of the 31st of January, 1917:

London, Jan. 31, 1917.

Statements that Canadian leather equipment has been burned on arrival in England are absurd and untrue. Oliver equipment with which First Division proceeded to France was subsequently replaced here without expense to Canadian public and it was returned to Canada early in 1915 for use there. Converted Oliver equipment with which Second Division was equipped was replaced before going to France and later returned to Canada for further service. 1916 Canadian leather equipment with which Fourth Division proceeded to France was eventually replaced by web equipment without expense to Canadian public. Large number of troops in training in England use Canadian leather equipment. Sufficient web equipment is now being supplied troops in training in England to enable reinforcements to proceed overseas with acceptable equipment properly adjusted.

It seemed to me desirable that I should make that statement to the committee.

With respect to certain other matters which have been raised, I might say that the Second contingent was authorized by order in council of November 7, 1914. The despatch of that contingent to England commenced on the 10th of April, 1915, and was completed on the 9th of August of that year. The number of ships required was twenty-one, and the total numbers that went forward in the contingent were: officers 930, other ranks 21,640, total 22,570. I am further informed, by memorandum placed in my hands by the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence, that the contingent was despatched to England as soon as accommodation and transports were available. I am informed that this contingent went to the front on September 13, 1915.

I have already explained that the motor trucks with which this contingent was equipped were loaned for the time being from the War Office. I have here a memorandum on the purchase of these motor trucks which I desire to read:

The purchase of motor trucks was authorized by order in council dated 15th December, 1914; —50 trucks from the Kelly-Springfield Company, Springfield, Ohio; 50 trucks from the Packard, Detroit, Michigan; and 50 trucks from the White Company, Cleveland, Ohio. One of the terms of the order in council was that if any of these firms failed to accept the order under the conditions named in the order in council, the portion of the order allotted to such firms should be distributed among the others accepting the conditions price: list price, less 20 per cent. discount f.o.b. place of manufacture. It was a further condition of the order that each firm representing any truck purchased should agree to have made in Canada such portions of the bodies and tire work as could be done in this country. Orders were placed in Canada by telegram for the bodies on 17th December, 1914, and for the tires on December 18th, 1914. The order for the chassis was delayed owing to the desire of the Prime Minister to institute certain inquiries in regard to the reliability of the Kelly-Springfield motor. On 5th January, 1915, the Prime Minister instructed to proceed with placing the order, and on the 15th of that month the firms named in the order in council were asked by wire to supply the trucks.

I interrupt the memorandum to say that a question had been raised as to the durability and reliability of the Kelly-Springfield motor, and it seemed to me desirable that the doubt should be absolutely cleared up before we should proceed to give an order. For that reason there was a delay during which I undertook to satisfy myself on that point. It eventually proved that the motor was entirely serviceable. The memorandum continues:

The Kelly-Springfield Company accepted immediately and the contract was made on the 16th January. The White Company offered only twenty per cent. f.o.b. Cleveland, and the Packard Company did not close within the period specified for acceptance, viz.: one week. The balance of the order was accordingly given to the Kelly-Springfield Company, who completed the entire delivery of the chassis by 19th February, 1915.

My recollection of the exact terms of the order is that we insisted that the various companies from whom these motor trucks were to be purchased should give a price to the Government based on a deduction of the commission which they allowed to their agents. As we were ordering direct, we thought the Government was entitled to a deduction equal to the commission ordinarily paid. The memorandum proceeds:

Owing, however, to the bodies originally ordered not fitting, and fresh bodies having to be made, the motor trucks did not arrive in England in time to equip the Second Division. But the Second Division was not delayed in proceeding overseas or in going to France by reason thereof. The trucks for this division were borrowed from the War Office and replaced by our trucks on their arrival in England. The Government lost nothing by their exchange with the War Office, as the trucks supplied by Canada, while just as efficient as the Imperial, cost less money.

There is another matter upon which I desire to give the committee some information, as the question is raised by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). He spoke of the response to the National Service card. On the 2nd instant, I procured from the Secretary of the National Service Board a statement as to the number of cards which had been received up to that time. He informs me that the estimate of National Service cards received to that date was 1,350,220, and that the cards were still being received at the rate of about 40,000 per day.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland): The right hon. gentleman who leads the House has told us that there have been a lot of wrong statements regarding the scrapping of articles of war equipment purchased in Canada and taken overseas. So far as this House is concerned, the information that we get in this matter is from the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes). He more than any one else has stated that articles purchased in this country have been scrapped. So, if anything has been wrongly stated, it comes from a former colleague of the right hon. Prime Minister. And I can hardly suppose that the ex-Minister of Militia has made such erroneous statements as would appear from the statements read by the Prime Minister. But that will be a question for investigation later on. At present, we are asked to appropriate $500,000,000 to be handed over to this Government to expend at their own sweet will. This is an amount which would have staggered the imagination of Canadians a few years ago —a very few years ago. To-day, we feel that we are strong enough financially to stand expenditure of this kind. But it is our duty, and the people of the country will see to it that we are held responsible for the performance of that duty, to see to it that this money is properly expended. There has been some discussion in the press of the formation of a national government. If anything would induce me to believe that the time was ripe for a national government, it would be the fact that we are asked to hand over $500,000,000 to the Government now in power. Consider the statements that have been made by ministers of the Crown themselves. Judging by what the ex-Minister of Militia has said, it would appear that for months, yes for years, he in his department was surrounded by what a former Prime Minister of Canada called, a nest of traitors. The Minister of Finance rises in his place in this House and states that expenditures made by the ex-Minister of Militia, when he was in office, were extravagant expenditures. He instanced one very large item, the expenditure on shovels I wonder if they were scrapped? I think that about $50,000 or $60,000 was paid out for shovels. The Minister of Finance admits that that was an extravagant expenditure, and he intimates, if he does not state it as a fact, that other extravagant expenditures were made in that department, and that in order to protect himself and, as far as he could, safeguard the treasury, he found it necessary to write a letter to the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister, in his letter to the ex-Minister of Militia, states that his time for several months was taken up with settling quarrels and differences between the ex-minister and other members of the Cabinet. To hand over to this Government on their own demand the enormous sum of $500,000,000, to be expended without our having any further information than we have now, is a rather hard proposal to put before the people's representatives.

The discussion this afternoon started on the report of Dr. Bruce. I would not assert that the Prime Minister would endeavour to mislead the House or the country, but his statement regarding Dr. Bruce's report was certainly a misleading one. It misled me, and I venture to say that it would mislead the people. The Prime Minister asserted very emphatically that he would not discuss Dr. Bruce's report until it was laid on the table of the House—indeed, that, until it should be laid on the table, the report should not be generally discussed. He said further that he had cabled to London for copies of the report and that about forty copies would very shortly be available for distribution. From that one would infer that the report had been published in England but had never come to this country. However, in answer to a question that I put this afternoon, we have been informed by the ex-Minister of Militia that Dr. Bruce's report had been sent to him in September last and has been in the possession of the Government since that time. An order of the House has been passed for the production of this report, and I cannot understand either why the Department of Militia has not produced it or why the Prime Minister has not seen that it was produced. The subsequent report is also in the department, and I think the Government is very much to blame for misleading the House and the country, even if not intentionally, by giving the impression that that report is not available, whereas it is in their own possession.

I quite understand that it is very much easier to sit outside and criticise what is being done within than to sit inside and improve what is being done. It is not difficult to criticise, but it may be difficult to administer the various departments in a time like this. Certain matters, however, can and should be very considerably improved. The House will adjourn, supposedly tomorrow. The Government have established a National Service Commission, ostensibly

in order to ascertain what can be done further in the way of recruiting; but they do not deign to tell us what definite action they purpose taking in the matter of recruiting. Recruiting is practically at a standstill. On Sunday, January 21, a recruiting campaign was begun in the town of Welland in order to get recruits for the 176th Battalion. The town and the county of Welland and the whole Niagara district have done admirably in the matter of recruiting. This district has made a splendid record for itself. Diligent and intelligent work in connection with this recruiting campaign was carried on for a week, with the result that only three recruits were obtained. There are a large number of men in that town and throughout the county who could go to the front. Why do they not go? I will tell the Prime Minister and the Minister of Militia why they do not go. There are in Canada thousands of militiamen who have volunteered for overseas service—they may be found at Niagara Falls, St. Catharines and other points. These men are officered by men who are drawing their pay simply for the sake of drawing it; who have no intention of going to the front, and who would not be allowed to go to the front even if they went to England. The young men in that district and throughout Canada generally know this, and they say: if men are needed, why do they not send the men that they have? The Colonel of the 176th battalion, who is a Conservative, representing the county of Welland in the local Legislature, made a statement along these lines at a recruiting meeting: The press report says:

> The commander of the 176th explained that he had brought 623 from Camp Borden to Niagara Falls and had since taken on 125 men, but owing to discharges for medical unfitness and desertions the strength of the battalion was only 648.

Or only 25 more than they had when they came from Camp Borden. One hundred men had deserted or been discharged for unfitness. At the city of St. Catharines they have the 213th Battalion, which, for some unknown reason, is called the American Legion. This battalion has a full complement of officers—colonel, majors and captains—men who will not go to the front and who cannot go even if they want to; and the battalion has only about 213 men. The number may be even less, because I was told on excellent authority that the men were deserting. Then there is the 176th, also with a full complement of officers and 600 men. There you have two battalions and two sets of officers, but scarcely enough men altogether to make up one battalion. Is that a situation which would appeal to the young men throughout the locality as being satisfactory? Is it not rather discouraging? If that is the prevailing situation throughout this country, that we have numbers of battalions in different localities one-half or less than one-half strength but with a full complement of officers, it being known that these officers will not go to the front and that they are drawing pay, why, in all reason and sensibleness, does not the Government bulk these men and send to the front all men who are fit to go? They want to go, they are appealing to be allowed to go. They do not want to stay here with the training they have had. Why does not the Government send the men to the front where they wish to go and where they can be of some use, and discharge these officers who are drawing pay? Then you would have some encouragement among the young men of this country to join the colours. I should like to know from the Minister of Militia, and I wish he would tell this House, how many colonels and majors and captains there are in London at this hour drawing pay who are not on actual active service, who will not and cannot go to the front. I know some, and a friend of mine who came from London only a few weeks ago, a very reputable gentleman, says that these officers who will not go to the front are having a high time, living at the Carlton and the Savoy at the country's expense. I believe they cannot go to the front, in the first place because they are not qualified, and in the next place because there are no positions for them in the capacity of colonel, major or captain. Now I say that condition of affairs is what is destroying recruiting in this country. I know it, because I have spoken to young men about recruiting. I belong to the recruiting committee in the county of Welland, and we have worked energetically to secure recruits for these battalions. You cannot do it. Young men say when you ask them: Why do they not take the men they have and discharge the officers who are not qualified to fill the positions, men who have had no military training, men who never were in camp, but who are simply boosted into these positions—I will not say for political reasons, at least not on the part of the Government, but through local political reasons—boosted into these positions which they are not fitted to fill, men who never intend to go to the front but who are drawing the pay of a colonel, a major or a captain, although they are doing no service to the country? Why

should the people's money be thus squandered in this time of stress, at a time when we are asked to vote $500,000,000? I trust that that money will not continue to be expended in that sort of way for any very lengthy period. The Prime Minister stated in his remarks in this House on the 22nd of January that he had enlisted 434,529 men.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not say we had enlisted that many; I detailed how it was made up.

Mr. GERMAN: Enlisted for overseas 392,647; actual militia called out and under orders, 9,052. The right hon. gentleman gave the details, but it totalled 434,529. Now let us see what has become of them. There went overseas to December 31, 280,562. For other services there were about 30,000, making altogether 310,522, the total who left Canada. There were serving in Canada 48,312; actual militia on guard duty, 9,052; permanent force 2,470, or a total in Canada of 58,824, making a grand total of 370,746. According to the Prime Minister, there were on duty in Canada a total number, as specified by him, of 434,529; and of these 370,746 are accounted for. But there are 63,773 who are not accounted for. Where are they? I should like to know. I should like the Minister of Militia to explain the 63,773 men who are not accounted for according to the Prime Minister's statement. But he says there are 280,562 who went overseas up to December 31. What has become of them? He tells us that there are at the front 110,000; that there are under orders for the front 10,000; and on sundry services in England 17,383; total casualties, including those who have been returned, 71,263, making a total of 209,646. There were 280,562 who went overseas. There are only 209,646 accounted for, and so there are 70,916 not accounted for. Where are they? Does the Department of Militia know where they are? Does the minister know where they are? There is a total of 134,689 men in Canada and overseas who are unaccounted for and as to whom the Minister of Militia gives no information. So that instead of there being for actual service 434,529, there are only something less than 300,000. It seems to me that that is a condition of affairs which is interfering with recruiting in this country. It is the serious interference with recruiting. The two factors to my mind which are most prominent in causing depression in recruiting are these: that the men are kept here not on service, and that they have a large number of officers who will not go to the front, who it is known do not intend to go to the front, and who are deriving pay from the Government simply as officers, being practically on a holiday. Those are conditions which should be and must be rectified if there is to be any effective service in the future. Whether or not conscription is to be resorted to, I do not know, but something must be done to bring about a different condition of affairs than exists at present, and I am confident that if the Militia Department would go at this recruiting matter as a business enterprise, with the proper sort of energy, they could get all the men they would require.

It is said that the ex-Minister of Militia was a very energetic man. So he was. He claims credit for having recruited all the forces that were recruited. Well, at the time of the breaking out of this war, the men were all anxious to go, whether we had a Minister of Militia or not, the men would have joined the forces. They were anxious to join. It did not require the energy of the Minister of Militia—and he has great energy; it did not require the intelligence of the Government, to bring about recruiting in those days. But now has come a time when it requires some active intelligence to bring about recruiting in Canada, and the first thing, to my mind, which the Department of Militia should do to secure further recruits is to send to the front every man in Canada who is wearing a uniform and who is fit to go to the front, and to discharge every officer, to put him off the payroll, who is not fitted to go to the front and who will not go to the front. If you do that you will create a condition of confidence in the country, you will create a condition of affairs which will make not only for the well being of the country, but for the general enlistment of further recruits throughout. Canada. The National service system which has been adopted may be of some use, but I doubt it very much. Speaking for myself, I have not the slightest confidence that it will produce good results. The National Service cards have been sent out. Some of them will be answered, but what possible effect will they have, so far as recruiting is concerned, and, to my mind, recruiting is the supreme interest at the present time. So far as work at home is concerned, we must look for results in a different way. I believe it would have been better to have put the matter altogether in the hands of the municipalities instead of sending out these National Service cards. It would have been

better to have put the matter in the hands of the authorities in each municipality, and called on them to make a return to the Government of every available man in that municipality, stating for what purpose he was available. You would have got the returns and got them quickly, and you would have got them without frightening a large number of people into leaving the country out of fear of conscription. You would have got a better report. You could have had committees formed in each county who would look into the requirements of each district, and you would have got, by that means, a result which would have been of far greater benefit than that which is likely to be derived from the National Service Commission.

I do not wish to take up the time of this committee further, but I do feel that the Government have been, if not negligent, at any rate unwise in their system of recruiting. I think they are unwise at the present time, and that they will fail to get recruits unless they change the system which they have adopted, and carried out up to the present time. Change that system, dismiss the officers who are drawing pay and who are of no use, send to the front the men who want to go there, and you will have no difficulty in getting recruits to fill up the ranks in the future.

Hon. Mr. KEMP: I wish to say just a word in regard to one matter referred to in the speech of my hon. friend from Welland, that is in regard to the battalions which are under strength at the present time. My hon. friend referred to two battalions that are under strength, one in the county of Lincoln, and the other in the county of Welland, one having between 600 and 700 men, and the other being of lesser strength.

Mr. GERMAN: 200.

Mr. KEMP: Over 200, I think. It is all very fine at this stage of the game to say that the mode of recruiting is wrong. We decided when the war broke out, and I think the country approved of it, that the best mode of raising recruits was by the battalion method, and that method was pursued. It was the only course, I think, that should have been pursued, and it has been followed and has been a success. Nearly 400,000 men have joined the forces through that system. Recruiting has now fallen off, and there are a number of battalions which are only partially filled. These battalions are being consolidated in some instances, and in other instances are being sent overseas in drafts. My hon. friend asks: Why don't you get all these troops out of the country, irrespective of the regiments that are under strength? But the battalions are not only under strength in the counties of Lincoln and Welland; they are under strength in many places throughout the country. We are sending troops out of the country at the present time.

Mr. GERMAN: Why does the minister not unite these battalions that are under strength and make one battalion up to full strength, and so do away with these surplus officers?

Mr. KEMP: I have just informed my hon. friend that that is exactly what we are doing as fast as we can. The reason they are not going out of the country at once is two-fold. One reason is that the British Government has told us that they have no shelter for any more troops than the number that they wish us to send over during the winter months. The other reason is that the Admiralty is not able to furnish transports for the conveyance of the troops. But there are a good many troops going over every month. We are sending exactly the number that the British Government want us to send during these months. I repeat that the regiments under strength are being consolidated in some cases, and that in others they are going over in drafts.

It seems to me that my hon. friend reflects to some extent upon the officers of the forces, that have gone over. All the officers to whom he refers were not in employment in England or at the front. Some of my colleagues have been on the other side recently and they know more about that than I do. They know about the number of senior officers who are in that position at the other side at the present time. But there is a very good explanation.

Mr. GERMAN: Why do you not bring them home?

Mr. KEMP: We will see about that in a minute. So far as the officers in this country are concerned, there are many who have done splendid service in recruiting, but who are not fit to go to the front, and who perhaps did not intend to go to the front. But they have done their bit in recruiting. They are not military men, but they have done all they could do to serve the Empire in getting battalions together. Recently they have not been so successful, because recruiting has fallen off. These men have done the best they could do, and they will revert to civil life as soon

as possible. In the regiments to which my hon. friend referred, although one is only 600 or 700 strong, it is necessary to have colonels and majors in the meantime. We cannot get along without officers for these regiments. As I said, these regiments are being consolidated, and they are being sent to England at the present time in accordance with the instructions which we receive from the British Government as to the number of troops they can accommodate during the winter months. They are being sent as fast as the British Admiralty can send us transports. They are not going over as fast as at other times, but they are being sent at the rate of 7,000, 8,000 and 9,000 a month. When the spring comes, the course that I have outlined in respect to sending them over will be followed. As I said, the men who are not fit to go to the front will revert to civil life, and they will be taken off the pay-list. They will willingly go off the pay-roll. There are many officers in this country who have done good work, and who did not have to be taken off the pay-list, because when they finished their work, they sent in their resignations and asked to be relieved. That is what is being done. I do not think that my hon. friend could name any man who has engaged in this work from a selfish motive. They have done their duty, and for the most part they have done it well and patriotically.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am loth to prolong this discussion, but I feel that I cannot retain my seat and listen in silence to the remarks of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) with respect to many brave officers at present in the United Kingdom. It is easy to say that Canadian officers in the United Kingdom should either be sent to the front or sent home. That may sound very well, but the matter should be looked into a little more carefully before my hon. friend makes reflections upon as brave a body of Canadian officers wearing the King's uniform as there are in Great Britain to-day. It is not well that any hon. member of this House should generalize with respect to men who have raised battalions in this country, men who have gone to personal expense, who have spent their time, given their services freely, and faced the perils of an Atlantic voyage to take their men across; men who desired to get to the front but who are unable to get there because the positions are filled which they would be glad to occupy. I have had dozens, yes, scores of officers in Great Britain come to me and say: "We want to get to the front; cannot you get us there?" The reason why they cannot get to the front is perfectly obvious. There are a certain number of officers in command of the men at the front. I discussed this very matter with Sir Julian Byng, I asked Sir Julian Byng whether it would not be possible to get more of the Canadian officers in Great Britain who are willing and anxious to go to the front, who plead to be allowed to go to the front, and his answer was: "We have officers in charge of the men in the trenches who have been here for months, some of them for a year, and some of them for two years; they are experienced officers; I do not care how capable the officers may be who are in England, if I substituted these officers for the men who are actually trained in the trenches, it would mean casualties." That was his answer and that is the answer that appeals to any one's common sense. He was quite willing that men should go over there as supernumeraries, and if qualified should, as vacancies occurred take their places in charge of the battalions in the trenches; but it is manifestly unfair to say that the Canadian officers who are in London to-day, who have qualified themselves by training and who are anxious to go to the front should either be sent there, when as a matter of fact there is no place for them, or be discharged and sent back to Canada.

Supposing that policy had been followed from the beginning, what would have been the result? There is many an officer in his grave to-day who waited for six or nine months in London before he had an opportunity to go to the front, the opportunity which he longed for. There are Canadian officers in London to-day anxious to go to the front, pleading to be allowed to go, and who will get their chance when there is a vacancy. Take the case that was brought repeatedly to my attention in England; take the case of a colonel, some prominent man who spent months of his time in one of the constituencies represented in this House recruiting a regiment. His personal weight and influence had much to do with the success of recruiting that regiment. I know of cases in which the colonel had everything to do with the recruiting, not because of his military ability, but because of his personality, his weight and influence in the community. That man recruited his battalion and when

he had recruited it to strength it went overseas. He accompanied it. Let us assume for a moment that for some reason he is not qualified to go to the front; does any one in this House begrudge that man the opportunity of going overseas with his force even if he has to return without going to the front? We all know what public opinion is. We know that the colonel who has recruited his battalion in a county practically must accompany his men to Great Britain. He must go over or else he will come in for a great deal of personal criticism that is decidedly objectionable. That is what has gone on. They go overseas. Many are qualified to go to the front. As positions become vacant which they can fill they are allocated to those positions, but until these positions become vacant obviously those qualified men have to wait for them and if they are not qualified they will be returned to Canada in due course. I hope I misunderstood the hon. member for Welland when he spoke about the men in the hotels in London. These men have recruited battalions here, they have gone to London and they are waiting their opportunity to go to the front. It is manifestly unfair—and I refrain from using a stronger expression—to cast any aspersion on the courage of these men.

Mr. GERMAN: How many are over there now?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not know.

Mr. GERMAN: Does the Department of Militia know?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: They probably could tell my hon. friend, but it makes no difference how many are there; they have recruited their regiments, gone over there in good faith; they are ready to go to the front when the opportunity does come, and they are waiting for the opportunity to come. Let us look into that further. Look at the Canadian casualties. Is there any man in this House who expected that the Canadian casualties would be on the scale they have been? What is the reason for the breaking up of battalions when they go over to Great Britain? The reason is the casualties which have taken place at the front and the need for reinforcements. If there had not been these casualties in the Canadian force we would have been able to maintain four or five divisions at the front. But on account of these casualties Canada has not been able to maintain four or five divisions at the front, and these regiments that have been sent forward have had to be broken up and the officers separated from their commands. Instead of there being criticism of these officers there should be the very opposite of criticism. These men feel it; they are cut to the heart when their regiments are necessarily broken up by reason of military exigencies. They do not want to be separated from their regiments, and most of them—I do not say all of them, but I have no information to the contrary—desire the first opportunity of going to the front. If there was anything I discovered amongst the men and officers wearing the Canadian uniform in London it was their intense desire to go to the front.

10 p.m.

Mr. GERMAN: Is there any thing to prevent them?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Of course.

Mr. GERMAN: Why cannot they go as privates? There are colonels who are no better than lots of privates in the ranks.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That sounds very specious. A man who is quite competent to act as a colonel might not be quite as competent to act as a private. He might be of an age at which he might be quite competent to command men and yet not competent to take his place as a private in the trenches. It is unfair to the gallant body of men in London to cast any such reflections upon their patriotism or courage as that which has been cast upon them by the hon. member for Welland.

Mr. GERMAN: I did not intend to impeach the courage or cast any reflection on any of the brave officers in London. I did not intend to do any such thing but I say that there are officers in London drawing pay who cannot go to the front, who will not go to the front, and whom it is the duty of this Government to return to Canada. Are they to be kept over there? If so, for how long? They have been there for months and some of them for a year or more. I have had something to do with recruiting in the section from which I come and I and others in my locality who are not in the Militia force know a good deal about recruiting. We think that we know something about the military situation as well as the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. This is one of the things that is interfering with recruiting in Canada. There ought to be a remedy and there is one. Are these men to stay there until the end of the war? The Minister of Finance has just told us that he could not send these Canadian

officers to the front as colonels, majors and captains because they have officers in the trenches who are more capable. They have officers in the trenches who enlisted as privates and who have gained their rank for brave deeds in the trenches and they are filling the place of lieutenants, and captains by promoting men from the ranks. So they should, instead of sending over men who have had no experience in the trenches, and placing them as colonels and captains over men who are just as good as they are, who have enlisted as privates and who have fought the battles of the country from the beginning. Are they to be supplanted by newcomers without trench experience? Certainly not. They should be rewarded by receiving the positions which become vacant when casualties occur in the superior ranks. These are the men who should be promoted. The hon. gentleman speaks very speciously of the officers there. I have not a word to say of the officers over there as men. I am perfectly willing that a colonel should go over with his regiment.

Should he stay there for six months and receive pay for doing nothing at this particular time when we are voting $500,000,000 for this war, and when the Minister of Finance is asking for $100,000,000 of a war loan? Is that a time when men should stay in London under pay, doing nothing, waiting for an opportunity to go to the front, forsooth! when my hon. friend knows as well as I know, and as the Minister of Militia and the ex-Minister of Militia knows, that these men will never go to the front in the capacity of colonel or major in which they went over to England, because those positions will be filled by the men who are promoted and who are fighting the battles in the trenches?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster): Mr. Chairman, there is poison gas disseminated in connection with this war from other quarters than the trenches in the German line, and there is sniping equally as disastrous to the cause of the war as that of the German sharpshooters. I am one of those colonels, commanding officers, of whom the hon. gentlemen who act the part of political snipers in Canada speak so contemptuously in this House and through their press. I think it is well that there is one of those commanding officers present from London to answer face to face some of those who have just as much right to be over there as we have had, but who content themselves with discouraging the public men of Canada who do attempt to set an example to so many others in Canada who might be serving their country, but who decline to do so. One feels almost ashamed to discuss service to one's country from the low standpoint of pay; but as a commanding officer who did not put on his uniform because of any pay attached to it, I would like to say that in the office which I carry on at home, and from which a large proportion of the staff have gone to serve our country, from the manager down to the printer's devil, the average pay of the workmen in that office is the pay that a commanding officer in the Canadian Militia receives for commanding a regiment. I hope that is sufficient illustration to convey to the intelligence of some of those hon. gentlemen to whom the pay of a commanding officer looms so large, that possibly there is some other incentive than to receive the same pay as scores of his own staff that impels him to put on the uniform.

I would like to cite my case as an example of what does prompt a member of Parliament to offer his services at the front. At a certain stage in recruiting in Canada, the then Minister of Militia called for 100,000 additional troops. We have about 100 infantry battalions in Canada, so that meant an overseas battalion, in addition to those already raised, from each of the infantry battalions in this country. As I had the honour at that time of commanding an infantry regiment in Canada, I felt that it was an appeal to me to raise an overseas battalion, and I promptly volunteered to do it and I did do it.

As the Minister of Finance has said, the personal influence of a commanding officer had a great deal to do at that time in securing recruits. I feel quite sure that the fact that I had the honourable position of a member of the House of Commons gave me a great leverage in going about through my district and asking the young men of Westminster district—not to go to the front, but to come to the front with me. I may say to the hon. gentleman who says that the commanding officers might go as privates that I will forestall his objection by telling him that when I was of the age at which men do go as privates, I went to the front as a private in the service of my country. I am not of that age now and I could not go as a private nor as a lieutenant. If I volunteered I would not be accepted. But I did raise a very fine battalion in my district because of my personal appeals, and, if I do say it, because of what little prestige I have in that district.

Under ordinary circumstances I and my battalion might very well have gone to the front as a unit. It was our desire. Many a political enemy at home—because we have a few snipers there, although in the West they do not flourish—has caused it to be asked of me on the platform or elsewhere: "Are you going to the front yourself"?—the imputation being that I was doing a grandstand play. I answered them honestly and truthfully that it was my desire and my intention to go to the front. My battalion arrived in England with thirteen others in a convoy, a total of 14,000 troops, immediately after the terrible experience on the Somme. The Canadian Headquarters in London were confronted then with a demand for the immediate services of about 19,000 men to replace the casualties which had just occurred, and it was our fortune when we arrived in England, to be selected as some of those reinforcements which were immediately sent. I think all the battalions in that convoy except two were drafted for that purpose. My battalion sent 400 men to the trenches within two weeks of our arrival in England, 100 a week later, and since then they have been going continuously. Now then, which is the more glorious, which is the more to be commended in a commanding officer, that, being met with a demand there to send men into the fighting line and having recruited men for the fighting line, he should say: "I have brought these men to fight and they are at your service"; or that he should come to his political headquarters, if he has any political standing, and say: "Do not send these men to fight, but leave them with me for my honour and glory so that I may go forward as a commanding officer"? What would the hon. gentlemen have said if it had turned out that I was asked to send 500 men immediately to the trenches and I said: "Do not do that; what position do you put me in; if you send those, I cannot go?" And why could I not go? Because the regiment most calling for men at that time was one from my very own district, the 47th Westminster Battalion straight from the Somme, 400 shy, including in the ranks of officers twelve out of my own home regiment, including hundreds of men the every day associates of those whom I had brought over. What more natural than that my 400 should go to their own neighbours from Westminster, to their own officers of their old regiment? And why could not the Colonel go? Because —greatly to the disappointment, seemingly, of these gentlemen opposite—Colonel Winsby, of the 47th, had not been shot; Major Coote second in command, of the 47th, and Major in my regiment at home, had not been shot. They remained in command. Therefore, Colonel Taylor and Major Cunningham of the recently-arrived regiment were not able to go to the front. What would the hon. gentleman have? Am I to be condemned by him and those like him because I took a battalion to England? Am I to be condemned because, having sent my men into the firing line, I come back and take up my duties as a member of this House?

I will show to some of these gentlemen what their criticism of unemployed officers means in some cases. An instance arose in England in June of 1915. A number of senior officers became unpleasantly conscious of their great numbers in England. There were eighty majors, for instance, who said: "We dislike remaining here; we came over to go to the front; let us go forward as supernumerary lieutenants". And they went as supernumerary lieutenants. Now, the supernumerary lieutenant has almost less than no duties. He is the understudy of the lieutenant in charge of a platoon. He is not quite so useful as a sergeant in charge of any section, because the sergeant has been trained with the section from the beginning and is more accustomed to it than the supernumerary lieutenant can be. Not afraid of German bullets, and perhaps too conscious of the criticism such as is offered in this House to-night, these majors said: "Let us go over the parapet with the men". They went. Only twenty came back. Are we to cheer in this House because in that one stroke we wiped out sixty superfluous majors?

The hon. gentleman asks why these men are not sent home at once. The answer is so plain that I wonder that anyone should ask the question with a desire of obtaining knowledge. If asked with the idea that, being unanswered, it will make a point to the discredit of the soldiers of Canada, the question seems more intelligible. I would like to bear in upon the consciousness of some of these hon. gentlemen the fact that a senior military officer is not made in five minutes. And, as it takes a long time to make him, so it should take a correspondingly long time to arrive at the conclusion that he should be discarded and sent home. As the training proceeds in Canada, there are technical courses of all kinds to qualify the officers for the duties they are to exercise at the front. When we are asked

to send an officer to a school at Quebec, to a school at Ottawa, or Winnipeg, or Victoria, as I was asked from time to time to send mine, the accompanying note nearly always is: Send a senior officer, if possible. And properly so; because a senior officer should be qualified to lead in every branch of instruction. In the case of my battalion, nearly every senior officer had been the subject of a special course of training at some of these schools, to the exclusion of the junior officers, because the number was limited.

Sir SAM HUGHES: They attended several schools in some cases.

Mr. TAYLOR: Some of these officers had attended several schools, as the former Minister of Militia reminds me. Now, what would have been said of this Government if the moment these highly trained officers arrived in London they were told: "Since you cannot go forward with your battalion, you had better go straight home?" Then we should have had a political scandal.

As to unemployment in London, as to the presence of officers in hotels in London, I wonder where these hon. gentlemen get their information. During the two months I spent in the Old Country, I was in London, I suppose, five or six times. On every occasion when I was there I had been sent for by an officer of higher command in London for some specific business. My visits there, I suppose, were generally for two days at a time—business starting to-day and finishing to-morrow. As these hon. gentlemen see it, I was one of the officers, "crowding the hotels in London." I saw no officers there during my time who were not properly there. The majority of them were on leave from the front, the few weeks' leave that the officer gets after a great many months of service. The minority were of my class, officers who had come to England with the bona fide intention of going to the front, and who had not achieved their ambition. I do not think a large percentage of these officers were in what we would call an idle class, or that by their presence or their actions they constituted a reflection upon the Canadian military service. It seemed to me they were an exceptionally fine body of men. We are asked why they spent months there instead of coming home. I had an illustration. I will not mention names, because to do so would be like advertising that the officer to whom I refer had spent so many months idle. I found in a camp to which I went in England one of the very finest officers in British Columbia, a man, perhaps, fifteen or twenty years my junior, trained in every respect, who had brought over a battalion equal in merit to any battalion that had left our province, but a battalion that, like my own, was broken up on arrival there. That man had come across with no other idea than that of serving at the front. He had closed all his affairs in Canada. He was not even a member of Parliament, and could not have a member of Parliament's excuse—these hon. gentlemen seem to think it is an excuse—to come back to Canada. He waited for employment. He got employment the day I left England, that is, nine months after arrival there. He got the remnant of his own battalion, the remnant of my battalion, and the remnant of the 158th Battalion of Vancouver, to be under his command as the 1st British Columbia Training Battalion. And a fine training officer he is. Why should we criticise that officer for having been compelled to wait that time? These hon. gentlemen speak, in connection with this, as in connection with all other military subjects we have heard discussed in the House, as if they were the discoverers of something which, if they were the Government, would be done, but which is not done by this seemingly neglectful Administration.

We are told that the administration in London should grapple with the question of unemployment. These gentlemen opposite must know—because they have read it in their own press, paragraph after paragraph—that the subject is being grappled with. They know that about two months ago a board was appointed to examine in detail into the standing of every officer not in serious employment in England; that this board visited every Canadian camp in England, questioned all the officers, as well as men of other ranks, as to their capacity and as to whether they could profitably take up military service other than what they had gone to England to do. The men were then divided into three categories: those who could advantageously be sent to the front and be replaced in England by others returning from the front; those who could do nothing at the front or in England, but might with advantage be given permission to return to Canada—because you cannot return without permission—and those who could profitably continue to be employed in London or in other parts of England. The question was dealt with in the most serious manner at that time by a board of very competent officers, several of whom

had seen service at the front, some of whom had served with distinction there and, having come back to London, found themselves temporarily unemployed. If an abuse had crept in, they were instructed to see that that abuse was discontinued, and they were inspired with a desire that it should be discontinued. No doubt as a result of the report of that board, officers have returned, opportunity has been found to send officers to France, and every opportunity has been taken to substitute the services of returned soldiers for services that had been performed in the Old Country by Canadians who had not been to the front. When the officers are moved on under these circumstances, I do not think they should be pilloried as having been driven to do something that they were unwilling to do. I prefer to take the view that the officers who go there, do so in good faith, ready to lay themselves on the altar of their country and to make whatever sacrifices they may be called upon to make. Do these hon. gentlemen opposite realize for a moment that soldiering is not eight hours' work a day during six days of the week? Do they realize that there are a great many soldiers in England and in France who are not in the firing line; that there are a great many private soldiers who are unemployed in quite as wide a sense as these officers are unemployed, and that it is absolutely true that these men are serving their country efficiently and nobly? We have millions of soldiers in reserve in England and France who are not working every day, or six days a week, just the same as we have some idle officers. These soldiers are kept for the great drive which we all anticipate, and which only can change the condition from that of apparent stalemate now prevailing. Are they to be pilloried as men who are eating the bread of idleness in England? Is it fair to our soldiers who remain in Canada, having been trained here, that they should be pilloried, as is the custom to-day, not only occasionally in the House, but also in the party press? Are they not just as useful to us in reserve in Canada, waiting to go to England and France when they are sent for, as they would be if we got them out of our sight by sending them to England or to France? Are we improving the cause of the war by having nothing but criticism—small-souled, mean-spirited criticism, if I may use the expression—of those who try to serve the Empire, but who are not permitted to do so to the extent that they desire? It seems to me, as an officer who has had much experience in recruiting, that more harm has been done to the cause of recruiting in Canada by the statements made this session from the other side of the House and widely disseminated as they have been, for political purposes by the party press—the fountainheads of the poisoned political gas in this country—than by any possible combination of errors on the part of the Government.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have been very much interested in the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor). I do not wish to criticise them, except to say that his entire speech was absolutely spoiled by the bitter partisanship of his last few words.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

An hon. MEMBER: Shame.

Mr. GRAHAM: One would think, to hear him speak of poisoned gas, that we on this side had no interest in the war.

Mr. BEST: It seems to fit well.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend, who is always interrupting, may say what he likes, but this is too serious a matter to be allowed to pass. If we on this side, who have made as many sacrifices as my hon. friend has in this war—some of us have devoted as much time as he has to matters affecting the war—are not to be allowed to criticise simply because he does not like it, then this is not a free country, and the liberties that we pretend to be fighting for he purposes taking away from us.

Mr. BEST: I do not purpose taking away any liberties. You have just told us what you pretend to be fighting for in the House, and I agree with you.

Mr. MACDONALD: What are you fighting for?

Mr. GRAHAM: He is not fighting for anything. I really do not understand what my hon. friend means. I wish to point out that any criticism that we have made has not been such as was indicated by my hon. friend. He has said that the criticism has been made solely for party purposes. I want to tell him that there are men on this side of the House who have an interest in seeing that our share in the war is conducted in the best possible manner with regard not only to the safety of the Empire, but also to the safety of the men at the front. It is our purpose to criticise in order to bring about that result, and if my hon. friend considers that to be against the best

interest of the Allies, then he has not the judgment that I think he ought to have.

Mr. TAYLOR: What I said was that untrue statements disseminated from the House had injured the cause of recruiting.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend said that the criticism indulged in during this session had injured recruiting.

Mr. EDWARDS: So it has.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend thinks it has. He has been here all the time, and he does not know about the outside.

Mr. EDWARDS: Neither do you.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have delivered several recruiting speeches since the session opened. I say that just such speeches as my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) has made have done injury to the cause of recruiting. We want to work in harmony with the Government in everything that will conduce to the best interests of Canada and the Empire, and I leave it to the serious judgment of the men on the Government side who do things as to whether or not that is the case. But if we are to be scolded because we criticise and make suggestions, then I say, Sir, that what we pretend to be fighting for is a myth. The full liberty of the member to discuss is given to us by the constitution of this country, and the more acute the situation is the more it is right, and the more it is our duty, to criticise, if that criticism will conduce to the best interests of the cause we all have at heart. Now this attempt to create discord, I do not think is the proper thing. I was deeply interested in the remarks of my hon friend (Mr. Taylor). He is a man who can speak with some knowledge of the conditions and of the situation in which he found himself. I took more than ordinary interest in what he said, and I might tell him that I was more than interested; I felt that he had spoken from his heart as to the conditions. But, Sir, when he turns on us and insists that we are doing something injurious to the cause of the Empire, and gives us a lecture, intimating that we have not the cause of the Empire at heart, I want to tell him that he is altogether wrong, and that we on this side of the House have as much right to free speech, and are as much interested in the war, as hon gentlemen opposite. And when the history of this country comes to be written, it will be found that the criticism made by members on this side of the House has helped and not hindered the cause of the Empire.

Mr. EDWARDS: I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks made by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) and I would like to add one or two words. I did not understand nor do I think the members of this House understood that the member for New Westminster was charging against the Liberal members of this House or the Liberal party as a whole that they should not make any criticism whatever. He stated that in this House during this session there had been criticisms offered on this Government which were founded on untrue statement, and that those untrue statements, offered in the form of criticisms, were hurtful to recruiting. And in making that statement he said what every man in this House knows to be absolutely true. I want to ask my hon. friend if he thinks the statement made the other day by the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) that because of the retempering of the bolts of the Ross rifle hundreds of lives had been sacrificed at the front was in the interest of recruiting. It was pointed out to him that that retempering took place last year, and not one of those rifles was in the hands of those men. But that makes no difference to that gentleman; his statement has gone upon Hansard, it has been caught up by certain of the party press, and sent out to the country. Was he man enough then to get up on the floor and retract his statements and say he had made a mistake? We had another instance in the case of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Pardee), who pours out a tale of woe about a returned soldier in Windsor who came back to Canada, was allowed to pass through the country without any overcoat, who had frozen his hands and feet and all that sort of thing; and he wound up by saying that he had no doubt there were hundreds of cases just like this throughout the country. That goes through the country, it is picked up by the press and circulated. The proof in that case lies in the fact that members belonging to the Soldiers' Relief Committee in Windsor sent to the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Wilcox) a telegram, which was read here to-night at six o'clock, to the effect that the statement of the hon. member for Lambton, as published in the press, was absolutely false. When challenged with that to-night at six o'clock by the hon. member for North Essex, what did the hon. member for Lambton say? He said: I merely read what was in the press, what was stated in the newspaper, that is all that I did. That is

not all that he did, for he followed up that statement, without trying to ascertain whether it was authentic, by his statement that he did not doubt there were hundreds of cases like that. This is the kind of statements made by the hon. gentlemen opposite to which the hon. member for New Westminster referred when he said, and truly said, that statements are made on the floor of the House by hon. gentlemen opposite that are a hindrance to recruiting. Does the member for Renfrew (Mr. Graham) think that his presence on the platform at a political meeting in the city of Toronto, when a man by the name of Hartley Dewart went into details and disregarded facts in regard to the exportation of nickel, and was supported and endorsed by the presence of the hon. gentleman on the platform—does he think that attitude was a proper one and in the interest of recruiting? I for one do not think it was.

Mr. Speaker, this war has demonstrated this fact, that we have, over at the front, Canadians who never were known in the public life of this country before, who were considered small men if you like, hardly recognizable, but who have proved themselves to be big men in every sense of the word. It has also been demonstrated on the floor of this Parliament that we have men who have been in the public eye as representative men, holding seats in this Parliament, who have shown by their attitude and their words that they are small men—small men and very small. Talk about their conscience being affected by the Ross rifle and that sort of thing! The stain is not in the conscience of hon. gentlemen opposite; for I say to them: if you will look down to your finger tips you will find that the stain is produced by your attempt, for political purposes, to turn the bloody key in the door of office and to open the portals to yourselves.

Mr. MACDONALD: After this scolding which we have received from our friend, with the true Germanic spirit which prevents him from permitting any man in this free country to say anything in this Parliament or out of it, or to venture in any way to disagree with him, I wish to read some extracts from a letter which I have received from another Colonel; not my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor), but a colonel who left this country for the war in 1914 and has not come home yet. I read this just for the purpose of telling my hon. friend who has just sat down that there are some people in this country who do not

agree with him, and who do not agree with our colonel friend from New Westminster. The letter is of such a character that if I read it in full detail my hon. friend who has just sat down would at once proceed to scold me and to scold the colonel, because he would say the publication of such statements would prevent recruiting in this country. I shall read one or two extracts and leave it to this House, once we have got back to our normal frame of mind and after the lecture which the hon. member for New Westminster has given us, as to whether or not there is justification for hon. gentlemen on this side saying something about the conduct of the war. This letter came to me unsolicited; I had no communication with this gentleman in any way whatever. It came to me in the month of December, and among the expressions which he makes use of is the following:

> If the people of Canada knew what goes on here in the waste of public money, the creation of jobs for disgruntled politicians and wire pullers, it would make very interesting reading for the Canadian people.

Mr. TAYLOR: What is his name?

Mr. MACDONALD: I will give to the Minister of Militia, if he desires, the name of this colonel.

Sir SAM HUGHES: As one having the interest of the soldiers at heart, I respectfully submit that the hon. member should not give out the name of the officer. I have never heard of this case, but I do not like to see the name of an officer brought in.

Mr. MACDONALD: If it is bad form for this colonel over in England, who is not a political colonel, to write certain remarks of this kind, what is the form of the Colonel from New Westminster?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not think my hon. friend should give the officer away.

Mr. TAYLOR: The colonel from New Westminster is not anonymous or ashamed of what he said.

Mr. MACDONALD: This gentleman is not anonymous. If it comes to a question of pluck and achievement, the gentlemen of whom I am speaking will compare with the hon. member for New Westminster. He did not spend two months in England; he went over in 1914, and has not come home yet. He goes on:

> If the facts that exist here were known in Canada—but our mouths are closed as long as we wear uniforms.

Mr. TAYLOR: Where is that from, is it from France?

Mr. MACDONALD: No, it is written from a camp in England. If my hon. friend wants to suggest any question about this letter, I pledge my word as a member of this House that I will give the name of the writer to the Minister of Militia.

Mr. DAVIDSON: What is he doing in England?

Mr. MACDONALD: He is at work in England at the present time. He goes on further:

> The impression with many officers is that the young life's blood of Canada is exploited to glorify the Tory party, and I must admit that it seems to be true.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACDONALD: What further does the gentleman say:

> I do not know whether the censor will pass this or not. If he does not I hope he will pass it on to the Government for I am going to sign my name to it and dare any one to contradict anything written here.

I have stated what I am prepared to do in regard to the matter. I desire to say that if, as has been suggested by the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) that this colonel, who went over in August, 1914, and has not yet seen his home or family, is not permitted to express his opinion in regard to the conditions over there without being denounced by hon. gentlement opposite, my hon. friend from Westminster (Mr. Taylor) has no right to lecture the men who sit on this side of the House when there are in France the graves of three boys, sons of members, and when there are some twenty-five to thirty members on this side of the House whose boys are over there. We need no lectures from hon. gentlemen opposite on this question.

Mr. TAYLOR: But what your friend says is not true.

Mr. MACDONALD: I will put the word of the man who wrote this statement against the word of my hon. friend.

Mr. TAYLOR: It is not true.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Who is he?

Mr. MACDONALD: I have told my hon. friend from Annapolis what I will do with respect to the name. I merely rose for the purpose of showing that there are colonels on the other side who have something to say.

Mr. TAYLOR: I said that the statement is absolutely untrue.

Mr. MACDONALD: Here is the letter with the signature to it, and I am prepared to show it to the Prime Minister or to the Minister of Militia at any moment. These statements are made by a man who left here two and a half years ago, and there is no justification whatever for the suggestion that hon. members on this side of the House should not indulge in reasonable criticism. What criticism has ever been made in this House so keen as that made by the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes), who declared that if the conditions as he found them to exist at one time in England were permitted to continue under the administration of a new Minister of Militia, the forces would be reduced to a chaotic condition. Has there been anything more emphatic than that statement? Could any stronger criticism be made?

Sir SAM HUGHES: What I said had reference to the statement that political action had been taken on the other side during the last nine months or during whatever time that officer has been over there. What I meant to say was that under my administration, I challenge the face of clay to point to a single instance of political preferment.

Mr. MACDONALD: I shall be very glad to show this letter to my hon. friend. He knows this colonel.

Sir SAM HUGHES: If I was Minister of Militia I would refuse to look at a letter of that kind from an officer, because it immediately brings him under the law. That was my reason for suggesting that he should not divulge the name to the Prime Minister except in confidence.

Mr. MACDONALD: An officer who is a member of Parliament has a double advantage, and certain exemptions.

Sir SAM HUGHES: An officer is always permitted to criticise favourably, but he is not permitted to criticise adversely.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is the law of the country.

Mr. MACDONALD: This gentleman writes this letter expecting that it might not pass the censor. He makes the statement which I have read.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I made the suggestion for the protection of the officer.

Mr. MACDONALD: I have quoted from this letter for the purpose of showing that there are men on the other side of the Atlantic to-day who have gone from Canada, and who have certain opinions about

the administration of affairs there at the present time; and the opinion of a man in that position is to be regarded as of as much weight as the opinion of my hon. friend from Westminster. I do not think that in the debate that has taken place to-day, or in the attitude which the Opposition have adopted in regard to this measure there has been anything unfair. Recognizing as we all do that it is to be passed through this stage to-day, and that we are looking forward to adjournment, I say it is not reasonable and proper for hon. gentlemen to undertake to say that we on this side of the House have not the right to ask for information, or that we have not the right to call the attention of the House and of the country to facts that are within the knowledge of the House or to information that is given to us as members of Parliament representing the people.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who says that the hon. gentleman has no such right?

Mr. MACDONALD: We have had an intimation from my hon. friend from Westminster.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. TAYLOR: I rise to a question of privilege. I am being misquoted by the hon. member. My reference was solely to untrue and unfair criticism from the other side of the House.

Mr. GRAHAM: These are not the words you used, as you will see in Hansard.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend made a general statement in regard to criticism from this side of the House, and I appeal to the judgment of this committee whether in the discussions that have taken place we have not been entirely within our rights in asking for information, in discussing the merits of the Ross rifle, or in discussing the question of the reports of Dr. Bruce and Dr. Baptie.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Dr. Bruce is in Canada to-night.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am aware of that. I submit to this committee and to the House that we have a perfect right to criticise, and that we cannot be asked to abrogate our constitutional functions as representatives of the people in discussing these matters. We have had tremendous expenditures during the past two years. We have had the great question of recruiting, the question as to whether or not recruiting has been properly carried on, and the question as to whether or not the aim of the Prime Minister as to raising 500,000 men can be realized. What sense is there in declaring that in regard to matters like these silence should reign, and that no man shall criticise or make suggestion. It is for the maintenance forever of that right in this country that we are fighting against a system which would prevent that criticism, the system which prevails in Germany, a militarism that wants to dominate the world. Our criticism has been legitimate and proper, and it has been within our rights.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Let me note a specific instance. What does my hon. friend think of the statement made by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) to the effect that the Prime Minister had stated before the Ontario Recruiting League that it was his desire that there should be no more recruiting in Canada? What is his opinion as to that statement? Does he consider it fair criticism?

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend wants me to discuss a question of difference of opinion between the hon. member for Assiniboia and the Prime Minister.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A difference of opinion! Does the hon. gentleman agree with the hon. member for Assiniboia?

Mr. MACDONALD: Probably the end of that matter has not been heard of. I am not here to discuss details. That is a personal matter between the hon. member for Assiniboia and the Prime Minister.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all. The hon. member for Assiniboia does not claim to have been present at the meeting. The Prime Minister was there, and he specifically and emphatically denies the statement; but there has been no retraction by the hon. member for Assiniboia, and no one has come to his rescue.

Mr. MACDONALD: Let me suggest to the Solicitor General that possibly we have not heard the end of the matter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Give us the end of it now.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend from Assiniboia is not here. Were he here he would be perfectly able to take care of himself. I do not think the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) was fair to the Liberal party with regard to his address

yesterday. Everyone who knows that the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) knows that he is not a gentleman who assails this House with extreme utterances at any time, but on the altogether too rare occasions upon which he has addressed the House he has not done so offensively or in such a way as to entitle him to be regarded as in any way extreme. The right hon. the Prime Minister yesterday complimented my hon. friend from West Lambton on the manner in which he had brought the attention of the House and the country to the duty which we are called upon to perform in reference to our returned soldiers. That speech was not regarded by the right hon. Prime Minister as having been the result of any idea of imputing blame to the Government at all. Every hon. gentleman who heard the hon. member for West Lambton knows that his speech was not of a controversial character and was not intended to impute blame to the Government. He asked for the best possible good and with the best of intentions that both sides of this House should join in the appointment of a committee to take into their most careful and serious consideration this great problem in the interim between now and the resumption of the session. It is only fair to my hon. friend who is not here that I should make this statement in reference to him.

In regard to the whole question of this debate, I regret that at this stage there should be any manifestation of feeling in reference to it. The ex-Minister of Militia refers to the fact that Dr. Bruce is in Canada. I understand that Dr. Bruce has arrived in Canada and in order that we may bring the discussion of this question back to where we started this afternoon I would like to ask the Prime Minister, as I am informed Dr. Bruce is preparing to make some statement to the Canadian people with regard to the question of the examination which he has made into medical conditions on the other side, whether he will not endeavour to give us to-morrow, before the House adjourns, the reports made by Dr. Bruce and Dr. Baptie, if they are in his possession. I understand from the statement of the ex-Minister of Militia that the report of Dr. Bruce is in the department. Let us have it on the table of
11 p.m the House to-morrow so that in the consideration of this matter, if there is to be any statement made by Dr. Bruce the House and the country will be seized of the facts in regard to the whole question after seeing the reports of Dr. Bruce and Dr. Baptie.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am not going to take any part in any of the pros and cons. I have been in the House for twenty-seven sessions and I have to express my regret at the quarrelings and contentions, backwards and forwards, over a great question of this kind. It is quite unseemly. But, I always appreciate criticism and I think I have had as much nasty criticism as any gentleman present. Last spring the Globe came out with an editorial attacking the department for having 200 or 300 officers lying around England idle. A short time after the troops first went over we had no staff, and no officers attached to the staff. They were taken from the various regiments as they passed over. These officers, although acting as staff officers, had to appear on the roll of the regiments as colonels, majors and captains. They were taken from the regiments and they were not on the headquarters or the various divisional or brigade staffs. These officers, could not draw their pay and allowances for staff work because they were only attached to regiments. The paymaster General across the water mentioned that there were 200 or 230 odd officers attached to regiments who were not drawing pay and allowances and some clever editor, seeing it, thought there were 200 or more officers in England unattached. Then, writers up and down the country, of course to help the cause and not at all with the intention of injuring the Tory party or the Minister of Militia, but to help the cause and to make the boys over there feel more at home and the friends and mothers of the boys more comfortable here came out with column after column attacking the Department of Militia and Defence for having these 200 odd officers in England for whom there was nothing to do. But every officer was actively employed. Shortly after this occurred there came the Zillebeke affair in June. I had an application, through our staff, from the War Office for upwards of 200 officers and I had an application when I was in England to send over 400 officers to fill the places of the boys who had gone.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Six hundred altogether?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Nearly 600 altogether to go and fill the gaps. We did not have the officers there. I gave instructions that well-educated, intelligent, capable boys, sergeants, corporals and privates in the ranks should be promoted, and hundreds of these boys were promoted. I did not take the criticism seriously. I rather enjoyed it. I think I have told the story told by

Barnum the first time I saw him when I was a boy. He said: I spend $75,000 a year to have the show condemned, and I spend $750,000 to have the show advertised. I get ten times as much value out of the $75,000 that I spend to have the show condemned as I do out of the $750,000 that I spend to have the show advertised. Everybody copies the condemnation and nobody believes it, but the advertisement is all the greater. I have learned to proceed upon that line. There has been a great deal of criticism, but it does not affect me.

Now, I want to say a word about getting the battalions across the sea. I am going to make this statement that in all the recruiting that has ever been carried on in civilized warfare, or any other kind of warfare, none has equalled that which has been carried on in Canada. We sent the officers who recruited these battalions over with them. There was some criticism, but I paid no attention to it. I felt that people, such for instance as my friend Taylor here, who had raised regiments, were entitled to take their regiments across, and serve a few weeks at all events with their regiments. Then we gave them what we called a Cook's tour to the front, where they would get a little experience and a great deal of information, so that they might be able to come back home and give Canada the benefit of the experience and information which they had acquired. I took that view, and it has been proved to be the practical and proper view of the matter, and it has been carried out. There is no doubt that there are a number of these fellows who are good fellows, the very best in the world, whose whole hearts are in the cause, like my friend Taylor here, who went to work and did their best, although they knew that their chances of getting to the front were more or less hazy. But they wanted to go. One member of this House, Col. Arthurs—I read the most touching letter I have seen for many a day—is in the trenches. He had reduced his rank and gone over in spite of his son's remonstrance from the trenches ordering his dad to get out. These officers went over in command. They knew that the chances were that a great majority of their battalions would have to be broken up for draft purposes. But, there is nothing wrong in having these officers overseas. It was due to their efforts that many of these regiments were recruited. Colonel Taylor, for instance, was the most powerful recruiting agent one could have in his district. I think these men were entitled to a trip over and a little visit there; it does not cost a great deal, and they are doing something useful. When they return to their homes, they will have acquired further experience, and they will be able to do even better work in the way of recruiting in Canada. Before I left England I gave directions for the organization of a committee. I demanded a report of every officer employed in England at that time. The report was not completed when I came away, and the instructions were to classify the officers, as my hon. friend has stated, into three classes and then to select those who were suitable for a command, and if possible, to give them an opportunity.

I want to say another word about the Fifth Division and the boys at the front. I am satisfied—and I do not want to go further than to express my own views—that we can have a Fifth Division and, if necessary, a Sixth and a Seventh and an Eighth Division at the front, from the men whom we now have across the water. That proposition I put in black and white to Sir Douglas Haig, Sir William Robertson and Mr. Lloyd George, now Prime Minister. My purpose was to have as many as possible of those men trained, and we have heard here to-night how men were taken over to France the second week they were in England, with no more experience than that, and put right into the trenches. I can tell of men who, within a week after their arrival in England, were sent over to France, and who the first morning after they arrived in France, were wounded and some of them killed, so that there is nothing in the story about the necessity of Canadian soldiers being kept in England for training purposes. They learn more in a week in the trenches than they do in a month in England or in Canada. My proposition was to put as many divisions at the front as we possibly could, to have a certain frontage and to take care of that and no more. Our casualties would be no greater if we had six divisions than if we had four divisions, because we would have only a certain length of front, and the men I am satisfied would be more healthy in France than they are in England. In that way we would have six divisions trained ready for action in the great drive which is coming on at an early date, whereas now we shall have only four divisions trained for it. There should be two Canadian Army Corps at the front, one which I would like to see under the command of General Turner and the other under the command of General Currie. I should imagine that

General Turner is sick of his job in London and that he would be glad to get back to the music of the guns. If General Byng has to be disposed of, he should be made an officer commanding an army because the Canadian boys like him. I do not wish to bring up anything controversial; but the whole matter is very easy: We have plenty of men across the water, and the few that are in England can very well get on without General Turner.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (South Cape Breton): Mr. Chairman, I do not arise for the purpose of criticising the Militia Department of this country. I could, of course, under my privilege as a member of the House of Commons criticise the department, but I am not entitled to criticise it outside, and I am not going to say anything in this House which I am not permitted to say on the hustings of this country.

Sir SAM HUGHES: If my hon. friend will permit me, he is all wrong. If he will read the address I gave to this House in the year 1901 in the Hutton matter, he will see the law laid down there on the subject. He can from his seat here to-night, or on the street to-morrow, if the House is in session, tell the Prime Minister, or the Minister of Militia, or the ex-Minister of Militia exactly what he thinks of them, positively or negatively, and no man can lay a finger on him under the law. Admiral Napier left the fleet in front of Kronstadt and came back to the House of Commons and pounded the life out of the Admiralty.

Mr. CARROLL: What the ex-minister has stated was what I was trying to point out. Perhaps I did not make myself quite clear, that I was allowed as a member of this House to criticise the military authorities and, indeed, any person, even the King; but when the House is not in session, I am not allowed to do it outside, and I do not purpose saying anything in this House or outside while the House is in session that I am not permitted to say outside while the House is not in session.

I am sorry I was not in the House yesterday when the matter of looking after returned soldiers was under discussion. Last evening I received from a personal friend of mine in the city of Sydney, who by the way is a very strong party man and who happens to be a Conservative, a letter regarding the matter of looking after our returned soldiers and also giving some strictures regarding the appointment of censors around the Marconi stations. He takes the ground that a great many of our men, who should be at the front to-day or who should be training for service at the front, were given positions as decoders or censors at those stations at the beginning of the war, and that they should be relieved to-day and their positions given to returned soldiers. We have in the island of Cape Breton a considerable number of returned soldiers who would make excellent decoders and censors. It strikes me that in the matter of appointing decoders and censors, the Government undertook to appoint men who in some cases had private incomes, who in many other cases had large wages and who are receiving the same large wages to-day. The names that I have in my hand are all those of censors; my friend does not mention the decoders at all. I wish it to be understood that I am saying nothing against any of these men or their capacities as censors; I have no doubt that the censors are good censors and that the decoders are good decoders. Mr. D. S. Hooper of Louisburg is assistant censor and at the present time is receiving $5 per day. He is Superintendent of Government Telegraph at a salary of $600 per year with horse-hire, and he is also local manager of the Maritime Telegraph and Telephone Company at a salary of $500 per year.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: When was he appointed?

Mr. CARROLL: He was appointed at least two years ago. I know a gentleman in the town of Glace Bay, a man who went over with either the Pioneers or the Tunnellers, Mr. Dan McDougall—and he is not a political friend of mine—

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is that old Dan?

Mr. CARROLL: Yes, old Dan McDougall. He was returned some time ago as being medically unfit. He is a man of considerable education.

Sir SAM HUGHES: He was concerned in the strike?

Mr. CARROLL: He was the leader of the United Mine Workers' strike?

Sir SAM HUGHES: He is a very good fellow.

Mr. CARROLL: A good man. I am mentioning his name because I know him personally. He is a man of education, if not a man of means. I think in justice to Mr. McDougall it would be well for whoever

has charge of the Censorship Branch that this matter should be looked into. When Mr. McDougall came back from the front, medically unfit for service, he could not get anything to do, and he had to go into the mines to work, although that is rather strenuous work for a person who is medically unfit for military service.

Then there is another man, Mr. W. T. Hayden, who is assistant censor at $4 per day. He is also private secretary to Mr. J. C. Douglas who has the patronage of Cape Breton county so far as military matters are concerned and who is a member of the legislature.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is Mr. Douglas a Tory?

Mr. CARROLL: Yes. Then there is Mr. Charles Macdonald who my informant states is decoding clerk at a salary of $3.25 per day, but I think as a matter of fact the salary for decoding clerks is $2.50. Mr. Macdonald is law clerk with Mr. J. C. Douglas. Then there is Mr. E. L. Gilpin of North Sydney who is censor at the cable office at a salary of $7 per day. He is also property agent of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company at a salary of $3,000 per year, and secretary of the Steel Workers' Benefit Fund at a salary of $1,200 per year. I think we have some returned officers, who, having been wounded at the front, have been sent back as medically unfit, who would be well suited for a position of that kind. Not that Mr. Gilpin is not able to fill the position, but because he seems to be a man moderately well off, judging from the salary he gets. Another gentleman to whom I would refer is Mr. E. C. Burke, a very fine, estimable gentleman. He is assistant censor in the cable office at five dollars a day. He is also employed with the Dominion Iron and Steel Company at a salary of $1,800 a year. Then we come to Mr. B. Archibald, of North Sydney, who is assistant censor at the cable office at five dollars a day. He is also stipendiary magistrate of the town of North Sydney and carries on a legal business in that town. The gentleman who sends me the information says that he is a man of independent means. If he said he was wealthy I think he would be nearer the mark. Though Mr. Archibald is one of the first gentlemen in our country, yet if he were relieved of that job and some returned soldier who had the capacity to do this work were given the position I think it would be an advantage.

There are a few grievances under which I think the soldiers at the front are suffering at this time, and I intend to ask the Minister of Militia the privilege of writing to him a letter to tell him in my own humble way of the things that I think should be remedied. It is not my intention to criticise, as I have said. In any case, the Government might not be the subject of criticism, as it might be that officers in England are responsible for the grievances. If the Minister of Militia will give me the privilege, I will bring these matters to his attention in a letter; or, if he would prefer it, I will see him in his office, and in an interview discuss them with him.

That is all I have to say. I think that the Government should take into consideration this matter of the censorship, not only in the places to which I have referred, but generally, because I think the same conditions hold elsewhere. Where men are able to earn a living otherwise, yet are given large salaries as most of these men are, they should be relieved of these positions and the positions given to returned soldiers, who are capable of filling them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The matter of the censorship drawn to the attention of the House by the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll) is one that involves not one department, but three, I think. It involves chiefly the Department of Militia and Defence, but also the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the Post Office Department. With the view to making such a survey as the hon. member for South Cape Breton asks for, I undertook some three months ago, at the request of the Government, to look over the entire censorship service. At that time I obtained a report on each censor and assistant censor, as well as each decoder. I also obtained reports as to the advisability of eliminating some positions in the service, reducing salaries, and otherwise cutting down expenses. The result was a very considerable saving. It is evident from what the hon. member for North Cape Breton has said that the salaries paid now are substantially less than they were at the opening of the war. Of course, at first it was expected that the war would not last long; and, as men of superior capacity were needed, and as they were required—as I understood it then, and as I still understand it—to give up their ordinary avocations and devote themselves to this work, good salaries had to be paid. But, as the service was lasting beyond what had been antici-

pated, it was thought not unfair to ask these officers to accept lower pay. Some services were eliminated as the result of the fact that the necessity for them that originally existed no longer obtained. It was desired to know how far, in reducing the staff, we could have regard to the fact that some of the men employed might possibly be eligible for military service, and a report with this in view was obtained on every man. And I must say that, judging from the report which came to the department, the number remaining who are eligible for military service is a very small one, and where the men are so eligible, it has been considered impossible to dismiss them for the reason that there was not available any one capable of filling that particular office. I admit the principle laid down by the hon. member for South Cape Breton, that preference should be given to a returned soldier in every service. I do not know that this would be of so much value in the work of the censorship as in more permanent offices in the Civil Service. The appointee to a censorship holds office only until the end of the war. It is not a very great reward to give a returned soldier, but if he wants it, he should have the preference,—and will be given it if the matter is brought to my attention. Of course, we have to maintain the standard of the service; we cannot allow that to go down.

Mr. CARROL: There is nothing very technical about this business. The men who are now in office went in knowing nothing about the censorship, and depending simply upon their instructions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say there was anything technical about it, but that it takes a degree of intelligence above the ordinary, as well as education and maturity of judgment more than can be secured for very small remuneration. But, while the standard of service must be maintained, yet, subject to that, the returned soldier must get the preference. I shall be glad to review what the hon. gentleman has said, and to make a specific investigation in every case.

Bill reported.

QUEBEC HARBOUR LOAN.

Bill No. 25, to provide for further advances to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners was on motion of Hon. J. D. Hazen read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

On section 2—$1,500,000 may be advanced to Harbour Commission for terminal facilities:

Mr. NESBITT: Why does the minister allow the commissioners to repay the interest out of the money that he is advancing?

Mr. HAZEN: That is always done in connection with these works during the period of construction. No new principle is involved.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I see by the paper this evening that the chairman of the Quebec Harbour Commission, Mr. L'Esperance, states that in connection with the improvements in the harbour at Quebec the Government intend to spend $700,000 this year on the river St. Charles works. Is that a fact?

Mr. HAZEN: The harbour commissioners have nothing to do with the works at the St. Charles river.

Mr. LEMIEUX: But he speaks of these works in the St. Charles river as included in the harbour of Quebec.

Mr. HAZEN: That is a matter that comes within the jurisdiction of the Public Works Department.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—interest on debentures during construction of works to be charged to capital account:

Mr. LEMIEUX: Can the minister give a statement of the indebtedness of the Quebec Harbour Commission?

Mr. HAZEN: Between the years 1886 and 1892 there was advanced by the Government on harbour debentures the sum of $3,612,802.42. There was advanced by the Government without security, $584,773.26. The old Harbour Commissioners borrowed from the public $1,150,000, making a total of $5,347,575.68 that had been borrowed by the Harbour Commissioners up to the time this new work was started in 1913.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The interest charges on debentures taken up by the public are paid out of the advance made by the Government?

Mr. HAZEN: They are paid out of the revenues of the harbour, but the interest on the $1,150,000 which in those days was loaned by the public, has a prior claim to the interest on the money advanced by the Government since 1913. The people who loaned that money to the old commissioners

are protected by a clause making that interest a prior charge.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Civil government—Department of Finance and Treasury Board—$600.

Mr. GRAHAM: One of the effects of the war has been to cause people to open their hearts and sympathies not only to those engaged in the war, but to all other needy people. Never in the history of Canada have the poor been so well looked after as they have been since the war began; the greater the burden imposed upon the people, the greater the burden they seem able and willing to bear. We are taking a new outlook: viewing things from a different angle. I want to bring to the attention of the Minister of Finance a case which, I think, deserves his consideration. Probably no legal right is involved, but when we are gladly preparing to look after those who are injured in the cause of Canada and the Empire, I think we may, without creating a precedent and without doing anything but honour to ourselves, consider a case of this kind. I refer to the case of Colin C. McNab, now a resident of Braeside, who was engaged by the Canadian Pacific Railway as a telegraph operator during the Northwest Rebellion. According to the information given to me by him, he was placed by the company in charge of officers of the militia. His pay came indirectly from the Government. He worked day and night for months during many long weary hours in the Northwest, and as a result of disease contracted in that employment he lost his eyesight and has since been blind. He has been groping his way through life, not an object of charity—he does not wish to be that—but he does think, and I think with him, that the people of Canada might well, through their Government, place an amount in the Estimates which would in a measure assist him in bearing the affliction that has come upon him on account of his work for the benefit of Canada during the Northwest rebellion. I know that this case has been brought before the Militia Department under the late Government as well as this Government, and the ground has been taken that there is no legal claim, as he was not really an employee of the Militia Department, though in substance he contends he was. I admit that at once. If anything is to be given, it must come under the heading of what we call a compassionate allowance, and not through any right. I know that last year the minister took the ground that it might establish a precedent. I do not think it would establish any precedent, but I would go so far as to say that if any other case arose that was on all fours with this case, I would grant gladly and support a compassionate allowance. He did this work, he became subject to this life-long affliction, the terrible one of blindness, at a time when men in employment such as his had no opportunity of being surrounded with such safeguards as they have now; there were no Workmen's Compensation Acts of which a man could take advantage in order that he might be protected if injured. He did his duty, and, taking the hours he worked day and night, he did not receive as much pay as an ordinary soldier does at the present time. I am pleading his case not on any legal ground, I am not suggesting that he has a legal claim, but as one which might be properly expressed in the words compassionate allowance. I believe that no precedent would be established by giving him a small amount, and I plead with the Government to place in the Supplementary Estimates for next year an amount which they think fair and proper in order that this man may be helped through the balance of his life to enjoy himself as much as possible with this great affliction. I asked him to put a statement fairly from his own standpoint, and this is what he has given me:

I was turned over to the Militia Department at Ottawa with instructions to report to Colonel Jackson. My wages, transportation, and expenses were paid by the Militia Department until I returned to Ottawa. I received orders from Colonel Jackson to report to Colonel Forrest at Qu'Appelle. I was under that gentleman's orders until the rebellion was suppressed. If it will be necessary to take it up in the House, the thing should be considered.

First, I worked day and night to assist the expedition, and when you consider overtime I did not receive as much as a private soldier to-day.

Second, I lost my eyesight through exposure in connection with the Northwest rebellion. That has been proven by certificates furnished by Dr. Edwards, Government officer, Qu'Appelle, and Dr. Horsey, Ottawa.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How old is he?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know, but I should think that he is forty-five or fifty years old.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This case has been before me for consideration. I understand that it was brought before the Militia Department during the period of the late Government, and also since the present Government assumed office. There seems no doubt that under the regulations of the Militia Department this unfortunate man would not be entitled to a pension. As my hon. friend has said, there is no legal claim. He was not a member of the militia force; he was not, so far as the facts are in my information paid by the Government; he was in private employ. He was a telegrapher in the employ of the Canadian Pacific Railway at the time of the Northwest rebellion. I believe that even if he had been a member of the militia he would not be legally entitled to a pension because of the period which has elapsed.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is not his fault.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There is, of course, good reason for the rule which debars a man after a certain time because there is uncertainty in relating his affliction to his service at so remote a date; there is always an element of uncertainty in those cases which are brought forward after a lapse of years. So that on legal grounds or under the regulations of the Militia Department he clearly would not be entitled to consideration for pension. My hon. friend recognizes that, and puts forward the case as one for compassionate allowance on the part of the Government. In admitting a case of that kind we must have regard to principle and to precedent, which must necessarily be established. My difficulty in regard to this case has not been one of lack of sympathy for him, because I think it is a hard case. This man is heavily afflicted, being blind, and our sympathies naturally go out to him. But when we consider putting him upon the pension list of the Dominion, we have to proceed in accordance with some principle, otherwise we should establish a precedent which would be embarrassing to ourselves and to succeeding Governments in matters of this kind. If the man was in private employ, I cannot see on what principle we can place him upon the list of those to whom the Government has granted pensions on the ground of compassionate allowance. One naturally considers just what the adoption of that principle would lead to. We take the case of a man who is engaged by a railway company as an engineer or brakeman or other employee in connection with the bringing up of supplies for an army in time of war. Supposing that he was injured; could you rightly differentiate his case from the case of this unfortunate man? Take the case even of an operative who is injured to-day in a munitions factory. He is in private employ, but nevertheless he is doing work indirectly or even directly connected with the carrying on of the war. My hon. friend will realize the questions that might arise from the establishment of a precedent of this character. My hon. friend has stated that he has been informed that this man was sent out to the Northwest by the Militia Department and paid by the Militia Department. If that is so, that has not been brought to my attention. If my hon. friend can establish that I will be glad to look into the case again, although I shall not commit myself and cannot, of course, commit the Government to any course of action.

That is a new statement, so far as I am concerned. My hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) and Dr. Maloney have brought this case to my attention, and so far I have been unable to see on what principle I could admit this man, although, so far as my own sympathies are concerned, I would like to do so. I am afraid, however, that a precedent might be established that would be quite unsound, and that would commit this and succeeding Governments to similar action on what might possibly be a large scale.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will try to get the information.

Civil Government—Department of Finance and Treasury Board. To provide for increased salary of J. C. Saunders, Assistant Deputy Minister—$300.

Mr. MARTIN (St. Mary's, Montreal): What is the salary of the assistant deputy minister?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The salary of the Assistant Deputy Minister of Finance is $4,500. My hon. friend knows that Mr. H. T. Ross, who was a very valuable member of the staff of the Finance Department, and who acted most acceptably as deputy minister for many years, resigned in order to take a much more lucrative position with the Canadian Bankers' Association. I filled the vacancy by promoting Mr. Saunders, who has been the Dominion bookkeeper for many years, a very capable official.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And deserving of promotion.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I adopted the principle of promotion, and Mr. Saunders occupies the position which a couple of months ago was occupied by a Mr. Ross.

Mr. MARTIN: What is the salary of the secretary?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My private secretary, Mr. Veitz, has gone to the front. He left the service of the department last spring. I took a young man on in his place, and he is now acting as my secretary. For some months he acted as assistant secretary, and the salary which he was getting was, I think, something like $1,300. I took him on as my secretary, and he becomes entitled to the secretarial allowance of $600, that is $300 for the period of six months ending 31st March of this year.

Mr. MARTIN: I am not against the increase of salaries, but if the minister finds it necessary to make an increase of $500 in the case of his deputy minister, and increases the salary of his secretary from $1,300 to $1,600, I would ask if it would not be possible for him to put an item in the estimates increasing the salaries of the letter carriers, not only in Montreal, but all over Canada. He knows very well that the cost of living has increased, and that those letter carriers get a salary of $900 a year. There is no better class of employees in the Government service. They work 365 days in the year, working on New Year's Day and on Christmas Day. I think that these men are deserving of an increase because the cost of living to-day is so high, being more than 100 per cent in different articles than it was before. The man who is getting $900 a year to-day is really not getting more than $450. If the big salaries have to be increased the small ones ought to be increased also, and those who are getting $750, $800 and $900 should receive the consideration of the Minister of Finance. I am not speaking only for the letter carriers of Montreal, but for all the letter carriers in Canada. Their wage is a small one, and it should be increased at this time. They have asked the Government to do so, but have received no answer yet.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The matter to which my hon. friend refers comes more particularly under the jurisdiction of the Postmaster General, whom I have not consulted in respect to it. There is nothing further that I can add to-night. The representations that have been made by the hon. member will no doubt receive the best consideration of the Postmaster General.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

Mr. LEMIEUX: I see an item in connection with the Postmaster General's Department, providing an increase in the salary of Mr. Robert Fowler, Assistant Deputy Postmaster General. I know Mr. Fowler. He is a very good official, but I did not know that he was Assistant Deputy Postmaster General. When I was in charge of the department the Assistant Deputy Postmaster General was Major Verret, who is at the front. He left with the First Contingent, and is now serving in France. I would be very sorry indeed to hear that during his service at the front for his country he had lost his position. I hope it is not the case, and that some explanation will be given by the head of the department. Outside of that, I know that Mr. Fowler is a very deserving official, but I am surprised to find that he is the Assistant Deputy Postmaster General.

Mr. REID: The hon. member knows that Mr. Verret is at the front, and while he is away there has to be an Assistant Deputy Postmaster General.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He is only acting then?

Mr. REID: He may be acting, but even as acting assistant deputy he is entitled to the increase in salary. The fact that it has been done in this way does not imply that Mr. Verret has been removed from his position. I know that that is not the case.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I hope not.

Mr. REID: Mr. Fowler is there while Mr. Verret is away.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As the vote is worded it would mean that there are two Assistant Deputy Postmaster Generals.

Mr. REID: There is only one acting now.

Mr. GRAHAM: There are two ministers of Militia, and we get it all the way through.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I think the item ought be changed and that it should read "Acting Assistant Deputy Postmaster General". I do not think it is possible that the Government can have created another Assistant Deputy Postmaster General.

Mr. REID: I think it is all right.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The item as it appears in the Estimates is precisely as it came from the department. I do not think for one moment that any change has been made in the status of Major Verret. Whether Mr. Fowler is Assistant Deputy Postmaster

General or not, I am not prepared to say, but I shall draw the attention of the Postmaster General to the matter. I do not believe that this item would make him Assistant Deputy Postmaster General if he was not. I am sorry that the Postmaster General is not here, as I am not in a position to give my hon. friend any information.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I will not insist, but if Mr. Fowler is only acting assistant deputy I think the wording of the item should be changed.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I should like to support the remarks of the hon. member for St. Mary's (Mr. Martin) in respect to some extra allowance being given to postal carriers in some of the cities at least, if not in all I think it is a case deserving the consideration of the Government. I understand that the matter has been placed before them by the Postal Carriers' Association and that possibly it will receive the favourable consideration of the Government. Therefore, I merely wish to concur in the suggestion of the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's (Mr. Martin) that something ought to be done for them either in the way of an increase in salary or a bonus or something of that nature. The Minister of Finance made a remark in answer to the statement made by my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) in which he asked for a compassionate allowance for a certain person in the province of Ontario. On page 5 of the Estimates I find:

Allowance to Emile Carrier for injuries which resulted in the loss of an eye. . . $600.

This in the nature of a compassionate allowance. The Minister of Finance suggested a moment ago that these votes should be based upon some principle. I brought to the attention of the Department of Railways and Canals the case of a young man in Halifax who was in the employ of that department. About a year ago a fire occurred in a shed upon one of the piers of the Intercolonial railway. This employee was at his home and had retired for the night when he was called out by his chief at the freight shed to fight the fire. While so engaged he lost his life. The matter has been brought to the attention of the Prime Minister, and the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Department of Railways and Canals was kind enough to advise me the other day that this young man was being allowed $500. Here is the case where a young man is taken from his home after his working hours, is engaged in protecting the property of the Government, and loses his life and it is proposed to vote a compassionate allowance of $500. On the other hand, here is a case where $600 is proposed to be voted to a man for the loss of an eye. I am not objecting to it, but it does seem to me there is a variance in the application of the principle as between these two cases. I hope the day will soon come when we can take care of the employees of governments in a more scientific fashion than we are doing to-day. In almost all of the provinces we have the Workmen's Compensation Act but it cannot provide for the employees of the Government and I hope we may establish some protection in the nature of the Workmen's Compensation Act for the employees of the Government who may meet with accidents. I refer to the matter to show that there is a very material distinction made between these two cases and I trust that the Minister of Railways and Canals will remember my observations to-night and look into the case further.

Mr. McKENZIE: Did the young man leave any dependents?

Mr. MACLEAN: He did not leave any dependents except that he was a substantial contributor to the upkeep of his home and parents.

Mr. LEMIEUX: This afternoon I made an inquiry of the right hon. the Prime Minister to know whether a postmaster at Montreal has been appointed. I see there are three vacancies in the higher outside Civil Service at Montreal—the collector of the port of Montreal and the postmaster of Montreal and the inspector of weights and measures. The three most important offices in the outside Civil Service are now vacant in Montreal. Whilst it is none of my business to recommend to the Government who ought to be appointed, I may be allowed to say a word or two about what public opinion considers to be the proper disposition of these offices. First of all, I wish to say that the post office lost an excellent official in the death of the late Mr. Bergeron. He was a kindly and courteous gentleman, he was in his office every day, the public had access to him, and really, he is lamented by the whole population of Montreal. We all know his geniality and his great courtesy towards the public and he will be hard to replace. Yet, if the Government would accept my recommendation, I would say first of all proceed by way of promotion. There are excellent officers in the office in Montreal. For instance, there

is Mr. Gaboury, who started at almost the lowest rung of the ladder and who now holds the office of post office inspector for the eastern section of Canada, a district extending from Montreal to Halifax. I am quite sure that his appointment would be very popular with the business men of Montreal. There is also in the post office Mr. Barcelo, who is very active, and who has taken a great interest in his work since he has been appointed. Of course, if the Government will go outside, there are some very excellent names. There is my friend Mr. Robillard, editor of La Patrie, who is a good fellow, who served his country in the Northwest rebellion, who has been in journalism for thirty years, who is, in fact, one of the deans of the press in Montreal and who is certainly entitled to some recognition at the hands of his political friends. Then, there is Mr. H. A. Cholette, K.C., a fighter of the old days who would, I am sure, be an excellent postmaster of Montreal. I have a certain sympathy with him because he belongs to the same profession as I do and if the Government appoint him I think it will be a very popular appointment.

Mr. REID: Appoint them all.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There are many more. I understand that my hon. friend for Montcalm (Mr. Lafortune) has some recommendations to make also.

Mr. KEMP: Have you a preference for any of these that you have named?

Mr. LEMIEUX: No, any of them would satisfy me; any one of them would make an excellent postmaster and would be an ornament to the office. As regards the Customs, I think the Government and the country have sustained a real loss in the resignation of Mr. White who was for many years the member for Cardwell in the House of Commons. For twenty-one years he has been collector of the largest port in Canada and everybody agrees that he has fulfilled his duties to the satisfaction of the minister, of the Government, and of the public in general. There again the Government can proceed by way of promotion. The name of Mr. McLaughlin, one of the chief officials at the port of Montreal, has been mentioned and I think the name will be well received by the business community. As regards the inspector of weights and measures, as some names have been mentioned from among members of the House of Commons, I shall make no comment here. But if one hon. member whose name has been mentioned gets the appointment, I will give him my blessing and say to the Government that they have made a good appointment.

12 Midnight.

Mr. D. A. LAFORTUNE (Montcalm) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I have only a word or two to say. I fully concur in what has just been stated by the honourable member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) as regards the late Mr. Bergeron. He was really a man of worth and of many parts, a faithful officer, a painstaking and most efficient official. I was well acquainted with him and, while he was not on my side of politics I always found him to be a loyal opponent.

As just stated by the honourable member for Rouville, there is at present on the post office staff a first rate official in the person of Mr. Gaboury, post office inspector at Montreal, who deserves recognition for his services. I think he was a political opponent, but, to my mind, in connection with such an appointment, integrity, honesty, character should be more particularly sought for in the appointee. Mr. Gaboury would undoubtedly fill the position most creditably; but there is another gentleman whom I would recommend to this Government and who is already on the staff of the post office. He is an old-time friend of mine, an opponent, a Conservative of years bygone, who was the party's standard bearer in the county of Montcalm. For many years he occupied a seat in the House; a well-to-do farmer, who lost whatever money he had, and whose circumstances were straitened through the sacrifices he was called upon to make to uphold the policy of the friends of this Administration. He is a straightforward and honest man, a most faithful and devoted employee, and I would be happy were he to be appointed postmaster. I refer to Mr. Octave Magnan, former member for Montcalm, who has expended his private means in forwarding the fortunes of his party and of his friends. He was appointed to a position in the post office, here he surely does not hold the place due him. I recommend him most earnestly to the consideration of his friends so that the electors of Montcalm may rejoice at hearing that their former representative is appointed postmaster of Montreal. It would be a great act of justice, and a day of rejoicing for the people whom I have the honour to represent in this House.

I trust that the honourable the minister will take in good part the remarks which have just fallen from the lips of the representative of Montcalm, and that they will be of some benefit to his former opponent. I had him as a rival candidate, but I am proud to say to his friends that he was a most trustworthy opponent, a man who showed unfailing courtesy in the discussion of public concerns. When he was appointed to the position he now occupied, I helped materially by recommending him to the former Postmaster General, Mr. Casgrain.

As regards Mr. Cholette, a lawyer of Montreal, to whom reference was made by the honourable member for Rouville, he is a good man who has worked hard in the interest of his party. In no way self-seeking, his sole object has been to help on his political friends; he has been constantly in the fray; he was even a candidate two or three times in the Magdalen islands. He has a large family to support, and is by no means a wealthy man. He is a lawyer of note, and I would be glad to see him appointed to such a position.

There are in the ranks of the Conservative party many others whose claims are entitled to consideration. I may mention in passing the name of Mr. Emile Léonard, barrister. When still a very young man he represented here the county of Laval. He has ever been faithful to his party. Uninterruptedly on the firing line, he never swerved from the stand that he was a faithful supporter of the Conservative party. Should the Government's choice fall on him, I would be very glad of it. But in closing I say to the honourable the minister: Do not forget my old friend Magnan, whom I recommend to you, most urgently, considering how hard he worked for his party. Being to-day the representative of the constituency he used to represent, I deem it my duty to recommend him most earnestly to the consideration of the Government.

Mr. GRAHAM: This money has all been expended; it is not for expenditure in the future?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Or that will be expended before the 31st of March.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is for this year; it is not for next year?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: For this year.

Mr. GRAHAM: I find that nearly all of it is for the operation of the Government railways.

Mr. REID: That is right.

Mr. GRAHAM: That means, it is money that will be returned to the Treasury, but that has to be voted.

Reverting again to my suggestion to the Minister of Finance, I take it for granted that he has not shut the door more tightly in regard to the McNab case and that he is going to give it some consideration during recess, and that I am going to receive some information from him on this subject.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I shall be only too glad to take into consideration anything that my hon. friend may submit.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have no letter carriers in my constituency, but I am pleased to support the suggestion made by the hon. member of St. Mary's, Montreal (Mr. Martin) in that connection. There was a petition circulated on behalf of the letter carriers and they sent their representatives around in various counties. One of them was sent to me from a branch of the association in the city of Sydney, and I replied saying that if the matter came up in the House of Commons I would give it my sympathetic support. As has already been pointed out, the pay of these men was fixed some years ago when the cost of living was about half what it is to-day. These men have been in the business for quite a while, and as it is not so easy for a man to get away from a position in which he has established himself, I think that, having regard to the fact that the cost of living for these men and their families has more than doubled, they deserve the consideration of the Government as to whether or not some further remuneration should be given to them.

Mr. LEMIEUX: May I ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance if any decision has been reached in regard to the increase, more or less promised, but hinted some years ago, to the Civil Service? I understand that lately the Government received a delegation from the Civil Service Association, which laid a request before the Government. I know that we are passing through hard times and that the expenditures of the country are high, but the man who suffers most in these days from the high cost of living is really the man who has nothing to depend upon but his fixed salary.

Has my hon. friend considered the position in which the Civil Service is to-day? And does he intend to do something about it? Three years ago, just before the war, he

had a tender spot in his heart for the Civil Service. Perhaps, in his anxiety about the war, he may have overlooked the poor civil servant. I cannot forget that I am the son of a civil servant myself, and I know what the anxieties of the poor civil servants are. We all expect a word of hope from the Minister of Finance on behalf of this class of employees.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In the midst of a war such as this, and with the burdens that are thrust upon the public, the time is not very opportune for considering a revision of the Civil Service salary list. But we are all aware that the cost of living has gone up during the past few years, especially since the outbreak of the war. It is altogether probable that when the House resumes after the recess we shall deal with the questions of the salaries at least of the lower grades of the Service. The matter has been under consideration.

Resolutions reported.

WAYS AND MEANS.

The House in Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance) moved:

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, 1918, the sum of $32,195,441.17 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Sir THOMAS WHITE moved:

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, 1917, the sum of $9,127,777.42 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions reported and concurred in.

SUPPLY BILL.

Sir THOMAS WHITE thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 20 for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial years ending respectively March 31, 1917, and March 31, 1918.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first and the second time, considered in committee, and reported.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

CONFISCATION OF COAL BY RAILWAYS.

On the motion of Sir Thomas White for the adjournment of the House:

Mr. LEMIEUX: Before the House adjourns, I wish to say a word about the coal situation.

Mr. SPEAKER: With the leave of the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: With the leave of the House, of course, because I consider this a very important question. I reported to the Minister of Railways this evening that several consignees were complaining that coal consigned to private firms was being confiscated by certain railway companies—and I named one of the companies—much to the detriment of private industry in Canada. My hon. friend has been good enough to notify the company named to respect the rights of private firms, and I thank him for what he did. Had it not been for the happy intervention of the hon. minister, a very important pulp establishment would have been obliged to close its doors, and leave about 800 hands inactive, incurring thereby a loss of about $10,000 daily. As the complaint seems to be general, I would like my hon. friend to give the House and the country a pronouncement on the subject. Can any railway company, by this high-handed action—I shall not say abuse its privileges, because such a privilege does not belong to it—deprive its customers of property of which they stand greatly in need?

Mr. COCHRANE: I think the railways have the right to do this, because trains must be kept moving. The stopping of the trains would more seriously discommode the public than the action to which my hon. friend refers. There is, no doubt, great scarcity of coal all over Canada; the Intercolonial railway itself has had to take coal belonging to other people. The coal companies have not been able to get the necessary number of men to enable them to fill their contracts. We ourselves have had to bring in some 500,000 tons of coal. I am sure that the company that took this coal is in a very bad way; in fact, all the Canadian railways are in a bad way in different localities. As I told the hon. gentleman, I wired the president of the company to which he referred and asked him to try and let up so that the different industries could be

kept going. I shall be very glad to do anything that I can in the matter.

Mr. REID: Has the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) seen the statement read by the Prime Minister in the House a few days ago with regard to this matter?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would the hon. gentleman give a synopsis of it?

Mr. REID: It is a statement by Sir Henry Drayton, Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and may be found on page 210 of Hansard. The Prime Minister read it in reply to a question put by the hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the gist of the statement?

Mr. REID: It is as follows:

The practice of commandeering coal by railways is the occasion of great annoyance and frequently positive loss to consignees. It is a practice which is not covered by the Railway Act, one way or the other, nor authorized by any regulation of the Board. The practice is very similar to the practice of general average applicable at sea, and the taking of necessary cargoes, belonging of course, to consignees, in case of emergency, It is justified by the railways in that it is better that some freight should move rather than that no freight should move at all.

Railway companies, of course, ought to lay in their own coal; they ought to have supplies; they ought to be able to carry on their business without commandeering coal; but, at the same time, it has to be recognized that the coal shortage is very acute, and that railways in some instances have been entirely unable to obtain supplies of coal which they in due season contracted for.

The Board has already had up the question of coal confiscation with the railways, and everything has been done to minimize it. The complaints on this score now are very much fewer than they were, and the situation is being got in hand.

The Board has not been advised of any confiscation of coal belonging to the Nova Scotia Underwear Company, but the matter will be immediately taken up.

On motion of Sir Thomas White, the House adjourned at 12.33 a.m. Wednesday.

Wednesday, February 7, 1917.

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

PRIVATE BILLS—FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 25, to incorporate the British American Telephone and Telegraph Company.—Mr. Jameson.

Bill No. 26, respecting The Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill No. 27, to amend an Act to incorporate The Canadian General Council of The Boy Scout Association.—Mr. Bennett (Calgary).

Bill No. 28, respecting The Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—Mr. Rainville.

Bill No. 29, to amend the Act incorporating The Canadian Surety Company.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 30, respecting The Canadian Western Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill No. 31, respecting The Cariboo, Barkerville and Willow River Railway Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 32, to incorporate The Cascade Scenic Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

Bill No. 33, respecting The Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—Mr. Currie.

Bill No. 34, respecting The Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Northrup.

Bill No. 35, respecting The Kaslo and Slocan Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 36, respecting La Compagnie du Chemin de Fer de Colonisation du Nord.—Mr. Northrup.

Bill No. 37, respecting The Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Company, Limited.—Mr. Rainville.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That as the time for receiving Petitions for Private Bills, and the time for presenting Private Bills without an additional charge will be curtailed by the adjournment of the House, be it resolved, That Petitions for Private Bills be received by the House if presented on or before the 10th of May next, and that the time for presenting Private Bills without the payment of the additional charges provided for under paragraphs (b) and (c) of subsection 3 of rule 89 be extended until May the 24th next and June the 21st next respectively.

Motion agreed to.

WAR LOAN—$500,000,000.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden for the third reading of Bill No. 24, for granting to His Majesty aid for military and naval defence.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: In order to facilitate the trip of my right hon. friend to the other side of the ocean, we have discussed this Bill without having before us much of the information to which we on this side of the House think we are entitled. I would remind my hon. friend that when we meet again we expect to have all

the information which we have not yet received, that is to say, the Bruce report, the Baptie report, and the details of the expenditure of the money that has been voted.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I expect to lay on the Table of the House to-day the Bruce report and the Baptie report. To do so it is necessary to take the only copy that is at present in the Department of Militia.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is it intended to utilize any portion of the $500,000,000 for the purpose of building war vessels in Canada? I do not mean battleships, but destroyers and submarines. I think it is most important that this should be done, and I think it would be of interest to the House and the country to have some information on the subject. The terms of the Bill are quite broad enough, I am sure, to permit of this being done, and it would appear to be in the public interest.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think it would be undesirable to make such a statement as my hon. friend suggests. I may say that communications of a highly confidential character, of which I have privately informed the right hon. leader of the Opposition, have passed on the subject, and I shall be very glad to acquaint my hon. friend privately with what information is available.

Mr. MACDONALD: In the ordinary course it would not be possible for members to discuss this vote when we reassemble unless an opportunity were afforded by the Government for us to do so. Will we be able to discuss this on the Militia Estimates?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I would not be disposed to interpose the slightest objection to full discussion of the subject. As a matter of fact, there was some suggestion yesterday that the Government were averse to criticism and were not desirous of supplying information. On the contrary, I stated when I first presented this war appropriation to the House that I was ready to give all available information asked for, and I have already given a good deal of information that was not asked for—some which is in my possession I have not yet had an opportunity to give. We shall be very glad to have a discussion. I do not think that under the rules of the House hon. gentlemen opposite would be precluded from bringing up the discussion of this subject on the Militia Estimates.

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: You will bring on the Militia Estimates as early as possible?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I shall.

HOUSE OF COMMONS OFFICIALS.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the recommendations of the Honourable the Speaker, laid on the table of the House on the 6th instant relative to the promotion of Mr. A. C. Campbell to the position of Associate Editor of Debates and Reporter, of Mr. Harry E. Oliver to the position of Debates Reporter, and of Mr. D. L. Desaulniers to the position of Chief Translator, and the appointment of Mr. L. Boulet as Chief of Pages, be confirmed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: With reference to the two last named appointments, Messrs. Desaulniers and Boulet, I have no observation to make. I would simply ask as to the others, Messrs. Campbell and Oliver, if this promotion is in accordance with any recommendations coming from the Debates Committee. Mr. Campbell is a very valuable officer, of that I have personal knowledge. But we have a Debates Committee which is supposed to take some cognizance of these matters.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am informed by the clerk that it comes through the regular channel, that the Debates Committee is not alluded to in the Civil Service Act, and I do not think there is any recommendation from them. As far as I am concerned, I know nothing about it except that this motion was put in my hands in the ordinary course.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The matter had better stand. It can be taken up at the next sitting.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the Prime Minister give an explanation of how the appointment of Mr. Desaulniers was brought about?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have not the slightest knowledge of the subject. The motion is put before me in the ordinary course to move. It comes through the regular channel, and I really know no more about it than my hon. friend. If it is desired there is no reason why it should not stand.

Mr. MARCIL: I think it might be desirable that Mr. Laframboise, an old official of the House, should know the circumstances under which he is being replaced.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If my right hon. friend has no objection, I would move the motion in this form:

That the recommendation of the hon. the Speaker, laid on the table of the House on the 6th instant relative to the promotion of Mr. D. L. Desaulniers to the position of the Chief Translator and the appointment of Mr. L. Boulet as Chief of Pages, be confirmed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My objection to the motion as first proposed was to the change in the Debates staff. I think this should not be made except upon the advice of the Debates Committee, which is appointed by this House to supervise these matters. As to the other two promotions, those of Mr. Desaulniers and Mr. Boulet, I have no objection to offer, because these matters come within the province of Mr. Speaker alone. Mr. Desaulniers takes the place of Mr. Laframboise. I have been informed, and I have reason to believe, that Mr. Laframboise has been very harshly dealt with, but I do not take exception to these promotions as they come within the jurisdiction of Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to as to appointments of Mr. Desaulniers and Mr. Boulet.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF CONFEDERATION.

APPOINTMENT OF A COMMITTEE.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:—

That the following members be appointed a committee to consider and report upon the arrangements which should be made for the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the foundation of this Dominion, namely, Messrs. Foster (Sir George), Graham, Hughes (Sir Sam), Jameson, Lemieux, Macdonald, Murphy, Sévigny and Taylor.

Motion agreed to.

CARE OF RETURNED SOLDIERS.

APPOINTMENT OF A COMMITTEE.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: With reference to the subject that was brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) a few days ago, I beg to move, seconded by Sir George Foster, that

The following members, namely, Sir Herbert Ames, Mr. R. B. Bennett (Calgary), Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure), Mr. Middlebro, Mr. Murphy, Mr. McCurdy, Mr. Pardee, Mr. Ross and Mr. Sutherland, be appointed a committee for the purpose of considering and enquiring into and reporting upon (a) the reception, treatment, care, training and re-education of the wounded disabled and convalescent who have served in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces; (b) the provision of employment for those who have been honourably discharged from the Canadian Expeditionary Forces, and the training and re-education of those so discharged who are unable to engage in their former occupation.

This is precisely in the form in which I read the motion to the House yesterday, and I have very great pleasure in moving it now, as I have no doubt that the enquiry which is proposed will elicit not only information as to existing arrangements, which I have already given to the House in speaking on my hon. friend's motion, but it doubtless will furnish the committee with very much fuller information on the subject, as my statement to the House was, of course, only a summary of the very great work which has been undertaken by the Military Hospitals Commission, and by various committees and boards which have been already created.

I have no doubt that the work which this committee will do will be of as great service to the House and to the country as that which was performed by the Committee on Pensions last session. I also entertain no doubt that this Committee will proceed with the discharge of its duties with the same ability, energy and devotion which characterized the work of the Pensions Committee last year.

Sir HERBERT AMES: Is it the intention that the committee shall sit during the recess, and if so, is any provision being made to that effect?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No provision is required. The House is technically in session during the adjournment, and a committee has the same power to sit as if we were proceeding with business here from day to day.

Motion agreed to.

CONGESTION OF RAILWAY TRAFFIC.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) desired to obtain information as to the effect of the reduction in passenger trains. I have a memorandum from Sir Henry Drayton which is somewhat lengthy. I can read it or have it embodied in Hansard.

Mr. GRAHAM: Put it on Hansard.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN handed in the following memorandum for publication in Hansard by consent of the House.

CONGESTION OF TRAFFIC.

The Right Honourable Premier desires a memorandum on the question of passenger train reduction and the consequent results on traffic.

Attached hereto is a copy of the judgment of the Board on the question of a reduced passenger service and the necessity of drastic action.

The following statement gives the number of trains cancelled, engines released, crews released, and reduction of train mileage daily and weekly, with the resultant approximate coal saving on the Canadian Pacific, Grand Trunk, and Canadian Northern Railways:

	C.P.R.	G.T.R.	C.N.R.
Trains cancelled ..	59	57	18
Engines released ..	24	28	12
Crews released ...	27	19	15
Train miles reduced daily	3,611	3,409	1,924
Train miles reduced weekly	25,280	23,866	11,544
Approximate coal saving in tons per week	1,204	1,137	577

The above statistics, as reported by the railway companies, are confirmed by present time tables and the observations of the Board's operating department.

All the equipment available has been put in freight service, but the freight service has not enjoyed the full benefit of the additions owing to the fact that the companies have been running for some time at high pressure, with locomotives so busy that they were not being repaired as and when they should, with the result that a comparatively large number of locomotives are now under repair.

The weather conditions have been such that the anticipated movement has not been obtained.

Effective steps were taken to increase the supply of coal, coke, and raw materials for munition works by movement by the car ferries over Lake Erie. The sudden piling up of ice entirely prevented this movement. For the first time in some thirty years even passenger ferries at Detroit were either unable to run or were impeded in their work, and for some time the car ferries running between Windsor and Detroit had to cease operation.

Coincident with the reduction of passenger service, weather conditions became and have continued bad and transportation rendered difficult. These difficulties have been the more acute owing to the shortage of labour. The different yards at terminal and transfer points were blocked with snow. The snow was not removed while in a soft condition, as the railways claim owing to a shortage of men, and the work of cleaning up the yards at once became both expensive and difficult.

At Massena Springs, for example, the Grand Trunk reported only yesterday that they could get only a limited number of men to dig out coal cars at that point, urgently required in Ottawa, although they were paying wages as high as $4 a day in view of the emergency.

The effect of weather conditions may be illustrated by the investigation lately held by the Board with reference to the service between Quebec and Chicoutimi.

Weather conditions were, comparatively speaking, favorable from the period January 1st to January 13th, both inclusive. During that period the line under observation carried 538 passenger cars, 1,626 freight cars, and 25 snow ploughs, or a total of 2,189 cars. In making this total haul, 2,074 tons of coal were consumed.

During the second period under observation, January 14th to January 24th, both inclusive, there were moved over the line, 290 passenger cars, 1,620 freight cars, and 33 snow ploughs,—total 1,943 cars.

In making this movement, and for an eleven day period as against thirteen days in the first instance, no less than 2,626 tons of coal were consumed. As a result it would seem that, during the second period, with two days less operation, 552 tons of coal were burned in excess of that consumed in the former period, although 246 less cars were carried.

The conditions to-day leave very much to be desired. The movement is not what it ought to be. Beyond all question it would have been a great deal worse had the passenger service not been reduced.

The approximate amount of coal saved by reducing the service is 2,918 tons a week. These figures are not based upon extraordinary conditions, but upon ordinary operating conditions. If it had been at all possible to have maintained the old passenger service and carry on freight business, which I very much doubt, a much larger amount than this tonnage would have been required.

With the coal shortage common both to American and Canadian points, differing only in degree at different centres, and with the railways, disappointed in their own coal movement, commandeering coal for the purpose of keeping their trains running, if the result of the decreased passenger service has merely enabled munition works and coal dealers to obtain the coal formerly consumed in the passenger service, rendering unnecessary, as the reduction does, confiscation of coal at least to that extent, on this ground alone the reduction of passenger service, in my view, was entirely justified.

The reduction, however, has done more than this. It has enabled the railways, even under the present trying conditions, to continue the coal movement, to continue hauling a sufficient quantity of grain to be turned into flour for the overseas forces, and to continue the service to the munition plants, with the result that, although impeded, these most necessary activities have been carried on.

Objections have naturally been made to the reduced service, but I think I may say that wherever those members of the public who are complaining have learned the traffic conditions obtaining in the country, the necessity of keeping up the movement of food and munitions to the front and the supplying of coal and feed corn and other necessities to our own people, the reductions and all consequent inconveniences have been cheerfully accepted.

February 7th, 1917.

H. L. DRAYTON.

File No. 27563.

TRAFFIC CONGESTION.

The Chief Commissioner:—

The matter of traffic congestion has been anxiously considered for some time past. In so far as the fact of congestion is concerned, there is no room for doubt.

Coal and coke shipments have been delayed to a serious, and in some instances to an alarming, extent; the proper supply of raw materials to munition factories has been interrupted; and the movement of grain from the North West, which is much required not only by the grain producing territory in the West but as well by the consuming eastern centres, to say nothing

at all of the overseas' demands which must be met, has been interfered with.

The grain movement from the West has been limited to some extent by the movement into and out of the Eastern territory and storage facilities therein, and has also in no small measure been injuriously affected by a shortage of box cars and by a shortage of men, and to a lesser extent of locomotive power.

The causes of congestion are not altogether a railway failure, but include an irregular loading movement overseas, resulting in an uncertainty in the railway movement and consequent congestion of traffic of itself in excess of the traffic ordinarily offered on Canadian lines.

Over and above all this, the situation is rendered the more acute by reason of the fact that, owing to the financial and traffic conditions obtaining in 1914, and for a portion of 1915, the Railway Companies had not ordered equipment, which has now become necessary, and later were unable to get it, speaking generally, except at largely increased prices on deliveries at an early date.

Again, over and above all this, the congestion became more marked, in the first instance on the lines in American territory, with the result that traffic which otherwise would have been routed on American lines was routed via Canadian lines and offered in large quantities before protective embargoes went into force. The result is a traffic congestion at all points at the border, both on the Canadian and American sides, and at a large number of the divisional points and at all large terminals.

The imperative duty of the Board is to see, in the first instance, that this country fails in no regard in supplying materials necessary in the prosecution of the war. This, of course, means that the transportation required by the Imperial Munitions Board from the different factories producing munitions or materials required by the Empire and its Allies, must be properly and efficiently supplied. It also means that the full movement of grain and flour required both by Great Britain and by the Allied Nations be fully and completely maintained.

In like manner, it is the duty of the Board to see that the freight movement of the necessities of life for our own people and raw material required for our export trade, on which depends so much in the matter of exchange and the financial standing of the country, is not allowed to suffer.

The Board has done everything possible to expedite the movement of these commodities with the equipment and competent men now available for freight service. No more can at the moment be done in this direction—the Railways are using every man available and every engine fit to use owned by the Companies or which they have been able to rent for this purpose.

The question now that the Board has to decide is as to whether the movement already referred to as being so necessary should continue to suffer, or whether, on the other hand, engines and men now used in the passenger business ought to be released and put into the freight service.

In my opinion, there is no room for doubt as to what ought to be done. Convenience and comfort on the one hand must be sacrificed to necessity on the other.

The companies have been advised that the freight movement must be increased and the passenger movement curtailed to the full extent that that movement can be curtailed and the necessary communication between different districts maintained.

Circulars No. 138 and 139 issued by the Board, requiring ten days' notice to the Board and to the public of changes in passenger service will be suspended until further order. It is necessary that this should be done, in view of the direction to the Railway Companies to forthwith cut off all unnecessary passenger movement and to increase the facilities of the freight service.

It is quite true that not all of the passenger locomotives can be effectively used in the freight service, but many of them can however; and, apart from the question of locomotives, the crews will become available and the supply of railway men, competent and efficient, directly increased in the proportion that the passenger service is reduced. Over and above all this in the public interest in view of the coal shortage existing the large quantity of coal consumed in passenger service ought to be curtailed as much as possible.

More effective service can be given in the mechanic and locomotive shops of the Companies, and the freight equipment be better maintained and made more efficient than it is to-day, with a reduced passenger service.

There will also be more room in the yards and a more free and expeditious movement of freight trains will become possible.

In my view, the Board cannot well at the present moment order the Companies to remove any specific trains. The details of the different passenger movements are much more familiar to the Companies than they are to the Board, and in the reductions that must be made the Companies will have to see that every section of the country at least has the necessary passenger movement both in and out, although this may mean the carrying on of some trains not of themselves remunerative and the cancellation of trains which may be remunerative to the Companies.

The chief congestion is to be found at the frontier and on the section between Hamilton and Toronto. Three Companies are directly interested in the passenger movement here,—the Grand Trunk, Canadian Pacific, and Toronto, Hamilton, & Buffalo Railway Companies. The territory is one requiring, undoubtedly, a good passenger service. Probably each and every Company will be able to show that every train operated in this district is operated at a profit. It is, however, absolutely necessary that at this the most congested point, the companies must lose their passenger revenue and the public be inconvenienced, until the present emergency is past. There are now 40 trains operated daily over the territory, that is, 20 into and 20 out of Toronto. In view of these circumstances, a radical cut in this service must immediately go into effect.

This district must be supplied with coal and raw material, not only owing to its own necessities, but also owing to the fact that in it are situated a large number of munition factories now in danger of being closed.

In my view, direction ought to be given immediately that out of these 40 trains 16 must be cancelled, the Companies to select out of the total those trains which can be cancelled with the least possible public inconvenience. The mere factor of Company revenue cannot be made a controlling factor.

After a careful review of the situation, I am further of the opinion that the Canadian Pacific ought to and can re-arrange its service so that a saving can be made of some 26 engines and crews, the Grand Trunk 35, and the Canadian Northern 12.

The reductions which are now proposed in the passenger service, entailing as they do a considerable loss of passenger revenue in some cases to the companies and inconvenience to the general public, are merely tentative. As and when the congestion from which the country is now suffering, and which probably will continue to a greater or less degree until the opening of navigation, is removed, the service must be restored.

All companies must use all suitable equipment and men released from the passenger service for the transportation of freight.

(Signed) H. L. DRAYTON.

Ottawa, January 8th, 1917.

I agree.

(Signed) D'A. S.
S. J. McL.
A. S. G.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

LABOUR TROUBLE AT THETFORD MINES.

Mr. VERVILLE:

What were the names and occupations of the gentlemen sent to Thetford Mines to get information or to settle the labour trouble during last year?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Stands.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This question of my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) has been on the Order Paper since the 25th January.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The reason it has not been answered is that my hon. friend the Minister of Labour has been absent for a very considerable time in connection with the strike in the western coal mines.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I know, but there must be a record of these names in his office.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I may have neglected it, but I have had rather too much to do.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

PURCHASE OF LEWIS MACHINE GUNS.

Mr. KYTE:

1. What is the number of Lewis machine guns purchased by the Department of Militia and Defence since August 1, 1914?
2. How many were purchased during the year 1916?
3. What was the price paid for each gun?
4. Have any complaints against the Lewis machine guns reached the Government?
5. If so, when?
6. Is the Government aware as to whether or not the Lewis machine gun has been condemned by the United States War Department?

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is not considered in the public interest to answer this question at present.

Mr. SPEAKER: Dropped.

MAIL ROUTE; BRAMPTON AND PALESTINE.

Mr. TRUAX:

1. Was a petition received by the Postmaster General's Department from residents on Rural Mail delivery route between Brampton and Palestine, Peel county, to serve one Ed. McCann?
2. If so, by whom was it presented, and on what date?
3. What action has been taken by the department in regard to same?

Mr. BLONDIN:

1. Yes.
2. Presented by Mr. Blain, M.P. for Peel in July last.
3. No action taken by the department because request is contrary to regulations of rural delivery.

QUARANTINE RESERVE AT COUTTS.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. How much land is set aside for the Quarantine Reserve at Coutts, Alberta?
2. How much stock was quarantined at this reserve during the past year of 1916?
3. Have representations been made to the Government for the opening of this reserve for settlement?
4. Does the Government consider it necessary to retain so much land for the Quarantine Reserve?
5. Is any of this reserve sub-let to ranchers?
6. If so, to whom, and at what rate?

Mr. PATENAUDE:

1. The land set aside for the quarantine reserve at Coutts, is that portion bounded by the Milk river on the north, the Alberta Railway Company's right-of-way on the west, the International Boundary on the south, and the dividing line between ranges 14 and 15 on the east, west of the fourth Meridian.

2. The number of animals quarantined at Coutts during the year of 1916: 34,384 sheep, 3 goats, 3 swine.

3. Yes, but as the land was still required for quarantine purposes, no action could be taken with a view to opening up for settlement lands included in the reserve.

4. It is considered necessary to retain our present quarantine reserve at Coutts in order to provide grazing for the large bands of sheep entering this country from the United States and quarantined at that point. Owing to the nature of the soil, it is very difficult for the animals to obtain sufficient grass without wandering over a wide territory. It is also advisable that the land

should be retained in view of changes it may be necessary to make in the Animals Quarantine Regulations as circumstances require.

5. No record of such.

6. Answered by Number 5.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—CARRIAGE OF LIQUORS.

*Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

Referring to "An Act in aid of Provincial Legislation Prohibiting the sale or use of Intoxicating Liquors" passed last session, and attaching heavy penalties to the carrying of such liquors into prohibition provinces:

1. Is the Government aware that large quantities of intoxicating liquors have been carried by its own railway and steamship employees from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick into Prince Edward Island contrary to the provisions of the Act above cited?

2. What instructions, if any, did the Government give its railway and steamship employees in regard to the carrying of such liquors from the mainland into the province of Prince Edward Island?

3. If no instructions were given, why did the Government elect to pursue such a course?

Mr. PATENAUDE:

1. The Department of Railways and Canals has no information as to the extent of the movement of intoxicating liquors by the Canadian Government railways and steamers from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to Prince Edward Island, and is not aware that any movement has taken place contrary to the provisions of the Act.

2. Instructions in the hands of agents on the Canadian Government Railways recite the clauses of Federal Act May 18, 1916, as to penalty attaching for shipping intoxicating liquors contrary to law.

3. Answered by Number 2.

SHIPS BUILT IN CANADA.

Mr. C. A. WILSON:

1. How many ships, of any kind, propelled either by electricity, steam, gasoline or sail, have been built in Canada from September 1, 1911, to date, (a) by the Government for its own service; (b) for other countries, firms or individuals; and (c) by different firms or individuals for the Government or for companies or individuals?

2. What was their respective tonnage, names, ports of register and the names of builders?

Mr. PATENAUDE:

Public Works:

1 and 2. Tugs and tenders:

	Name.	Port of Registry.	Tonnage. Gross	Registered.	Builder.
(a)	Mossy River	Winnipeg	30·15	20·51	Department of Public Works.
	Le Pas	"	23·24	15·81	Department of Public Works.
	Friday	"	38·93	26·48	Department of Public Works.
	Peguis	"	38·93	24·48	Department of Public Works.
	Vaughan	"	134·04	91·15	Department of Public Works.
(b)	None.				
(c)	Roustabout	Not registered	about 5 tons.		Vancouver Shipyards, Limited.
	Runabout	"	" 10 "		Westminster Marine Railways.
	Knockabout	"	" 11 "		W. Menchions.
	Point Ellice	Vancouver	162:67	69:40	McDougall-Jenkins.
	Point Garry	"	19	13	Vancouver Shipyards.
	Point Grey	"	238	162	Wallace Shipyards.
	Fredericton	Ottawa	109·21	46·76	Polson Iron Works, Limited.
	Maggie K	"	24·73	12·35	W. H. Kelly.
	No name	Under construction			"

Naval Service:

1. (a) None. (b) None. (c) Two motor launches.

2. Tonnage, 16 tons; names, Fisheries Patrol Boats "F" and "G". Not registered. Builders, H. W. Embree and Sons, Port Hawkesbury, Nova Scotia.

Railways and Canals:

1. Five. (a) For its own service, on the Rideau and Lachine canals and Hudson bay.

2. "Agnes P" built by W. H. Kelly Lumber Co., Buckingham, P.Q. Net registered tonnage 18. Port of register, Ottawa. "Carillon"; net registered tonnage 28. Port of register, Ottawa, built by the department in Lachine Canal yard. Lighters "1", "2" and "3", net registered tonnage 120 each. Port of register, Toronto. Built by Polson Iron Works, Limited.

Marine and Fisheries:

Name.	Date.	Gross Tonnage.	Port of registry.	
1. Estevan	1912	1,161	Ottawa.	Collingwood Ship Building Co.
2. Bellechasse	1912	417	"	Kingston Ship Building Co.
3. Dollard	1913	761	"	" "
4. Hopper Barge 1	1913	676	"	Geo. T. Davie & Sons, Lévis.
5. Dredge 14	1914	888	"	Collingwood Ship Building Co.
6. Dredge 15	1914	888	"	" "
7. Grenville	1915	497	"	Polson Iron Works, Toronto.
8. Hopper Barge 2	1915	743	"	Collingwood Ship Building Co.
9. J. D. Hazen	1916	3,515	"	Canadian Vickers, Montreal.
10. Dredge 16	(under construction)	approx. 2,100	"	" "

Vessels built at the Dominion Government Shipyard, Sorel, P.Q., from 1911 to 1916, for Government service, giving tonnage, name, and port of entry.

Const'n No.	Description.	Gross. Tonnage.	Name and Port of Registry.
26	Steel elevator dredge	842	M. & F. No. 12, Sorel
33	Steel sand scow	202	Scow No. 22, Sorel
36	Steel tug	213	Lavaltrie, Sorel
37	Steel elevator dredge	842	M. & F. No. 13, Sorel
38	Steel tug	213	Laviolette, Sorel
42	Wooden scow	177	Dumping scow No. 20, Sorel
42	" "	177	Dumping scow No. 21, Sorel
43	" "	177	Dumping scow No. 10, Sorel
43	" "	177	Dumping scow No. 11, Sorel
44	Steel stone lifter	309	Stone lifter No. 5, Sorel
45	Steel tug and fire boat	213	Becancour, Sorel
46	" " " "	213	Deschaillons, Sorel
47	Steel dump scow, 450 yds.	362	Scow No. 27, Sorel
48	" " " " "	362	Scow No. 28, Sorel
49	" " " " "	362	Scow No. 29, Sorel
50	" " " " "	362	Scow No. 30, Sorel
51	" " " 230 "	201	Scow No. 25, Sorel
52	" " " " "	201	Scow No. 26, Sorel
53	Gasoline wood launch	6	Margot, Sorel
54	Twin screw sheathed steamer	413	Bradbury, Winnipeg
55	Steel catamaran	——	Catamaran, Sorel
56	" "	——	Catamaran, Sorel
57	Twin screw testing steamer	607	Detector, Sorel
58	Wood flat scow	105	Floating Derrick, Sorel
59	Twin screw steel tug	368	Berthier, Sorel
60	Single screw sheathed steamer	174	Argenteuil, Sorel
62	Composite oyster steamer	110	Ostrea, Charlottetown
63	Single screw steel barge	611	Coal Barge No. 6, Sorel
64	Steel dump. scow, 250 yds.	228	Dump. Scow No. 31, Sorel
65	" " " " "	228	" " " 32, Sorel
66	" " " " "	228	" " " 23, Sorel
67	" " " " "	228	" " " 24, Sorel
68	Gasoline Wood Launch	15	Thurlow, Belleville
	" " "	3 ½	Bellechasse, Quebec
	" " "	1 ½	Bradbury, Winnipeg

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—PURCHASE OF COAL IN UNITED STATES.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. How many tons of coal have been purchased by the Canadian Government railways in the United States during the past year to date?

2. What was the actual cost per ton of said coal delivered on board cars at Halifax, St. John or other points on the road?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. 553,856 tons.

2. Bituminous: $4.85 to $5.10 per gross ton, Levis; $4.46 to $4.58 per gross ton, St. Hyachinthe; $4.62 per gross ton, Montreal; $2.51 (slack coal) per net ton, Fort William; $3.25 to $3.38 per net ton Fort William (run of mine engine coal), $3.79; (blacksmith coal) per net ton $9.24 net Halifax; $9.24 net, St. John. Anthracite: $6.95 to $7.05 per gross ton, St. Hyacinthe; $7 net, Fort William; $9.75 per gross ton, Charlottetown; $10.23 per gross ton, Halifax, N.S.

YUKON DISTRICT EXPENDITURE.

Mr. COPP:

1. How much has been expended in the Yukon District for all purposes during the year ending December 31, 1916?

2. What is the present population of the Yukon?

Mr. PATENAUDE:

1. Mines—Geological Survey: Mr. D. D. Cairnes, exploration expenses, $5,044.75; purchase of palaeontological specimens, $144.75, total $5,189.50.

Customs: $29,286.69.

Marine: $600 to the Meteorological Officer at Dawson.

Post Office:

Paid from vote	$123,450 88
Salaries and commissions of postmasters paid from revenue	3,860 87
	$127,311 75

Interior:

Expenses of Government and surveys	$126,778 00
Grant for roads and bridges	100,000 00
Grant for local purposes	125,000 00
	$351,778 00

Agriculture: $2,775.25.

Royal North West Mounted Police: $115,469.82.

Militia and Defence: $564.86.

Naval Service:

Salary paid to C. C. Payson, inspector of fisheries, Dawson, Y.T., for period January 1 to December 31, 1916.	$1,425 00
Disbursements by C. C. Payson, inspector of fisheries, January 1 to December 31, 1916	64 00
	$1,489 00

Justice: $28,801.76.

Inland Revenue: $2,532.94.

Public Works:

Telegraph lines	$ 71,116 75
Public buildings	52,018 58
Harbour works	4 00
	$123,139 33

Indian Affairs: $225,353.75.

2. Trade and Commerce: Official Census of 1911 state the population to be 8,512.

Indian Affairs: The Indian population of the Yukon is 1,528.

JUDGES ON PROVINCIAL COMMISSIONS.

Mr. PARDEE:

1. Has the Department of Justice or any officer thereof given any opinion as to the right of judges to sit upon commissions enacted by provincial governments?

2. If so, what was said opinion?

3. Was the advice of the Department of Justice asked and obtained by the Minister of Public Works previous to his charges before Judge Galt, that judges so acting were taking graft?

4. If so, what was the date of asking said advice, and what opinion was given by the Department of Justice?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. No, except as may appear by the letters, copies of which are annexed.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. The Minister of Public Works did not at any time ask or obtain the advice of the Department of Justice on the question.

4. Answered by No. 3.

Ottawa, October 11, 1906.

My Dear Sir,—I have your letter of the 6th inst., asking my opinion whether the statutes of 1905, chapter 31, section 7, would interfere with your acting upon a commission for revision and consolidation of the statutes in force in your province.

I am quite aware, as you point out, that it has been usual for judges in Ontario to act upon such commissions, and that some of the judges of the Superior Courts in Ontario are appointed upon a commission, recently constituted for revision of the statutes of that province.

I have not given any very profound consideration to the question whether such a position is or is not opposed to the spirit of the enactment to which you refer. I have thought that was rather a question for the construction, judicially, and by the judge himself, which he might put upon the provision, but I may say that although the language of the section is very sweeping in its provision that judges are not to engage in any occupation or business other than judicial duties, it would occur to my mind that Parliament never could have intended to prohibit a judge from work of the character in question. Such work is offered him by the Crown itself. True, it is not the Crown in the same capacity as that from which his commission as a judge issued; still, it is an appointment, or mandate, from the Crown itself which he is asked to undertake, and the duties, while possibly not actually judicial, are none the less of a character which demand the exercise of judicial functions and certainly such as in no way conflict with judicial duties, unless possibly to the extent you indicate, that time might be taken which otherwise would be devoted to judicial work.

Whether the acceptance of any particular commission of this character would or would not so occupy the time of the judge as to interfere materially with his ability properly to discharge his judicial duties must, I think, be decided by each judge for himself, but upon the question whether the enactment was intended to preclude the judge from accepting a commission of this character, my view would be that there was no impropriety in the judge so accepting.

I remain, yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) A. B. Aylesworth.

The Honourable
Mr. Justice Wetmore,
Moosomin, Sask.

Ottawa, 10th May, 1906.

Dear Judge Harvey,—Referring to your letter of 24th March last, the minister desires me to say that he does not consider that your acting

as commissioner for the revision of the statutes is within the prohibition of the recent Act forbidding judges to engage in business.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) E. L. Newcombe.

The Honourable
Mr. Justice Harvey,
Macleod, Alta.

Ottawa, May 2, 1910.

My Dear Maclean,—I have your letter of the 28th April with reference to your proposal to appoint Judge Drysdale Chairman of the Commission to Administer the Affairs of the Victoria General Hospital at Halifax.

I see no objection from the point of view of this department in the judge acting in this capacity, and the more especially as you state his services will be gratuitous and the position purely honorary.

I remain, yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) A. B. AYLESWORTH.

The Honourable
A. K. Maclean,
Attorney General,
Halifax, N.S.

Ottawa, November 10, 1910.

Dear Sir,—I have your letter of the 8th inst., with reference to the question whether section 33 of the Judges' Act (R.S.C., c. 138) prevents a judge from acting as commissioner of the Victoria General Hospital at Halifax.

This is a matter of interpretation of a statute, and therefore one for judicial decision. My opinion in the matter is of no more value than that of any other lawyer, but I have no objection to saying to you that it would not seem to me a judge acting in this capacity was engaging in an "occupation or business," more especially as the position, I understand, carries with it no salary of any description.

I did not know whether or not any judge of Nova Scotia had been in fact appointed to these positions, but some time ago the Attorney General asked me if this department would have any objection to such an appointment being made, and I replied to him that I saw no objection from the point of view of this department, inasmuch as I assumed that the duties of the office would not interfere with the judge effectively discharging his regular judicial duties.

I remain, yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) A. B. Aylesworth.

John J. Power, Esq., K.C.,
Halifax, N.S.

Ottawa, 16th October, 1912.

My Dear Chief Justice,—Referring to your letter of 2nd instant, I would prefer not to express an opinion as to the application of the statute to the execution of commissions by the judges. There is, of course, quite a variety of commissions which may be issued, and some may be regarded in a different light from others. Therefore, I do not wish to give a general answer. Moreover, I think that the judges must determine for themselves in the first instance the propriety of accepting any commission, and that I must remain free to consider any case which may arise and require my consideration unembarrassed by a previously stated opinion.

With kind regards,

I remain, yours very truly,

(Sgd.) C. J. Doherty.

The Honourable
F. L. Lemieux,
Acting Chief Justice
Superior Court,
Quebec.

Ottawa, 4th December, 1913.

Sir,—Referring to your letter of 27th ultimo, wherein you ask the Minister of Justice to be good enough to give the leave necessary so that Judge Patterson, of the County Court for District No. 5 may act as a member of the Provincial Commission as to the use of electricity in the coal mines of Nova Scotia, I observe that in your view this would not cause any interference with the discharge of the judge's judicial duties or detriment to the administration of justice within his district. In these circumstances the minister does not perceive that any leave on his part would be necessary or effectual. It is the duty of the judge, of course, to see that he does not infringe the requirements of the Judges' Act, and the minister exercises no dispensing power.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) E. L. Newcombe,
Deputy Minister of Justice.

The Honourable
O. T. Daniels, K.C.,
Attorney General,
Halifax, N.S.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES.

Mr. ROSS:

What were the total receipts and expenditures respectively on the Canadian Government railways in the financial year to December 31, 1916?

Mr. COCHRANE: Receipts, $18,658,956.42; expenditures, $18,342,733.69.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—ROLLING STOCK.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. How many engines have been taken from the Intercolonial railway to be sent to the National Transcontinental railway from Winnipeg to Moncton?

2. How many passenger and freight cars have been taken for the same purpose?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Engines are being moved from Intercolonial to Transcontinental and returned as traffic requires. At present there are 32 Intercolonial engines on Transcontinental track, between Moncton and Winnipeg. 4 Transcontinental engines on Intercolonial tracks. 74 Intercolonial engines were sold to Transcontinental.

2. Transcontinental east of Levis is equipped with 11 Intercolonial passenger

cars. All passenger cars west of Quebec are owned by Transcontinental. There are 1,510 Intercolonial freight cars on Transcontinental from Moncton to Winnipeg and 1,085 Transcontinental freight cars on Intercolonial tracks. 33 Intercolonial passenger cars and 174 freight cars were sold to the Transcontinental.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—COST OF CLEARING ROAD.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. How much has the Government paid from the 1st of April, 1916, to the 1st of December, 1916, for clearing the road and removing the stones fallen into the cuts on the railway division between Hervey Junction and Fitzpatrick?
2. How much has been the cost of the same on the division between Fitzpatrick and Parent?
3. How much has been paid for the same purpose on the division between Parent and Doucet?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. $819.83.
2. $12,131.83.
3. Nil.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—EXPRESS SHIPMENTS.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. Are shipments of express made by the Canadian Express Company and not by the Transcontinental from Quebec to Winnipeg, on the Grand Trunk Pacific Line?
2. If so, why?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The Canadian Express Company operate express service on Transcontinental from Quebec to Winnipeg.

2. On account of the war it was thought advisable to make a temporary arrangement with the Express Company for this service.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—PAY OF MEN WHO ENLIST.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. Is the Government aware as to whether or not F. P. Gutelius, General Superintendent of the Canadian Government Railways, issued a circular dated at Moncton, N.B., the 30th of October, 1914, promising to all officials and employees of the said railways, enlisted or who would enlist in the active militia for overseas service, their full salary or pay while they were in the said service?
2. If so, has the Government authorized or approved the promise made by Mr. F. P. Gutelius in said circular?
3. Does the Government propose to pay full salary or wages to such officials or employees of the said railway who have or will enlist in the active militia for overseas service, in accordance with said circular?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1 and 2. Yes.

3. Salary or wages will be paid to those having enlisted prior to November 1, 1915, in accordance with circular No. 16, dated October 30, 1914, and to those enlisting, subsequent to November 1, 1915, salary or wages will be paid in accordance with circular No. 26, dated November 8, 1915.

PATRIOTIC FUND.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. What amounts have been given to the Canadian Patriotic Fund to December 31, 1916, and what amounts have been promised for 1917, by the different counties, towns and cities in each of the different provinces?
2. What are the names of the different counties, towns and cities, and the respective amounts subscribed and promised by each?
3. What counties, cities and towns in each province, if any, have not contributed any amount to the said fund up to the present time?

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. How much money has been subscribed and voted to the Canadian Patriotic Fund by each of the different provinces to December 31, 1916?
2. How much money has been paid to the Canadian Patriotic Fund by each of the different provinces during the same time?
3. How much money has been promised by county, township, city or other grants by each province for the year 1917?
4. How many persons in each province have received assistance from the Canadian Patriotic Fund to December 31, 1916?
5. What was the total amount so expended in each Province?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

It is impossible to answer these questions at the present time, as complete returns from the several Provinces, respecting contributions and expenditure to December 31, 1916, have not yet been received and checked but answers will be prepared during the adjournment and will be ready when Parliament meets.

COLONEL CURRIE, M. P.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Is Colonel Currie, member of the House of Commons for North Simcoe, in the military employ of the Dominion Government?
2. If so, in what capacity?
3. If so, is he receiving any remuneration for his services in such capacity?

Mr. KEMP:

1. Colonel Currie is a member of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces, but is on leave of absence without pay.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

SUPERANNUATION PAYMENTS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What was the gross amount paid by all Departments of the Government during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1916, to superannuated or retired officials on account of retiring allowances or superannuation?

2. How many officials entitled to such compensation were retired or superannuated by all Departments of the Government since October, 1911?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. $474,540.67.

2. 290.

MARINE DEPARTMENT AGENCY AT PICTOU.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Was the Agency of the Marine Department at Pictou closed last autumn?
2. If so, on whose request, and for what cause?
3. Did the department reverse its decision and reopen the agency at a decreased salary for the agent?
4. If so, on whose request, and for what reasons?
5. What is the salary of the present agent?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.

2. As the control of the winter service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland had been transferred to the Department of Railways and Canals, it was not thought necessary in the interests of the Department of Marine and Fisheries to retain the services of a sub-agent at Pictou.

3. Yes.

4. Having regard to the fact that the steamers of the Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island agencies of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, as well as those of the Department of the Naval Service, call at Pictou from time to time, for orders and supplies, and also in connection with buoy service and other aids to navigation, it was decided on reconsideration to continue the services of the sub-agent at that place, but at considerably reduced salary.

5. $400 per annum.

P. O. SUB-STATION, MONTREAL.

*Mr. MURPHY:

Referring to the answer given by the Honourable the Minister of Public Works, on page 322 of unrevised Hansard of 1917, respecting the addition to the Post Office sub-station on St. James street, Montreal —

1. What are the names of the newspapers in which the advertisement inviting tenders for the said work was published?
2. What are the dates upon which the advertisement appeared in the said newspapers?

Mr. ROGERS:

1 and 2. La Patrie, Montreal, on 3rd and 6th November, 1916; La Presse, Montreal, 3rd and 4th November, 1916; Gazette, Montreal, 2nd and 9th November, 1916; Star, Montreal, 2nd and 7th November, 1916; Chronicle, Quebec, 2nd and 3rd November, 1916; L'Evenement, Quebec, 3rd and 4th November, 1916; Danebrog, Ottawa, 3rd and 10th November, 1916.

LOSS OF DREDGE CAPE BRETON.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Has any investigation been held into the loss of the Government dredge Cape Breton, off White Head, Guysborough county, N. S., on January 17 last?
2. What was the port of destination of the said dredge at the time of the loss?
3. For what purpose was the dredge being towed to the said port?
4. Were any men lost in this wreck?
5. If so, how many, and what were their names and addresses?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Investigation now being held, at Halifax.

2. Sydney.

3. For repairs, and returning to district in which it is customary for this dredge to work.

4. Yes.

5. Nine: D. A. Hatfield, Hatfield's Point, N.B.; Alzear Le Blanc, West Arichat, N.S.; Peter Bonin, West Arichat, N.S.; Harry Burrows, Liverpool, N.S.; A. R. Selig, Lunenburg, N.S.; William Holland, Lunenburg, N.S.; John Greep, Lunenburg, N.S.; Gordon Miller, Lunenburg, N.S.; Foster Knickle, Lunenburg, N.S.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

How much was expended since August, 1914, in connection with the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway, including the harbour improvements at Nelson and the aids to navigation?

Mr. PATENAUDE:

Marine Department: $2,592.41.

Railways and Canals: From August 1, 1914, to November 30, 1916, $9,917,657.70.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN.

Mr. KYTE:

1. What is the number of interned aliens, and nationality of each, employed on public. works since the 4th of August, 1914?
2. What is the number employed in industrial work in the Provinces of Canada, and the nationality of each, since the 1st of August, 1914?
3. What is the number so employed at the present time?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Macdonald.—For a copy of all letters, telegrams, papers and other documents relative to the closing of the marine agency at Pictou last autumn, and as to the reopening of said agency.

Mr. Murphy.—For a copy of the contract between the Government and P. Lyall &

Sons Construction Company for the reconstruction of the Parliament Building.

IMPERIAL WAR CONFERENCE.

ADJOURNMENT TO ENABLE PRIME MINISTER TO ATTEND.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That when this House adjourns on Wednesday the 7th instant, it stand adjourned until Thursday, the 19th day of April next.

He said: This motion is made in pursuance of what passed between my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and myself in the debate on the Address. I have consulted him as to a suitable date on which to re-assemble, and we are both agreed it ought to be after Easter Sunday, which falls this year on the 8th of April. The date I am suggesting here for the re-assembling is the Thursday of the following week. It seemed to me that we should leave a convenient period between Easter and the date on which the House re-assembles, and furthermore, in view of the purpose for which the adjournment is being made, it hardly seems possible to adjourn for a shorter period than that which I have here indicated.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Motion agreed to.

PROMOTION OF TRADE BETWEEN CANADA AND FRANCE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: Before the opening of Parliament a large delegation of manufacturers and business men, from Montreal and Toronto chiefly, approached my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) with a view to obtaining aid from the Government in promoting closer trade relations between Canada and France. At the head of the delegation was the hon. Senator Beaubien, who has taken a very deep interest in this question. He visited France as one of the Canadian delegates at his own expense. There is a widespread feeling both in France and Canada that the trade between the two countries could be very materially increased if the natural resources and manufactured products of the two countries were better advertised and more widely known. I understand that a concrete scheme was proposed to my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and that the Chambers of Commerce in France, acting under the authority of the French Government, are willing to provide us with what I might call an exhibition train, which would start from the north of France and, travelling from city to city and town to town, display samples of our manufactured products and mineral and other resources to the people of that country. I need not say that this is a very important matter, and that if this plan were carried out, it would promote to a very considerable degree closer trade relations between the two countries. There are many things we can buy from France, and many more things that France can take from us. I understand that my hon. friend is well disposed towards this scheme, and I should like to know before the adjournment if anything concrete has been done towards carrying it out. I understand from the answer which the minister is reported to have made to the delegation, that he is willing to do something along this line, but he was leaving for England just then and the matter was dropped. I can assure my hon. friend that there are many manufacturers and business men in Canada awaiting with interest the answer of the Government, so that they can make preparation for having the train equipped and the manufactured goods and natural resources of Canada widely advertised in France.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): My hon. friend has spoken of closer trade relations between Canada and France. Of course, what he meant was trade exchanges. There is nothing official about this; that is, there is no question of negotiations between this Government and the French Government in regard to trade relations now existing or that may exist in future between the two governments. The information in reference to this matter can be tersely and very quickly given. The trade delegation which was spoken of by my hon. friend met me and we had a conference in Ottawa, based upon this idea: In the first place it was not proposed by the delegation, nor on the other hand was it sustained by the department as a possible proposal, that we should make an exhibition of Canada's resources and manufactured goods in France, or that France should undertake a similar exhibition in Canada. It was all based on the idea that as our trade commission had visited France and opened up personal and business relationships with their Chambers of Commerce and business men, if circumstances were at all favourable, it would be a good thing to follow that up with an exhibition

on wheels of samples of such goods as in the opinion of our trade commission and our manufacturers and business men might stand a chance of selling economically and profitably in France. This exhibition of samples, for such it would really be, would be on wheels and not housed in the Chambers of Commerce or in an exhibition or buildings of any kind. It would be much after the style of similar displays that have been made in Canada on two or three occasions, where samples of different lines of goods are arranged and displayed in cars, and the train runs through the country, stopping at various places, and an opportunity is given to the buying public to come in and see the goods, and to the exponent of the line of goods on the car to give information as to prices, possibilities, and the like of that. That is the first thing I wish to make plain: that, so far as Canada is concerned, it was not to be an exhibition, but a display of samples of goods which might possibly find a market in France. Having discussed the question with the delegation, the conclusion I came to, and expressed to them, was somewhat along this line. If the manufacturers generally thought the plan feasible and advisable, and would stand behind it, then in the first place they should provide the samples at their own expense. In the second place, if arrangements can be made for the carriage of these goods across the Atlantic and throughout France without expense to Canada, that will cover another factor in the case and will be another step towards the realization of the idea. I was informed that these samples would be carried from New York by the French line of vessels, without expense to the exhibitors, and that the same line would bring free to Canada a display of samples which the French people should arrange for exhibition in Canada. I was informed also that arrangements could be made in France for the free transportation of the exhibition train throughout those parts of France which it was proposed to visit. That, I understand, still holds good. The Department of Commerce of France and the Chambers of Commerce which have been approached were in nearly every case favourable to such an interchange of samples, and I believe that the French Government were favourable to the plan being carried out along these lines. When I left for England, the matter was in about that stage, and I left a memorandum and a letter which based the whole operation on the conditions I have named. When I was in London, I received some advice from this side, especially of the general adherence of the manufacturers and producers to the scheme and their intention to stand behind it and make it successful. My hon. friend will see that in a thing of this kind, unless it is very carefully thought out and very well done, it would be better not to start it at all. And arrangements for such a work cannot be made within a limited space of time. My own view was that this was an excellent idea, one that would be very beneficial if it could be carried out. But there was then, as there still is, some doubt in my mind as to whether this is the opportune time. When I was in Great Britain a couple of weeks ago, nothing impressed me more than the burden which was laid upon the inland transport system of Great Britain and upon the transport facilities as between Great Britain and the Allied countries in carrying on the operations of the war. I am quite certain that any request made to the British Government to allow their railways to allocate a train to such a purpose as this, would not be acquiesced in. I was also impressed with the fact that in France there is no more difficult and pressing problem than the transport problem. Great Britain, with supplies obtained from the United States and Canada, is making every possible effort to sustain the work of the French Government in preparing the transport which, within the next few days may be, and within the next few months certainly, will be absolutely necessary for the conduct of the war. The question arises in my mind, and it sticks there yet, as to whether it will be possible under these conditions for the French Government to favour the abstraction from necessary transport of any portion of the effective power of the railway system. That I think must be settled first of all; and I am now in communication with the French Minister of Commerce, who, I know, has had this matter brought to his attention, to know whether or not he considers it possible that it can be done now, or whether it would be better at a more favourable and opportune time. That is where the matter stands. I have great sympathy with the idea, but would like to see it carried out at the most opportune time when we are best assured of good results.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am perfectly satisfied with the very clear and interesting answer given by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). He has referred

to a memorandum sent to the delegates on his departure for England. Would he send me, confidentially if he thinks best, the correspondence on the subject. I ask in no critical spirit. I have taken some interest in this matter, as the hon. gentleman knows, and wish to work harmoniously with him and the delegates to carry out the scheme to success. The hon. gentleman has made a very luminous statement. I would be the first to admit that perhaps it would not be proper to insist at this time on this train being equipped and sent from point to point in France, in view of the necessities arising from the war.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is no objection to my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) having a copy of the instructions. An order of the House has already been passed for the correspondence. But the correspondence is very voluminous, and a great deal of it is not necessary to an understanding of the matter.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I leave that to the hon. minister; all I want is the essential documents.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I went through the whole correspondence, and I can give in a very few pages all that is necessary to an understanding of the project. In the meantime, I will send to the hon. gentleman a copy of the memorandum.

DOMINIONS ROYAL COMMISSION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is the report of the Dominions Royal Commission being prepared, and is it likely to be presented soon?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The reason I went to Great Britain so hurriedly and at the time I did was that the commission was meeting in London for the purpose of drawing up the final report. The commission finished that work while I was in London. The draft is ready for final revision. Two reports will be issued, an interim report for Canada, which will be out probably in the course of three or four weeks, and the final report of the commission, which will probably be issued inside of a couple of months.

PRIVILEGE.

STATEMENT BY THE HON. ROBERT ROGERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege, in order to call attention to an editorial article which appeared in this morning's Ottawa Citizen, referring to a report recently made by Commissioner Galt, of the city of Winnipeg, a report that carries with it in its every line unmistakable evidence of animus, temper and misrepresentation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Rogers) is speaking to a question of privilege. I submit to you, Sir, that it is not in order for him to impugn the character of the commmissioner. He can dispute the commissioner's conclusions, if he wants to, but he has no right to impugn the character of the commissioner.

Mr. SPEAKER: Speaking without having had opportunity to consult the rules, I am inclined to think the point of order is well taken.

Mr. ROGERS: I accept your ruling in the matter, Mr. Speaker. However, I presume that this report was made largely due to the fact that some time previously I had occasion to refer to Commissioner Galt as a judge who was guilty of bartering the honour of the King's—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Order.

Mr. ROGERS: I am only repeating what I said on a previous occasion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I take the same point of order. The hon. gentleman is entitled to make an explanation. He can deny, or qualify as he may, the findings of the commissioner, but he has no right to impugn the character of the commissioner or his authority in making that investigation.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that Rule 19 does not cover that special point; I have not had opportunity to refer to Bourinot.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Rule 19 is not the rule on which I rely. My point is this: On a question of privilege, the hon. gentleman has the right to deny statements that have been made, and to disprove the findings of the commissioner. But at this stage, on a question of privilege, he has no right to characterize the character or work of the commissioner.

Mr. SPEAKER: The rule is that the member who rises to a question of privilege must state the ground of his complaint, and deny, or qualify the statement.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Does my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) put his objection on the ground of the commissioner's judicial position?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No, I do not make the point that the commissioner had or had not a judicial position. That is a point to be debated at the proper time. But I say that the hon. minister (Mr. Rogers), rising to make a personal explanation, has no right, except to deny or qualify the finding of the commissioner; he has no right to question the commissioner's authority.

Mr. ROGERS: I did not refer to questioning his authority.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Yes.

Mr. ROGERS: My reference was by way of explanation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend said that he had attacked the commissioner for occupying an illegal position —that is a thing he has no right to do.

Mr. ROGERS: I do not agree with my right hon. friend in that; I think I am quite within the rule. However, I shall not dispute the point, because it is not relevant to the matter to which I purpose referring. I was simply saying that in his report he gives every evidence of being sore. This, however, was no justification for the article that appeared in the Citizen of this morning's date, in that there is no honest reason why a sheet like the Ottawa Citizen should take this special occasion of also being sore. Yet, for the past two years at least, it has given evidence of being sore, and very sore.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I rise to a point of order. My hon. friend is not speaking to his question of privilege. I repeat that he can refer to the finding of the judge, but he has no right to go beyond that.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I beg my right hon. friend's pardon. Over and over again in this House I have heard newspaper articles discussed in the same way that my hon. friend (Mr. Rogers) is now discussing them, upon the Orders of the Day as a question of privilege. I have never before heard such a point of order raised as that raised by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The judge to whom my hon. friend refers was acting in a position which has been assumed by judges over and over again.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. ROGERS: I am speaking of the Citizen just now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend can do no more than deny what the Citizen says.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no point of order in respect of the Citizen newspaper. The sole question is as to how the hon. member should make denial of the specific article complained of.

Mr. ROGERS: I am afraid that my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition is over-anxious in his desire that I should not make the statement that I purpose making. Were it not for the fact that I am an individual known to be full of great kindness and long-suffering, I would long before this have taken this House and the country into my confidence in respect to the reasons why I have not to-day the full and complete support of the Citizen newspaper. I hope my right hon. friend does not think I am out of order in saying that. Because, if the Citizen was the pure sheet that it would like its readers to believe it to be, then it would undoubtedly be obliged to support me, for the simple reason that the owners of the Citizen newspaper had the very best of reasons to know that the affairs of my department are honourably and honestly administered in the public interest. Heaven knows, the owners of the Citizen know, and I know, that I have not the support of that petty little sheet to-day simply because I would not yield to pressure and become a party to the purchasing, for a post office site in the city of Montreal, of a lot which the Southams were most anxious to sell to the Government at a cost of $100,000; a site that was not suitable and not in the public interest to purchase.

4 p.m.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Order. Is the hon. gentleman in order?

Mr. SPEAKER: The right hon. leader of the Opposition raises a point of order. Will he state it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The hon. gentleman proceeds not by way of making a personal explanation regarding the article in the Citizen, but by way of making an attack upon a citizen of this country. That, I submit, is not a proper explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not had an opportunity of going into the matter as fully as I would wish. I am of opinion, and while I was a private member of this House

I held the view that it was open to an hon. member to defend his character from attacks by newspapers, and I have always noticed that on questions of privilege more or less latitude has been shown. It does seem to me that it ought to be open to an hon. member of this House to so state his position that he may be enabled to clear aspersions which may have reflected on his character. For that reason, I would feel inclined to err rather on the side of latitude than on that of restriction in the matter of enabling an hon. member to make his defence.

Mr. ROGERS: My only desire was to give to the House and the country the reasons why I have been subjected to the various attacks, especially the one published to-day in the Ottawa Citizen. The only reason that I can assign, Sir, for that is that I have not been prepared to despoil the administration of my department for the personal gain of that compact. If I had, I would to-day have their full and devoted support. That is the explanation which I give of the attacks upon me by the Ottawa Citizen, not only to-day but upon former occasions, every one of which has been unfounded, untrue, and unworthy of a paper claiming to be a reputable journal.

RECRUITING IN PARIS AND BURFORD.

On the Orders of the Day.

Mr. J. H. FISHER (Brant): An item appears in the Toronto World of Thursday last, the 1st instant, which I have no doubt has appeared also in other papers. The item is sent out from Brantford, Ontario, and reads:

> Exodus from Village.
>
> Referring to the poor success which has been attendant upon recruiting in Paris, Brant county, an officer who was prominent in recruiting around Burford last fall makes the pertinent comment that the village of Burford is now denuded of young men. It was not enlistment that took them, he added, but an exodus to the States.

I wish to say that this item reflects most unfairly upon two important centres in the constituency I represent, namely the town of Paris and the village of Burford. In fairness to the town of Paris, my home town, I desire to say that I doubt if there is any town in Canada of the same size that has a better record in the way of recruiting, and, as the former Minister of Militia has said, in the way of fighting also. It has a total population of about 4,500, and, owing to the large number of girls who are employed in the mills, probably 60 per cent of the population is of the gentler sex. Yet from this town over 500 men have enlisted, being one in nine of the total population, or one in five at the outside, of the male population. That, it seems to me, is a record of which the citizens of Paris have reason to be proud; and of which I, as a citizen of Paris, certainly am proud. A number of these young men have already laid down their lives for the Empire, and we have many more who have returned seriously maimed and injured.

In regard to the second statement that the young men of Burford have gone to the United States to avoid enlistment, I have no hesitation whatever, knowing the young men of Burford as I do, in saying that the statement is absolutely untrue; and I doubt very much if any officer ever made it. I would much prefer to believe tha he has been misquoted.

I have made these few remarks as I felt it was only fair, in justice to these two important centres in my constituency, that I should offer this explanation.

DR. BRUCE'S REPORT.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN laid on the table of the House a report by Colonel Bruce on the Canadian Army Medical Service.

He said: This is the only copy that is available on this side of the ocean at the present moment. I have, however, decided that it had better be laid on the table of the House, as further copies are coming in the immediate future. I should explain that it is marked "confidential, for official use only." Under ordinary conditions, I should think it ought not to be brought down; but it would appear that it has been made public, wholly or partially, through the press, I do not know in what way. Further, it seems to me that to avoid any misconception and understanding which might arise, if it was not brought down and laid upon the table of the House, it is better to take that course than to refuse to lay upon the Table a document which was intended only for confidential official use in the first instance.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will it be printed during the recess?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is being printed now, I understand. Some forty copies, I think, are coming from England

by mail. These will be available, and we will have further copies printed if necessary.

I am also laying upon the table of the House the report of the Board of Enquiry of which Sir William Baptie was chairman. This report deals with practically the same matter as the report I have already laid upon the table of the House, and it is proper that if the one report is placed before the House and the country, the other report should also be made public.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I may say that General Wilson of Montreal notified me that he had found a parcel in his office which had been left by a young soldier named Shaw who came back some time last fall. It had been injured by water, but he forwarded it to me last week, though I did not get either the letter or the parcel until yesterday. It consists of four or five copies of a report—I have not looked at it—of General Jones, and the Bruce report. I think that if there is any way of making provision for them being printed also, it should be made I will send them to the Minister of Militia. As to the publication of these reports, the first report, a fly leaf, was given to me by Dr. Bruce, and the next two or three reports were sent by Surgeon-General Jones. Soon thereafter I found correspondence in England and in Canada from some ladies' societies—I forget what they were—and from Sir William Osler on the subject. Then we found, a week or two later, correspondence from the other side. I presume that the reports give a little about each side concerned in the case. I make this explanation to the Prime Minister as to how the reports got out. The first report I ever saw was issued by some women's associations to which General Jones had evidently given a copy.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER GALT OF WINNIPEG.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: As the report of Commissioner Galt has been brought to the attention of the House by the hon. Minister of Public Works, I expect that we will have it when the House meets again.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That was not a report made to this Government, and we have not got it, so far as I am aware.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not think it is beyond the power of the Government to get that report. It has been referred to in this House, and I think we should have it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not think that the rule to which my right hon. friend refers applies to the case in question, but I will give it consideration.

RESIGNATION OF SIR SAM HUGHES.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the correspondence between the Prime Minister and the late ex-Minister of Militia, which brought about the latter's resignation, be brought down?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It can be brought down.

Mr. MARCIL: It has not yet been brought down.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It has not.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved the second reading of Bill No. 13, to consolidate and amend the Railway Act.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE moved that the Bill be referred to a special committee composed of Messrs. Ames, Armstrong (Lambton), Bennett (Calgary), Blain, Cochrane, Carvell, Crothers, Cromwell, Donaldson, Fowler, Graham, Green, Lapointe, Lemieux, Macdonell, Maclean (York), McCurdy, Meighen, Murphy, Nesbitt, Oliver, Pugsley, Rainville, Reid, Sinclair and Turriff.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is it the intention to convene the committee during the recess, and if so what arrangements are being made in that regard? Shall we meet in the minister's office, or where?

Mr. COCHRANE: I think it would be a good plan to meet say a week before the 19th of April, so that the matter would be fresh in our minds when the House resumes. We will undertake to call the committee together a week before that date.

Sir HERBERT AMES: Who will undertake to call it?

Mr. COCHRANE: I will.

Mr. GERMAN: Will the minister state what this committee is to do?

Mr. COCHRANE: It will go over the Bill, and approve, or disapprove, of the clauses and consider any representations made by the railway companies or other people with

reference to it. It will consider the whole matter.

Mr. GERMAN: The minister does not suggest that the report of that committee will be binding on this House?

Mr. COCHRANE: No.

Mr. OLIVER: If the committee is expected to meet during the adjournment, it would not be possible for me to attend, and, therefore, if it is intended to take serious action during that period I shall have to ask to be released from the committee.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not think that that would be a good reason for the hon. gentleman's retirement from the committee. I am rather inclined to think that there will be difficulty in getting the committee convened. It may be easy to call the members together, but many are called, and few may come. As I understand it, this Bill is referred to a special committee instead of being referred directly to the House. That committee, of course, will have to bring its report to the House to be dealt with by the Committee of the Whole in the usual way.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There may be difficulty in accomplishing a large amount of work upon this Bill, but possibly something can be done by such of the members of the committee as can assemble from time to time during adjournment. Of course, on account of the very great distance at which many hon. gentlemen reside, it would be impossible, I suppose, to do more than fix a certain date at which the Bill might be taken up for a week or ten days. It might be impossible to have the committee meet at certain intervals, because the journey which some of the members would be called upon to undertake is too great, and the inconvenience also would be too great. Possibly the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) might be able to accede to the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that there should be a meeting say a week before the House re-assembles.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to disturb the arrangements; I only wish to make it clear that I would not be able to attend during the recess, and therefore, if there was an urgent reason for convening the full committee it would be better to release me, and appoint some other member.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The business on the Order Paper having been disposed of, I declare this sitting suspended until 5.15.

The House resumed at 5.15 p.m.

THE ROYAL ASSENT.

A message was delivered by Lieut.-Colonel Ernest J. Chambers, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, the House went up to the Senate.

And having returned,

The Speaker informed the House that the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General had been pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:

Bill No. 19, An Act to authorize the raising, by way of loan, of certain sums of money for the public service.

Bill No. 23, An Act to provide for further advances to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners.

Bill No. 20, An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial years ending respectively the 31st March, 1917, and the 31st March, 1918.

Bill No. 24, An Act for granting to His Majesty aid for military and naval defence.

IMPERIAL WAR CONFERENCE.

STATEMENT BY SIR ROBERT BORDEN.

Right Hon Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Perhaps the House will permit me before moving the adjournment, to depart from the usual custom and say a few words. I desire to express, in the first place, my appreciation of the consideration of hon. gentlemen, and especially of hon. gentlemen on the other side, in expediting the business of the House by reason of the necessity that I and some of my colleagues, should proceed overseas in the immediate future. As far as the call for that purpose concerned me, it seemed that one should consider it in the same way as if it were a call to the trenches. Therefore, putting aside all considerations of whatever character, I thought it my duty to obey it.

I realize, as I have said before, that the adjournment which has been agreed to and the arrangements necessary to bring about that adjournment within a suitable period entail some inconvenience upon hon. members of the House, but I know that considering the greatness of the cause which we all have at heart they will not be disposed to regard that inconvenience either as unnecessary or as undesirable.

We are facing in these days very great events. That might, indeed, be said of the whole period covered by the past two and a half years, but within the past eight or ten days events have been moving with even greater rapidity, and I trust, and more than that, I believe, that the trend of these events is for an earlier consummation of that issue towards which this country, in common with all the Empire, has directed its energies in no small way ever since the commencement of this war. Every reason that influenced the mind and the soul of the Canadian people when war was first declared prevails in ten-fold measure to-day. The renewal, in an intense form, of the submarine campaign with all the barbarous methods which accompany it, can only serve to steel our resolve. More than that, the sufferings and barbarities that have been inflicted on some of the smaller nations should serve to strengthen that determination. I am voicing an opinion in which I am sure my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will concur, when I say that the barbarities inflicted on the heroic Belgian people, in leading them into practical slavery by thousands, by tens of thousands, and even by hundreds of thousands, have shocked the conscience not only of the Allied nations but of the whole civilized world. It is fitting that we should at this moment and in this, if not in some more formal manner, raise our protest against such outrages and barbarities, which in the end can serve no good purpose even for the enemy nations, as they will but strengthen the determination of the British people and of all the Allied nations.

That brings me to the further thought that our own work in this war is by no means concluded. The Canadian people have done mighty things in this war. The splendour of their devotion, their resourcefulness, their determination, their valour and heroism on the field of battle, whether in attack or in defence, have placed Canada upon a status before the nations of the world to which none of us could have looked forward in August, 1914. Their effort has been a glorious one. But we have not yet attained to the authorized standard which was established in January a year ago, although we have made very considerable effort towards reaching that standard. The fact that nearly 180,000 men were enlisted in 1916, and that 165,000 of them went overseas in that year, constitutes in itself an achievement to which I believe few of us in August, 1914, could have looked forward. But, as I have said, the effort must not be stayed, because the purpose for which we have entered this war has not yet been accomplished. It may be that the war will yet be prolonged for a very considerable period. On the other hand, it may be that the end will come sooner than many of us now anticipate. As to all this, we cannot form even a conjecture which is based upon reliable grounds. But we do know that all the allied nations are united in the firm determination of which I have spoken, and we are all, I am sure, inspired with a just confidence that these efforts will not be in vain. All the sacrifices made, in blood and in treasure would indeed be vain, and worse than useless, if the great purpose for which the war was undertaken should not be accomplished. This is a war of nations, but more than that, it is a war of absolutely conflicting ideals; and unless the purpose for which it has been undertaken by the allied nations is accomplished, one could not look forward with reasonable confidence to a development of future civilization upon the principles of freedom and justice. The democracies of the world are on trial. So, I pray that we may, all, whether in this House or out of it, unite in the effort to throw the full strength of this country into the conflict. Appreciating, as I do, the co-operation of my hon. friends on the other side of the House in facilitating the passage of the Bill, the largest appropriation for one purpose that ever passed this Parliament, the largest for one purpose that is likely to pass this Parliament for many years to come, I most earnestly invite their continued co-operation, and the co-operation of all the people of this country, irrespective of political opinion, irrespective of race or creed, in the firm determination to make our cause triumphant, and for that purpose to throw into this war the greatest and strongest efforts of a united people. Once more, Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. friends on the other side of the House for their co-operation in the passing of this measure, and I trust that it may be made thoroughly to subserve the great purpose for which it has been framed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, in endeavouring to facilitate the business of the House, so that my right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) and his colleagues might proceed to London in answer to the invitation they have received, we do not claim to have done anything for which we

deserve thanks—we have only done what was our duty as members of this House and as Canadians

As regards the object of the war, I share the sentiments expressed by my right hon. friend. The course of this war, from the day when the neutrality of Belgium was cynically violated by Germany down to the present, and its latest developments, have shown the world, have satisfied everybody, that there can be but one end to the war, and that it must be carried to that end—such a victory over Germany that a recurrence of such an issue shall not be seen at least for generations to come.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden the House adjourned at 5.45 p.m., until Thursday the 19th day of April next.

Thursday, April 19, 1917.

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

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of Hon. Joseph Pierre Albert Sévigny, for the electoral district of Dorchester.

VACANCY.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have also the honour to inform the House that I have received a notification of a vacancy having occurred in the representation of the electoral district of Terrebonne by the death of Gédéon Rochon, Esquire, member for the said electoral district. I accordingly issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Hon. Joseph Pierre Albert Sévigny, member-elect for the electoral district of Dorchester, introduced by Rt. Hon. Sir George Foster and Hon. E. L. Patenaude.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 38, respecting certain patents of George C. Breidert and Burton W. Mudge—Mr. Macdonald.

Bill No. 39, respecting The Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company—Mr. T. J. Stewart.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report of Militia Council for the year ended March 31, 1916.—Sir Edward Kemp.

Report of the Board of Visitors, Royal Military College, Kingston, for the year 1916.—Sir Edward Kemp.

General orders promulgated to the Militia by the Minister of Militia and Defence in Militia Council, between December 30, 1915, and February 8, 1917.—Sir Edward Kemp.

Summary report of the Mines Branch of the Department of Mines for the year ended December 31, 1915.—Hon. Mr. Patenaude.

Eighth Annual Report of the Civil Service Commission of Canada for the year ended August 31, 1916.—Hon. Mr. Patenaude.

Annual report of the Department of Railways and Canals for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1916.—Hon. Mr. Cochrane.

Twelfth Annual Report of the Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1916.—Hon. Mr. Cochrane.

Telegraph statistics of the Dominion of Canada for the year ended June 30, 1916.—Hon. Mr. Cochrane.

Telephone statistics of the Dominion of Canada for the year ended June 30, 1916.—Hon. Mr. Cochrane.

Report of the Royal North West Mounted Police.—Sir George Foster.

Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1916—Parts 1 and 3.—Sir George Foster.

Auditor General's Report for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1916, volumes 1, 2, 3 and 4.—Sir Thomas White.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE moved:

That the resolution adopted by the House on the 7th February, 1917, referring to Bill No. 13, an Act to consolidate and amend the Railway Act, to a special committee (of twenty-six) members, be amended by adding thereto:

1. That Rule 11 be suspended in connection therewith;

2. That the quorum of the said Committee be of nine members;

3. That the said Committee be empowered to send for persons, papers and records, and to report from time to time; and have leave to sit while the House is in session; and also be authorized to have their proceedings and such evidence as may be taken, printed from day to day for the use of the Committee, and that Rule 74 be suspended in reference thereto; and

4. That the name "Kamouraska" be inserted immediately after the name "Lapointe".

Mr. GRAHAM: I am told that this is not really a consolidation of the Railway Act, but that it contains much new and important matter. I understand that the committee has not yet had a quorum and

has not made the recommendation embodied in the resolution. Would it not be wiser and more in accordance with the rules of the House for the minister to call his committee together and have it recommend that this resolution be submitted to the House?

Mr. COCHRANE: It was an oversight that this was not done when the committee was moved. The committee is called to meet to-morrow morning and it would help things along if this motion were allowed to pass.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would not suppose that much progress could be made by proceeding as suggested by the minister, because the ordinary notice of motion would have to be given before the rule could be suspended. I should like to make an inquiry as to a point raised by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), who was informally named as chairman in the absence of a quorum. He took the point that the appointment of the committee might be irregular, the rule providing that no committee of the House should consist of more than fifteen members unless by special leave of the House. I understood that the matter was to be looked into by the hon. Minister of Customs or by the hon. Minister of Railways. Has any decision been arrived at as to that point?

Mr. REID: I have not gone into the matter. I do not think that I agreed to look into it any more than any other member of the committee. I thought that perhaps the hon. member (Mr. Pugsley), knowing the rules of the House much better than I, would look into the matter and be able to say whether there was any irregularity. Personally, I do not agree with the interpretation of the rules by the hon. member for East Lambton.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is another point.

This committee is to consist of a joint committee of both Houses.

Mr. COCHRANE: No.

Mr. GRAHAM: I understood so.

Mr. REID: That was last year.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the hon. minister will look at Hansard he will find that that was to be the proceeding this year as well, in order to save time. That committee, therefore, will not be fully constituted if it meets before the Senate Committee joins with ours. It would be very much out of place for this House to say that its committee should sit while the House is in session until the Senate agrees to the same procedure.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Would it not be more respectful to the committee to sit and see whether or not the suggestion has been made? As the committee has been appointed by unanimous resolution of the House, I would understand that it is regularly appointed. No committee can be appointed to be composed of more than fifteen members, unless by special permission of the House, and this committee has been so appointed. The committee has not yet sat and, it seems to me these questions should be referred to it for its consideration. The meeting of the committee was called, but there was no quorum and so there has been no real sitting of the committee yet.

The SPEAKER: I am of the opinion that this resolution is of such character as to require unanimous consent for its adoption. In the absence of such consent it cannot properly be put at this stage.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is not unanimous consent?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No.

Motion stands.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

THETFORD MINES LABOUR TROUBLE.

Mr. VERVILLE: What were the names and occupations of the gentlemen sent to Thetford Mines to get information or to settle the labour trouble during last year?

Mr. CROTHERS: Stand.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This question has been standing since the 25th of January. When may we expect an answer?

Mr. CROTHERS: I can give a verbal answer now. I was not in the city on the 25th of January and I was not here until after the House rose, so my attention was not called to the question. Two gentlemen were sent; one was Mr. Archand who was at that time one of the fair-wage officers of the department, and the other was Mr. Blanchet, a barrister of Ottawa.

POTATO CONSIGNMENTS.

Mr. CHARLES WILSON:

1. Has the Government been informed that it is alleged a large quantity of potatoes have been kept in cars, since first of November, 1916, on some lines of Canadian Government or other railways in Canada, and that said potatoes were frozen or spoiled, consequently having to be thrown away and thus unavailable for consumption?

2. Has the Government received any complaints in the matter? If so, from whom?

Mr. PATENAUDE:

1. Under a joint agreement the Grand Trunk railway handles Intercolonial freight at Montreal, and on November 15, that company complained that a large number of Intercolonial railway cars of potatoes had accumulated in their Montreal yards. The Intercolonial railway authorities urged consignees as strongly as possible to take delivery, and finally were obliged to threaten to unload if consignees would not.

2. No complaint since that time. The Government has no further information on the subject.

CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS UNDER SECTION 21 OF THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

How many appointments have been made by the present Administration since they took office, under the provision of Section 21 of the Civil Service Act?

Mr. PATENAUDE: Certificates of Qualification issued by the commission since October 15, 1911, under the provisions of section 21 of the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908—174.

OUTLOOK PUBLISHING COMPANY.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

What amounts, if any, were paid to the Outlook Publishing Company, Limited, or to F. C. Cox, of Middleton, N.S., during the year 1916, for printing and advertising?

Mr. PATENAUDE: Agriculture Department, $24; Post Office Department, $7.60, Public Works Department, $6.20.

COST OF HANSARD.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE:

What has been the total cost of the Hansard yearly for the last three years, as to cost of staff, translation, printing and distribution respectively?

Mr. PATENAUDE:

Service	1914-1915	1915-1916	1916-1917	Total
Reporters	28,400 00	29,025 00	29,333 34	86,758 34
Translators	34,790 00	36,225 00	36,475 00	107,490 00
Extra Translators	1,358 35	245 50	1,918 50	3,522 35
Amanuenses	6,937 50	3,637 50	5,222 13	15,797 13
Express Charges	523 70	300 19	248 43	1,072 32
Analytical Index		1,500 00	1,650 00	3,150 00
				$ 217,790 14

It is impossible to give the cost of distribution as all parliamentary papers are distributed from the one office and the exact cost of Hansard cannot be given.

FOOD INSPECTORS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How many food inspectors are in the employ of the Canadian Government?

2. What was the total amount paid for remuneration of food inspectors in 1916?

3. How many new appointments were made in 1916?

Mr. PATENAUDE:

Agriculture: 1. 197 food inspectors (inspectors of meats, meat food products, canned fruits, vegetables and milk), appointed under the Meat and Canned Foods Act, are at the present time in the employ of the Department of Agriculture.

2. $254,729.95.

3. 42 new appointments were made in 1916, but of these 23 were made to replace officers who left the service during 1916.

Inland revenue: 1. 35.

2. $7,374.02.

3. 9 new appointments were made in 1916, but of these two were made to replace officers who left the service during 1916.

NORTH SYDNEY CUSTOMS SERVICE.

Mr. McKENZIE:

1. How many persons are employed in the customs service at the port of North Sydney?

2. What were the names, dates of appointments and respective salaries, on appointment of these persons?

3. Have any of these persons received any increase in salary since appointment?

4. If so, what are the names of the persons receiving increase and the respective amounts of said increases?

5. What amounts have been collected at the sait port of North Sydney during the years 1900 to 1916, inclusive?

Mr. REID:

1. Ten—one of whom is absent on active military service.

Name.	Date of first employment.	Date of perm. appointment.	Sal. at date first employment.	Overtime 1915-16.	Present salary 1916-17 besides overtime.
Jos McPherson	‡Aug. 17/99	Aug. 17/99	$1,000	$295 30	$1,600
J. L. Brennan	May 31/13	Aug. 29/14	800	93 60	§
David Edwards	June 5/12	April 1/13	800	292 80	900
J. H. Cameron	Jan. 14/13	Aug. 29/14	1,200	.....	1,200
F. E. Jackson	March 4/12	April 1/13	800	308 10	1,000
John Cogan	May 18/14	April 19/15	800	281 10	800
J. J. McDonald	Aug. 30/97	Nov. 1/98	300	284 10	800
H. W. McNeil	Oct. 9/15	.....	900	124 20	900
Jas. McLeod	April 29/07	Aug. 1/11	600	.....	800
Angus Young	April 17/13	Aug. 29/14	900	499 50	1,000

‡ Received $355.25 from other departments 1915-16.
§ Absent on Active Military Service without pay.

3. Yes.

Jos. McPherson, $100, September 1, 1904; $200, April 1, 1907; $100, April 1, 1910; $100, April 1, 1911.

T. L. Brennan, $100, September 1, 1913; $50, April 1, 1914.

David Edwards, $50, April 1, 1913; $50, April 1, 1914.

F. E. Jackson, $50, April 1, 1913; $50, January 1, 1914; $100, April 1, 1914.

J. J. McDonald, $50, July 1, 1900; $100, July 1, 1901; $50, July 1, 1904; $100, April 1, 1907; $50, April 1, 1908; $50, April 1, 1909; $50, April 1, 1910; $50, April 1, 1911.

Jas. McLeod, $50, April 1, 1908; $50, April 1, 1910; $50, April 1, 1911; $50, April 1, 1913.

Angus Young, $100, April 1, 1914.

Customs Revenue: Fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, $16,459.03; June 30, 1901, $25,946.43; June 30, 1902, $25,381.09; June 30, 1903, $65,204.58; June 30, 1904, $77,211.77; June 30, 1905, $32,250.64; June 30, 1906, $40,562.58; March 31, 1907, $29,557.43; (9 mos.); March 31, 1908, $53,385.33; March 31, 1909, $41,205.99; March 31, 1910, $47,686.95; March 31, 1911, $77,013.98; March 31, 1912, $93,860.27; March 31, 1913, $98,398.13; March 31, 1914, $92,807.13; March 31, 1915, $71,632.94 March 31, 1916, 66,460.66.

PENSION COMMISSIONER'S STAFF.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. What are the names of those who compose the Pensions Commissioners' Staff of Canada?
2. What is the salary of each commissioner?
3. Where are their offices?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. Lieut. J. K. L. Ross, Chairman of the Commission; Col. R. H. Labatt, Commissioner; Major J. L. Todd, Commissioner.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

2. $5,000 each per annum (Lieut. J. K. L. Ross gives his services without remuneration).

3. Head Office, Union Bank Building, Ottawa; District Offices situated at Montreal, Toronto, London, Ont., Winnipeg, Regina, Calgary, Edmonton and Vancouver.

ABBOTSFORD POSTMASTER.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

What is the salary of the Postmaster of Abbotsford, in the County of Rouville?

Mr. PATENAUDE:

Salary, $343; rent, $40; total, $383.

ROUVILLE COUNTY MAIL CARRIER.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. What is the name of the party carrying the mail between the Post Office of Abbotsford, in the County of Rouville, and the Canadian Pacific station?
2. What is his salary?

Mr. PATENAUDE:

1. Azarias Maynard.

2. He is paid a contract price of $199 per annum.

MR. H. B. TREMAIN, M.P.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Is Mr. H. B. Tremain, M.P. for Hants, N.S., in the military service of this Government or of the Imperial Government?
2. If in the Canadian military service, what is his position and what are his duties, and has he received or does he receive pay or allowances, salary or expenses in connection with the same?
3. If so, what amount has been paid him on such accounts?

4. If in such military employment, does he receive allowances for servants? If so, for how many?

5. If in military service during the last year, has he drawn sessional indemnity as member of Parliament? If so, what amount?

Mr. KEMP:

1. Lieut.-Colonel H. B. Tremain is in the military service of the Government of Canada.

1. Lieut.-Colonel Tremain is attached to the staff of the Overseas Minister and is performing general secretary duties. He is in receipt of the following daily pay and allowances of his rank: Pay, $5; field allowance, $1.25; messing allowance, $1; London subsistence allowance, $2.

3. $2,575.25.

4. No.

5. Yes.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

1. What are the names of the members of Parliament who now belong, or who did belong to the Overseas Forces or the Militia Forces of Canada since the present war was declared?

2. Were, or are, these members, or any of them, in receipt of pay from the Militia Department and in receipt of their indemnity as members at the same time?

3. Were, or are, the wives of these members, or any of them, in receipt of separation allowance?

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. What amounts have been given to the Canadian Patriotic Fund to December 31, 1916, and what amounts have been promised for 1917, by the different counties, towns and cities in each of the different provinces?

2. What are the names of the different counties, towns and cities, and the respective amounts subscribed and promised by each?

3. What counties, cities and towns in each province, if any, have not contributed any amount to the said fund up to the present time?

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. How much money has been subscribed and voted to the Canadian Patriotic Fund by each of the different provinces to December 31, 1916?

2. How much money has been paid to the Canadian Patriotic Fund by each of the different provinces during the same time?

3. How much money has been promised by county, township, city or other grants by each province for the year 1917?

4. How many persons in each province have received assistance from the Canadian Patriotic Fund to December 31, 1916?

5. What was the total amount so expended in each province?

Mr. MACNUTT:

1. Is the Government aware as to whether there are cases in the Military Service in which men after enlistment have been given leave on harvesting furlough, and during such leave have been injured by accident, and who have in consequence of such accident incurred hospital bills, and who having been treated in hospital have returned to military duty and been discharged on account of injuries so received?

2. If so, have claims been made for hospital care and treatment?

3. Have such claims been recognized by the Government?

4. If not, why not?

5. If so, what action has been taken in connection therewith?

6. In such cases is not the enlisted person entitled to pay up to time of discharge, and also the payment of his hospital account?

DEATH OF HER ROYAL HIGHNESS THE DUCHESS OF CONNAUGHT. EXPRESSIONS OF SYMPATHY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER: I should like to call the attention of the House briefly, and I hope fittingly, to a sad event which has occurred since the House adjourned. I allude to the death of Her Royal Highness the Duchess of Connaught, who passed away on the 14th of March at Clarence House in London after a brief illness. I very well remember the beautiful autumn day on which His Royal Highness and the Duchess of Connaught made their entry into the capital city of the Dominion, passing along in front of the old Parliament Building, and on to their new home farther down on the banks of the Ottawa. Her Royal Highness was by person entirely unknown to us at that time, but she was heartily welcomed as the consort of the soldier son of the well beloved Queen Victoria. As the wife of a soldier whom she accompanied on his journeyings around the Empire she became known to all, and her grace and dignity endeared her to the hearts of British subjects the wide world over. Her Royal Highness soon entered into the life of Canada, quietly but with zest. Canadian sports and social activities attracted her attention, and participation. Local charities, and the wider charities of the provinces and of the Dominion claimed her devotion. In all of these she participated unobtrusively, kindly, and effectively. The war brought about a situation very trying to Her Royal Highness, in that the land of her birth was involved in hostility to the land of her adoption. Her Royal High-

ness ably seconded the untiring efforts of the Duke of Connaught in everything that had for its object the welfare and comfort of the soldier, whether in Canada or at the front, and more particularly those whose lot it was, in the fortunes of war, to become prisoners in a hostile country. Great charities were inaugurated or helped by Her Royal Highness, and which, owing to her strong sympathy and tactful manner, were crowned with success. On leaving Canada in October, 1916, after a sojourn here of almost five years, she continued to go about doing good in London and its vicinity, the soldiers chiefly being the object of solicitude, and more particularly those from the country of her five years' sojourn. She has passed away, but not from our memories. Her singular directness of manner, her innate kindness, the personal touch which she seemed to give to her acquaintanceship and her friendships, remain with us. When the news of her death came across the ocean it left us all with a sense of personal loss. I think I may take it upon myself to say that I am voicing the opinion of this Parliament and of the people of Canada in asking this House to convey to His Royal Highness and to the family so sadly bereaved our deepest and most heartfelt sympathy.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, the members of the House of Commons will, I am sure, avail themselves of this, the first opportunity at their disposal, to express their deep sense of reverence for the memory of the noble lady who for five years was associated with the life of this country. Every word that has fallen from the lips of my right hon. friend is true to the very letter. The memory of Her Royal Highness will ever be cherished by the Canadian people, who had learned to appreciate her many noble qualities. As has been observed by my right hon. friend, Her Royal Highness was of a retiring and unobtrusive disposition. The duties of her office, whether public or private, she carried out in a most admirable manner, never sparing herself so far as her health would permit. Notwithstanding her ill health, which prevented her during her residence in Canada from participating to the extent she would wish in philanthropic and social duties, the people of Canada had opportunity to appreciate to some extent her kindness of heart and her beneficence. It was her fate, as has been observed by my right hon. friend, to have the last years of her life saddened by this terrible war between two countries to which she was bound by such close ties. It is written that a daughter will leave the house of her father to follow her husband. This Her Royal Highness did. When she wedded a son of Queen Victoria she was not only wedded to the life of her husband but also to his country. No one within the wide range of the British Empire could suffer more than she, the agony that has resulted from this war. Her heart ever beat true to the cause of her adopted country. I hope that our expression of to-day will convey to her husband and to her children some consolation in the knowledge that her memory will ever endure in the hearts of the people of Canada.

DECLARATION OF WAR BY THE UNITED STATES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Acting Prime Minister): I wish Mr. Speaker to allude to an event of very great importance, namely, the entrance of the United States of America into the war which for nearly three years now has plagued the world and has raged with unexampled destructiveness. Yesterday the British Parliament passed a resolution affirming their appreciation and gratefully recognizing the fact that at this supreme juncture the United States had elected to take its place on the side of the Allies, in vindication of the cause of right, and justice, and freedom for which the Allies have so long been fighting. While there are many considerations which attach to such action by the United States when its President made his memorable address on the second of April, there are some which make it peculiarly important and peculiarly fateful. The United States, for a hundred years and more, by its traditions and its practice had kept almost completely aloof from European wars and contentions. It had enjoyed for a century uninterrupted peace with outside powers of great strength. It had successfully passed through a period of internal struggle, the greatest which ever fell to the lot of a nation. The result of that struggle was to reaffirm freedom; and in the succeeding years the North and the South, at one time rent apart by this internal war, had been welded together in peace, concord, and union. The country's traditions, its history, its pacific pursuits, its geographical position, the allocation of its popu-

lation with so many millions dwelling at a distance from the sea-coast and far from the menace or the allurements of possible warfare, had bred in its people a spirit of antagonism to war itself, and particularly to war in which the territorial possessions or the general rights of the nation were not attacked or infringed upon. When the German hordes smashed through Belgium defying its guaranteed immunity from invasion, a sentiment was violated which was possibly as strong in the United States of America as in any other country. The developments of the war, from the first outbreak until it included virtually the whole world, involved in many cases the defiance of principles of international action and of humanitarianism which were held dear by the people of the United States. Yet for two years and a half that nation maintained its position of neutrality, maintained it honestly, maintained it thoroughly, even under conditions of great provocation and difficulty. The United States had no territory to gain by entering into the war, it had no selfish motives so far as power territorial or political was concerned. It stood as a great neutral power, carefully noting the trend and development of the war; protesting on one side and on the other at the violation or infringement of rights. But at last the nation came to the conclusion that it could no longer remain neutral, and it felt compelled to throw its weight of one hundred millions of peace-loving, liberty-loving, democratic people with the cause of the Allies.

To my mind, outside of any armies which the United States may gather, drill, and send to a fighting front; outside of any aid which can be given by her fleet, now large and capable of being made much larger and more powerful; outside of any strength which she may bring to this contest by virtue of her resources, the supremest effect of the entrance of the United States into this war is that in the gradual clarifying of the issues she came to the conclusion that the moral and international sanctions were against the Germans and in favour of the Allies. It is something when such a nation, trying by every possible means to avoid entrance upon the arena, finds itself at last compelled by virtue of its high traditions of morality, humanitarianism and regard for international rights, to come to the conclusion that it can stay out no longer, but must throw its sword into the scale in favour of democracy, of justice, and of the liberties of small nations. That, to my mind, is the greatest factor which the entrance of the United States imports into this contest, and history, I believe, will so record it.

As was voiced yesterday in the Mother of Parliaments, in both branches, the United States brings at once, by the position she has taken, a wealth of and a quickly utilizable power of resource, which is of immense benefit to the allied forces in this war against Germany. I think sometimes we can easily make the mistake of not properly understanding and adequately weighing the immense drain upon the warring nations in blood and resources during the last two years and eight months. France stood to her trenches week after week, month after month, year after year, to beat back the millions of her enemies who already had desecrated and destroyed one-tenth of her territory and were seeking to wreak upon the other nine-tenths the same vengeance and destruction. France did not do that without the shedding of blood almost without parallel, without a drain upon her resources of moral and human fibre that cannot be calculated and which cannot be portrayed by pencil or by tongue. If that be true in reference to France, it is measureably true with the other warring nations and allies. Great Britain herself, who has taken a tremendous part in this contest both by sea and by land, who has borne the brunt of practically the whole of the burden by sea, has within two years made out of her peace-loving citizens, an army that in number, in calibre, in courage and in skill in armed warfare, has never been surpassed by the soldiers of any nation however long they may have been trained and drilled in the exercises of war. Great Britain has felt the drain, and felt the drain in a way which we, who are so far distant from the scene of action, find it difficult to have adequate conception of.

Leaving that argument to apply to all the forces which have been in this war for these two years and eight months, what an immense thing it is that new resources, virgin and untouched, new resources in material and new resources in men, come now upon the theatre of this contest to take their vital and strong part in the ultimate decision that has been so long and so destructively fought for on all the fronts in this war.

It not only imparts courage to the soldiers who have been long warring, but it gives actual sustenance, food, munitions and support in a way in which these things were not given before at a time when they

are badly needed, and in the way of finance itself—moneys which make it possible for Russia, Italy, France, if not for Great Britain herself, to go forward in the remaining months of the war with a feeling of confidence and trust that financial resources will not be failing them, and that in these last decisive months of the war what the United States has to give in that respect will be to a large extent determining factors in the result that shall be attained.

If we come down to the actual forces now in the field, Great Britain's experience is rich and ripe and will be availed of. Great Britain sent her whole standing army in the early part of the war into France. The men who were the fighters in the ranks were the officers and trainers of the fighters who took part in the gallant contests in France and Belgium which ultimately resulted in the victory of the Marne, suffered a great depletion in their ranks. There was not only the loss of actual numbers, but the loss as well of those officers and trained men who were fitted for training the soldiers to take the vacant places in the depleted ranks of that first British army. The United States to-day could possibly send a good, well-organized little army to the front, but if they did they would deprive themselves of those very factors which are necessary to the early and complete training of that large army which in the end might be effective. So that, we come down to the conclusion that, with all the wisdom that has been gained from the past, and having regard to all the necessities of the situation, a large army from the United States cannot find its way to the battle front for eight, or nine, or twelve months at the very least. But, even though that be so, that might be the very time at which the coming of a new, fresh army of a million or two million might be the deciding factor in the war.

We do not know when this war shall cease. It is endless, its lengthening out has paralyzed the thought and conception of all men who thought about it and its possible time of conclusion. Three months —six months we said; nine months, a year, we said; and yet two years and eight months have passed their long, dreary and sanguinary length and there is no man who can tell how long this gigantic struggle may yet last. If it turns out that this war, holding all these different points of vantage, works its weary length along for another year, with the increasing exhaustion of the Allies and enemy forces, then the importation of a fresh, virile force of a million or two millions of men spells absolute victory for the side upon which it fights and absolute defeat for the side against which it fights. I think it was Count Reventlow, who, after two years of cogitation, in a sentence or two, placed the issue between the two parties pretty accurately when he said: There is a necessity for victory for Germany or it will spell the downfall of the German monarchy. That is really the clarified issue to-day—the democracies of the world are at war with the autocratic bureaus and kaisers of the world and the ultimate grinding down of the whole issue must be this: That in Germany the people must rule, and only by a victory of the Allies does it seem possible that the results which we are fighting for can be won.

The United States entered upon this undertaking not yet a month ago and with characteristic energy it is preparing in a scientific and energetic way. It has the wide and sometimes bitter, experience of the nations which have been warring from which to get its information so that it may avoid the mistakes, and at the same time avail of those things which have been most effective. The United States having entered into this war, and living up to the declaration of its president, will without doubt carry out the work to which it has set itself with the same characteristic energy and, we trust, with the same success as has characterized the efforts of the other allied nations. To us who live here, along a border of 4,000 miles, neighbours in peace for a hundred years now with the people to the south of us, it is very gratifying that our neighbours, with whom we are upon such good terms and with whom we have so much to do, have agreed with us in our conception of the rights of the issues in this warfare and have now joined with us, and with the other defenders of those rights, in pushing the war to a successful conclusion and in bringing about an era when the democracies of the world shall enjoy the freedom and peace to which they are entitled.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, the entrance of the United States into this world-wide war introduces a new chapter not only into the history of the United States itself, but into the history of the world. If, in the month of August 1914, any citizen of the United States had ventured to predict that in this conflict the United States itself would take

a part, that man, at that time, would not have been taken seriously. Many people indeed outside of the United States, and perhaps also within the United States, were sorry, when the neutrality of Belgium was invaded, that the United States did not raise its powerful voice to at least protest against that outrage. But such a course of action would not have been in accordance with the traditions of the Republic. The founders of the American nation had hoped, and indeed they in solemn terms warned their people, that they should forever keep away from the conflicts of Europe. They had hoped that the young nation which had just had its birth, would initiate a new civilization which would furnish an example to the rest of the world, and that as far as they were concerned they would live at peace with every nation. But, they had counted without regard to the march of events, the discoveries of science, the facilities of locomotion and communication which have brought the nations of the earth very close to one another. The principle has at last found expression in the United States itself that no nation which pretends to be civilized can keep outside the pale of civilization, that there is a solidarity amongst all nations and that the law of might against right cannot go unchallenged. Therefore, they have thrown their sword into the balance.

Some people, in fact many people, have found fault with what they called the hesitation of the President. We in this House and in this country do not share those views. President Wilson has acted with great caution; he has acted with great prudence; but at the same time he has always maintained high ideals of the civilization of the world. He had to contend not only with the German element in the population of the Republic, but also with the great body of pacifists who hoped against all hope that they would forever keep their country free from the bane of war. But by the course he has pursued the President has at last brought the whole of the American people, almost without exception, to stand behind him in support of the cause of the Allies. No more than this could be expected from that nation. I share in everything that has been said by my right hon. friend (Sir George Foster).

We do not know when this war will end. We all hope that it will end even before the American Army is called upon to fight. If it is called upon to fight, then there can be no doubt as to the issue. But we hope that the issue will be decided even before the armies of the United States cross the sea, and that the weight of their moral action alone will be a decisive factor in favour of victory. We, more than any other part of the British Empire, more than any other part of the civilized world, are interested in the action which has just been taken by the United States. We share with them this continent. We hope that henceforth, as a result of this war, the solidarity of the nations will be established; not only that the solidarity of nations will be established but that the brotherhood of man will be the basis of the future relationships of the world. Let us hope that this brotherhood of man with man will commence in our relationship with the United States. There were some men amongst us who were afraid of too close relations with the United States. We have no such fear on one side of the House at all events, and I am glad to say that now there is not much fear on the other side either. My hon. friends on the other side now realize that there are no dregs in the cup of freedom, that it is wholesome to the last drop. Free wheat has come about as the result of the present situation. I shall not dilate upon this point, it may come up for discussion later on; but upon the present occasion I join my voice most gladly in everything that has been said by my right hon. friend.

4 p.m.

MR. BALFOUR AND GENERAL JOFFRE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would the Acting Prime Minister inform us if the report in the press of this morning is true, that the Right Hon. Mr. Balfour and General Joffre are to be officially invited by the Government to visit Canada?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not know the source of my hon. friend's information

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Ottawa morning papers.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I shall be better able to answer that question in the course of a day or two than at present. In the meantime, my hon. friend may rest assured that it would be a source of the greatest possible satisfaction to us if we could prevail upon Mr. Balfour and his distinguished colleagues on that Commission, when they have come to this side of the water, to pay Canada a visit.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is this other consideration, that it is a wonderful thing that such men in such positions could have taken the time to have crossed the Atlantic—to say nothing of the perils of the crossing—out of the midst of the business of this war, and it is very likely that they will want to get back again just as quickly as their most urgent business will permit.

LABOUR STRIKE IN WESTERN MINES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): The Minister of Labour to-day referred to the fact that previous to the adjournment of the House in February he had been absent from the House for some time in connection with labour matters in the West; and the House will recall that the Premier announced that on his return the minister would give to the House a statement as to what he had done in the West in regard to adjusting the difficulties which had arisen in connection with the mining situation there. I understand that while in the West the minister made some arrangement of a character which assured the temporary resumption of work by the men; but I see the following dispatch in yesterday's paper:

> Calgary, April 17.—The coal miners of nearly every mine of the district are out on strike because of the delay in the settlement of the men's affairs.
>
> The ranks of idle miners were augmented this morning by the other places in the Crow's Nest Pass country going out.
>
> The miners now out are at Michel, Blairmore, Canmore, Hillcrest, Bellevue, and Frank.
>
> Those at Drumheller also are out, but the difficulty in the latter company is of a different nature.

The minister is well aware that this subject is of very great importance and is regarded as such not only by the men interested but by labour everywhere. I would ask the minister to give to the House a statement such as was promised by the Prime Minister.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): Labour disturbances in mining industries are perhaps more numerous and more serious the world over than in any other. The reason of that, I think, is not very far to seek, although I do not purpose at the present time to discuss that subject. That has been our experience in Canada.

Eight or nine years ago we had, in the province of my hon. friend who has just spoken, a cessation of work amongst miners for a period of twenty-two months. During that time there was much public disorder and it was found expedient to call out the militia in order to restore and maintain order.

We had serious disturbance in the western coal fields in 1903, 1906 and 1907, and it was with the view of preventing such disturbances in the mining industry that the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act was passed. It can hardly be said that the Act has been a success so far as mining operations are concerned; it has been more successful in other lines of industry. Neither the operators nor the miners in Western Canada have paid any attention whatever to the Act, nor has any attempt been made, so far as I am aware, to enforce its provisions. I believe that it was applied to one of the disturbances there in 1907, but the finding of the Board was ignored by the miners. There was another strike there in 1909, and the most serious one, which lasted about eight months, was in the year 1911. In the autumn of that year the strike was ended by an agreement made between the Western Coal Operators' Association and the members of the United Mine Workers of America in District No. 18, covering the southeastern part of British Columbia and the southwestern part of Alberta. That agreement, which was to continue for three years from the 31st of the following March, provided for the adjustment of any strike conditions that might arise during that period, and it worked surprisingly well. Before the end of that period, namely, March 1915, a new agreement was entered into, to continue for two years from March 31, 1915, containing somewhat similar provisions for the adjustment of conditions in the meantime. That worked very satisfactorily until July last, and I was very much gratified in the feeling that we were to have no more serious labor troubles in that western mining district. But in July of last year the miners, probably influenced by a war bonus that had been given to miners in Wales after the outbreak of the war, demanded, in addition to the wages and conditions of labour set forth in the then current agreement, a war bonus of ten per cent on their wages. The operators were reluctant—and I may add that I myself was reluctant—to take any part in a departure from an agreement deliberately entered into. However, it was said on behalf of the

miners that they would no longer adhere to the provisions of that agreement, and that unless their demands were met, they would cease work. The operators finally, in substance, conceded the payment of a war bonus of about 10 per cent. It was not put just in that way; the bonus was arranged on a sliding scale of from 5 to 12½ per cent, according to the class of worker, and averaging 7½ or 8 per cent. A supplementary agreement to this effect was made on the 16th of August last, the current agreement in all other respects to remain in force until April 1 of this year. In less than three months after that, on November 11, another demand was made for an increase of twenty-five per cent—a second war bonus. Or, putting it another way, the men said that unless an inquiry were made as to the advance in the cost of living and a war bonus equivalent to that advance paid, they would all quit work on November 25. Well, it was a very serious condition of affairs. Winter was coming on; the farmers on the plains required coal; the railways required coal and the smelters required coal and coke. As hon. gentlemen know, the smelters are manufacturing copper, zinc and lead, which are essential to the manufacture of shells. The cessation of work in district No. 18, therefore, would mean suffering on the part of farmers on the plains, the holding up of railway operations and, worse, the cessation of the output of those ingredients absolutely essential to the manufacture of shells. Two or three of the representatives of the miners came to Ottawa at our request, and while they were here or on their way, the men went out on strike. Then we undertook to make an inquiry concerning the high cost of living. An officer of the department satisfactory to both parties was appointed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Who?

Mr. CROTHERS: Mr. Harrison, fair wage officer, whose headquarters are at Calgary. He did not complete the inquiry until some time in January, when the operators refused to contribute any money towards this increase in the cost of living. The immediate conditions were worse, in a sense, than they had been in November. I went out in the latter part of January, when the thermometer registered 48 degrees below zero. Intense suffering would follow if these coal mines were closed up. Hon. gentlemen know that the domestic coal used in the West does not endure for any length of time unless it is very carefully stored; it disintegrates, slackens and becomes useless. Generally speaking, no large stocks of coal, therefore, are kept on hand for domestic purposes, and the closing of these mines for a few days would mean great suffering. The operators refused to do anything. It was found by the Commissioner that the increase in the cost of living was equivalent to $1.75 a week in wages. In order that the mines might be continued, I undertook that we would check up the amount that would be payable to these miners at the rate of $1.75 per week from and after the 15th of November until the 4th of February, and that we would advance that amount in the first instance and take our chances of getting it back from the larger consumers, several of whom had undertaken to pay, for the coal shipped to them during that period, a sum equivalent to this $1.75 in addition to the price that they had arranged to pay for it. The operators undertook to pay that $1.75 per week from and after the 3rd of February until the 1st of April when the current agreement would expire. This agreement provides that thirty days before its expiration, which would be the 31st of March, the operators and the representatives of the miners should meet together and endeavour to negotiate a new agreement to become effective on the first of April, this proviso being intended to prevent a cessation of work at the end of the period covered by the agreement, as had occurred three or four times previously. A conference was held at Calgary early in March, but the operators felt that the new demands made by the miners were so great that there was no probability of any understanding being reached. I went out there and spent nine days with them, and two weeks ago last Monday I succeeded in inducing them to appoint a sub-committee of four representatives of the operators and four representatives of the miners, which sub-committee has been in session ever since. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has referred to some of the mines in which the men have gone out on strike. My advice is that they have done so as their protest against the protracted negotiations going on at Calgary. They have got the impression that the operators and the miners should have reached a conclusion earlier. The last word I received in regard to the matter was from my officer at Calgary who said it was expected that the joint conference of operators and miners would to-day report a conclusion reached by this sub-committee. I have no doubt the conclusion will be accepted by the operators, but it will have to be submitted

to the miners of the different mines throughout that district for their approval. If, as is anticipated, an agreement is reached to the satisfaction of the gentlemen representing the miners, I am confident that they will induce the miners to accept it and that there will be no further trouble.

Mr. MACDONALD: How much money has the Government paid out in consequence of the undertaking given by the minister to make up this difference in regard to the cost of living? Has the Minister received from the parties who have got the coal anything to compensate the Government for the disbursement, and if so, how much?

Mr. CROTHERS: It has been a very slow process to get the reports as to the quantities that have been shipped to different people, but the amount paid out by the Government is about $92,000, and I believe that we shall receive every dollar of it.

Mr. MACDONALD: How much have you received now?

Mr. CROTHERS: We have not received any. The time has not arrived for its return. The other day I wrote to the president of a company in the United States which had received 41,000 tons from one mine, pointing out to him the arrangement that had been made and telling him that we expected his company to contribute. I was very much gratified at his prompt reply: "Certainly, we will contribute whatever is said to be right." It was thought that contributions should be 25 cents per ton, and that is what I believe the operators have added to their prices from and after the 3rd of February to cover the payment of $1.75 per week. Three or four of the larger consumers agreed to contribute before we undertook to advance the money, so that I do not think the Government will lose a dollar in the matter.

Mr. MACDONALD: Was the payment provided for by a special Order in Council, and, if so, would the minister bring down the Order in Council and any other papers relating to the matter?

Mr. CROTHERS: The money was advanced under the authority of an Order in Council, and I shall be glad to bring it down.

Mr. OLIVER: Would the minister say if the conference sitting at Calgary has relation to the domestic coal mines or to the steam coal mines?

[Mr. Crothers.]

Mr. CROTHERS: It has relation to all the mines, the lignite mines as well as the bituminous mines, to all the members of the association operating in District 18, or about twenty mines.

Mr. OLIVER: Is it the domestic miners that are making trouble or the steam coal miners?

Mr. CROTHERS: Most of the domestic coal is produced at the Galt mine at Lethbridge, and the men there are working. There is another mine at Bankhead, where domestic coal is produced chiefly, and the men there are also working. I do not think that lignite coal is produced at any of the mines where the men are out at the present time.

Mr. OLIVER: The position is that it is not the domestic coal mines, the mines upon which the prairie farmer or dweller depends for his coal, that are being shut down.

Mr. CROTHERS: Not at the present time.

Mr. OLIVER: It is the mines that provide the steam and smelting coal.

Mr. CROTHERS: But they were all involved last winter. They all belong to the same association. I am not sure that any of the mines producing lignite coal are shut down, but I rather think not.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Mr. Speaker, this discussion is all more or less in violation of the rules of the House, and I do not wish to aggravate that condition, but I hope the House will pardon me for saying, in connection with this discussion, that I was yesterday in conference with representatives of the mining industries of Cobalt and Porcupine and the adjacent camps, and they feel that trouble is coming in that quarter, their view, and probably that of a large number of the people of this country, being that labour strikes in connection with mining ought in a time of war to be dealt with under the War Measures Act, if we have one, in the way that similar strikes have been dealt with in England. Such strikes have been anticipated there in this way, and as a consequence they have not occurred. We ought to find a way, in the state of war that obtains in Canada to-day, of approaching these mining labour troubles before they reach a head and if possible preventing a strike occurring. It is not a hard thing to do. The War Measures method must be adopted by Parliament and this Government in connection with the failure of our railways to deliver coal and

freight of other kind to our cities, in particular to the manufacturing cities of Ontario.

Mr. CROTHERS: In reply to my hon. friend, I would say that no other country in the world that I am aware of has had so few labour troubles as Canada has had in the last few years. Australia is sometimes referred to. Last year, with only two-thirds of our population, they had four times the number of strikes we had, and so with the United States and with England. Things are not just as we would like to have them in Canada in this respect, but our wage-earners have shown up well in the matter of freedom from strikes.

RAILWAY SERVICE BETWEEN MURRAY BAY AND STE. ANNE DE BEAUPRE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I am sorry that the Minister of Railways has left the House, but perhaps some other member of the Government will bring to his attention the question I desire to ask. It was reported a few days ago that the branch line of the Intercolonial from Rivière Ouelle would be discontinued and a new service inaugurated on the north shore of the river between Murray Bay and Ste. Anne de Beaupré, running through Ste. Irenes to Ste. Anne de Beaupré and connecting up with the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix railway. One report said that the rails of this branch line had already been carried over to the other side to be used on the Quebec and Saguenay line. I sent a telegram to the Minister of Railways, and another to the Minister of Inland Revenue, whom I am happy to see in the House, and four days later the Minister of Inland Revenue informed me that the report was erroneous and without foundation. But since that time the new service has practically been advertised in the ministerial papers of the province. Yesterday, in La Patrie, of Montreal, the fare between Murray Bay and Quebec was announced. I think the people of the district are entitled to know the intention of the Government in this matter.

Mr. REID: The Minister of Railways is out of the chamber at the moment, but I shall see him directly, and will give my hon. friend the information he desires to-morrow.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would ask that the information be made public, because many people are interested in this service. In addition to what my hon. friend from Kamouraska has pointed out, there is a large colony of Americans, who come up every year to spend the summer at Murray Bay and in the neighbouring district, who would be very much inconvenienced if they were deprived of this valuable service.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: They will be soldiering this summer.

SUPPLY.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I would point out that according to Rule 17 (c) the House has no Supply ready to take to-day. I would not make any objection because we might take Civil Government Estimates as we have done before, but as we got the Auditor General's Report only the other day, we are not in a position to take Civil Government Estimates now.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is Civil Government that we propose to go on with, if my right hon. friend has no objection.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I would suggest that we take it up to-morrow. I will raise no objection then.

PROPOSED ABOLITION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

The House again proceeded to consideration of the motion of Mr. R. Bickerdike (Montreal, St. Lawrence) for the second reading of Bill No. 3, to amend the Criminal Code and to abolish capital punishment.

He said: Since the House adjourned there have been a number of occurrences bearing on this question, one of the most important of which is the fact that Russia in the last week of the month of March abolished capital punishment, and I hope that this Parliament will at an early date pass a resolution congratulating them on having abolished not only capital punishment, but also the Romanoff dynasty. Another important occurrence was the sentencing to death of a young boy of sixteen in Manitoba. I did not think it was possible to find in this country a judge or a jury that would condemn a child to be hanged. However, such is the case. This boy is to be hanged on the 15th of May. A large number of petitions have been circulated throughout the country asking for clemency, not only to save the life of this young boy, but to save this young nation

from the everlasting disgrace of hanging a child of sixteen. If there is one thing on which we all are agreed it is the fact that women and children should be exempt from hanging in Canada. We have had several mass meetings in different places in the province of Quebec, one in Montreal and another in Sherbrooke, and with the permission of the House I shall read the following resolution, which was passed at a meeting of the citizens of Montreal, held in the Windsor Hall on Monday evening, April 2, 1917, and which is identical with the resolutions passed at the other meetings:

BE IT RESOLVED, That whereas there now lies within the Dominion of Canada a young lad of sixteen under the condemnation of death and whose father is at the present moment fighting with his regiment in the British army in France in defence of the Empire; and

WHEREAS this meeting has heard read a petition addressed to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada praying for the commutation of his sentence of death to one of imprisonment:

BE IT RESOLVED that it is the sense of this meeting that the infliction of the death penalty is contrary to the dictates of civilization and Christianity, and we hereby protest against the proposed hanging of this young boy of the tender years of sixteen and which we consider would be a blot on the fair name of the Dominion of Canada;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that copies of this resolution be forwarded to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada and all members of the Dominion Parliament.

If we cannot all agree that capital punishment should be abolished entirely at this time, we can surely all agree that the day has gone by for hanging women and children. And I hope that every member of this House will have an opportunity to declare by his vote whether he is in favour of hanging this boy or not.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does the hon. gentleman object to shooting?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I do.

Mr. BURNHAM: Then, he must object to the war?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I do.

Mr. BURNHAM: Gracious, this is terrible.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: If I had to shoot the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burnham) I would, as the Irishman says, only wing him, not kill him.

When the House adjourned on January 31st, I was about to say that in the early days I had had my attention called to the brutal and inhuman practice of hanging in this and other countries whose citizens lay claim to being quite civilized and generally as enlightened as those of other communities, where this horrible practice of the Middle Ages has long since been abolished. Having first been actuated by sentiment in my opposition to the infliction of the death penalty, I began to read upon the subject, and from being an opponent on the ground that it was brutal and inhuman, I finally have come to the further belief that the question is one of government, as it relates to the safety of life and the more certain and unerring enforcement of law.

In presenting an argument in support of these measures for the abolishment of capital punishment, I have endeavoured to show that the main defence in support of the death penalty inflicted by the state, to wit: that its infliction is a prevention of crime and therefore insures greater safety of life, is wholly and absolutely in error. I have endeavoured also to show that the example set by the state in taking human life, is at once brutalizing and demoralizing; that it has a strong tendency to destroy in the breasts of men the sense of the sacredness of life; and that it acts as a dangerous suggestion to the vicious mind. I have endeavoured to show that in communities where the death penalty is not inflicted, life is quite as secure, as there is far more certainty of conviction than in communities where capital punishment is enforced. For the purpose of setting forth the best possible data upon this subject, I have used statistics and quotations taken from numerous and well informed authorities.

We are told that "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." This is quite true, but it has nothing to do with the penal laws of to-day. Moses may have decreed that "Witches shall be put to death," but because of this there is no reason why any statute should exist to-day perpetuating this decree. Moses may have laid down that if A destroys B's eye, then shall A have his own eye burst or excised, or that if A breaks B's tooth, then shall a dental surgeon be told off to draw a similar tooth of his. Because a certain code of laws was suitable for a nomadic people many thousands of years ago, it is absurd to quote them as having binding force to-day under very different conditions.

Capital punishment by legal statutes has been an institution rock-buttressed, respected, protected and even fawned upon by the elect as one of the indispensable pillars of

a righteous and self-respecting government. The following are the names of some who have declared against the death penalty: Abraham Lincoln, Senator Sherman, Roscoe Conkling, Horatio Seymour, Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes, A. B. Richmond, Wendell Phillips. Catherine, Empress of Russia, said, "We must punish crime without imitating it. The punishment by death is rarely anything but a useless barbarity." Elizabeth, another of the Russian empresses, said: "Experience demonstrates that capital punishment never yet made man better." The Right Hon. John Bright said:

> Whenever you hang a man in the face of the public under the circumstances to which we are so accustomed, if you do in the slightest degree deter from crime by the shocking nature of the punishment, I will undertake to say that you, by so much, may by much more, weaken that very and greater security which arises from the reverence with which human life is regarded.

The State does not kill people merely because they are worthless and to be rid of them. Insane asylums are built at great expenses for the incurable, upon whom relatives cannot bear to look, who personally may be better off dead. The State tenderly cares for all such cases. This is done because the example of kindness and humanity to the unfortunate is of an inestimable benefit to society. A man would be a brute —lower than the dogs that devoured the body of Jezebel—who would say, kill them to be rid of these imbecile burdens. It is not possible to imagine the effect society would feel if we were to destroy all imbeciles and the incurable insane. What a horrible example would be set for the people of the State to follow. No calculation could be made of the injury to the morals of the State by countenancing such conduct. One of the greatest advantages to the State from the preservation and tender care and treatment of the hopeless insane is this example of humane treatment and of tender consideration of a human life however useless and pitiable it may seem. Our citizens are taught to be kind and gentle to the unfortunate by this example of the State.

As professors of the religion of Jesus Christ, we find no sanction in the record of His life and teachings to the shedding of human blood by judicial process. The whole trend of His example and precept was in the direction of love for the whole brotherhood of man.

Mr. BURNHAM: Was not He sacrificed in order that the word of God might be fulfilled?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: Surely.

Mr. BURNHAM: Well, what is the matter with that?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: The only thing the matter with it is that you do not believe it. Revenge and the retaliation had no place in the heart of the Redeemer, and if we are Christians, they can have no place in our hearts, and certainly should not have in the State. As we apprehend, the attitude of the State towards its criminals should be one of reformation, coupled always with such powerful restraint as will ensure the safety of society. That the substitution of life imprisonment for the death penalty is a step that may be taken with safety is manifest not only from years of successful experience in those States where capital punishment has been abolished, but also in our own country, where we have criminals serving life sentences in the penitentiary, whose crimes were as atrocious as those of others who were executed.

May I now ask the members of this House if they believe any boy sixteen years of age, any mother's son, either black or white, should be hanged? His father is right in the trenches, where our friend came from recently, fighting the battles of the Empire. I have much pleasure in moving the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Bickerdike) has introduced the same subject on several occasions in this House and, I believe, moved the adoption of practically the same Bill. On each occasion the position assumed by the Government was stated by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) who, unfortunately, is not in the House at present. I believe, however, that my views on the question, never before expressed in Parliament or elsewhere, as far as I remember, coincide in principle with those of the minister and are line for line and precept for precept opposed to those of the hon. member.

Perhaps it would be better for me first to state the points which he has advanced upon which we are in agreement. I agree with the hon. member in this, that in all cases where the crime of murder, or treason, or rape, or any crime punishable by death under the code is committed, it would be inconsistent with the principles

of humanity that the supreme penalty should be exacted. I agree with him further that we are not able to justify the exaction of the supreme penalty in any case by reference to any doctrine merely because such doctrine is laid down in the Mosaic law. But, I cannot carry my agreement with the hon. member for Montreal any further than that. I do not know, if ever, in the course of my life, I had sympathy with the movement for the abolition of capital punishment, but I do know this, that my experience in the criminal courts in Canada, and my experience later on in connection with the applications for clemency, have driven me from any sympathy that at any time I might have had with the opposition to capital punishment. The hon. member this afternoon endeavoured to get the assent of the House to this modification of his request, namely: if we cannot look for entire abolition, we must at least look for the abolition of the punishment as applicable to children and women. I do not think that the adoption of even that restriction in the absolute could possibly be made. He has referred to a case which is just now, or very shortly will be, before His Royal Highness, that of the convicted murderer Spain from the courts of Manitoba. That was the case where a boy of sixteen, himself not a native of this country, a native of England, murdered in cold blood—and the adjective cannot be too strongly emphasized so far as my information at present goes—two innocent people, two respectable citizens of that province, under most revolting circumstances. It would ill-become me to make any statement—because I do not know all the circumstances, although I know some of them—as to what should be the attitude of the Governor in Council and of His Royal Highness with regard to that case. I have simply to say that the circumstances already made known need only be considered to convince hon. members of this House that if capital punishment is to still remain the final, supreme penalty in the worst cases of murder, it might well be that that case would show that there should be no restriction in its application merely on the score of age. It must be remembered that though the Code lays down the penalty of death as the last supreme penalty that can be exacted in cases of murder, cases of rape and cases of treason, still it is well known everywhere, of course well known in this House and I think well known to juries, in almost every case explained specifically to juries by the trial judges, that there is a prerogative of clemency that still remains, and that the mere finding of a verdict of guilty by no means necessarily entails punishment by death. Consequently the objection raised by my hon. friend this afternoon and at other times has not the force he desires to give it. It is true that juries are more careful, more cautious before they bring in a verdict of guilty in a trial for murder or treason—but particularly in a case of murder where a judge has no option but to impose a penalty of death—than in other cases; and as a consequence it happens no doubt that there are many murderers who escape, proportionately more perhaps than of those who are guilty of other crimes. That may be one of the results that we must suffer by reason of our jurisprudence in this regard. But while juries are more careful, it does not go to the extreme the hon. member fears. Juries are well aware and they are well instructed that the prerogative of clemency lies behind, securely reposing in the Crown; the Crown has power to reduce and to exact only such punishment as to the Crown may seem mete. The duty upon the judge in case of murder—in other cases it is optional—is imperative; he must, where a verdict of guilty is brought in, himself sentence the prisoner to be hanged. I cannot speak from as wide an experience as perhaps other members of this House, but I can speak from some experience, and I can say that I never knew a jury to whom was committed this awful trust of determining upon the guilt or innocence of a person accused of murder who did not know and who did not admit that they knew that there was a prerogative of mercy, and that their verdict in itself should not mean an irremediable sentence of death. To my mind that disposes in the main of the objection which the hon. gentleman raises. I am quite willing to admit that the fear, if you may call it so, that the verdict of the jury may result in the taking of a human life does bring on them a caution that sometimes is extreme; that as a consequence perhaps a disproportionate number escape; but I cannot go further and say that the result of that small number, whatever it may be, escaping is anything like so disastrous in relation to the commission of the crime of murder throughout the country as would be the enactment of legislation that would take away the terror and fear of death which deters evil-doers. The

5 p.m.

Mosaic law must be read with reference to the conditions that existed in Mosaic times; our law must be read with reference to conditions that now obtain. What was necessary then is vital now and that is to see that there is held before the wrong-doer and the criminal such a punishment as bears fitting proportion to the crime he contemplates, and bears a character that becomes the crime he contemplates. It must not be of such a kind as has been found insufficient to deter even those who contemplate lesser wrongs.

I have been impressed with this as I have walked through jails and prisons on many occasions long before I entered this House, that the mere punishment by incarceration as incarceration is now in these later days understood and practised, while it has a terror of a character, while it is a punishment of a character and a fitting punishment, would weigh very little in the mind of a man whose lust or greed or passion was so violent or so sordid as would drive him to the taking of human life. It is true that certain portions of civilization, intelligent portions of civilization, have moved beyond the point that we have gone, and have carried the attribute of mercy so far as to abolish capital punishment in every case. But I do not think the movement has been very general. I think this has been a slow movement for many years gone by, and my hon. friend is bound to admit, from instances that have been cited to the House by the minister in other debates, that while it has gone forward and has resulted in the abolition of capital punishment in certain cases, there are many others where it has gone the other way and where public opinion that once went as far as abolition has been reversed and where the old punishment has been restored.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: You cannot name one.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot name them, but I think I could name them after very little inquiry. Does the hon. member say that in no state of the Union has a reversal of legislation taken place? That may be, but it does not apply the world over. It may be, as the hon. gentleman says, that there is no state in the American Union that once has abolished capital punishment and later returned to it, but I am quite sure that I myself have read of cases in which countries where they have at one time gone that length and later gone back again.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: No country and no state that has abolished capital punishment has ever returned to it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman says that it applies to all countries as well as to all states of the Union. I do not think he is correct in that. He may be correct as to the states, but, correct or not, the records do show that in some of the cases, at all events, where the abolition took place the result has not been by any means a diminution of the crime of murder. There might result an increase in the proportion of convictions of murder known to have been committed, but cases are undoubtedly recorded in well authenticated works where there has been a pronounced increase in the perpetration of the crime of murder.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: Can the hon. gentleman put his finger on a single case or a single statement to that effect? I challenge that statement. I have the facts here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman may not have all the facts.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I have sufficient.

Mr. MEIGHEN: While the rules of the House may prevent my speaking again in this debate, the hon. gentleman will introduce his Bill again and we shall have an opportunity of threshing this out. There may be differences of opinion on that point; there may be differences of authority, and the hon. gentleman may have one side and we may have to other; but what appeals to me most of all is this: the character of the punishment must be such as will appeal as a fitting punishment; as will appeal with sufficient terror to the type of man who would contemplate the crime of murder. It would take a great deal of argument to convince me that incarceration as now necessarily practiced can be made such a dreaded punishment as will hold in check the passions of men who contemplate the crime of murder. Remember again that in this country—and I believe the same principles apply in the old land and in other countries as well—though the supreme penalty is exacted by law, that is to say, is called for on the part of the bench as the sentence that must follow conviction for murder, certain well known principles obtain in the execution of that sentence after it is pronounced. One principle I might state is this: it is well known that insanity as defined by the Code, while not a defence, may be pleaded in several ways

and may result in there being no possibility of conviction, because of proven incapacity to commit the crime. But insanity is there defined as insanity in such a degree as in stated degree to paralyse the intellect and prevent the man from knowing in reality the difference between right and wrong. Now, while there may not be incapacitation of intellect to that extent, there may be such a condition of mind, such a lack of development of intellect, such an absence of the full human faculties, as would make it not a fitting case in which to exact the extreme penalty: such a failure fully to appreciate the nature and consequence of the act as, while it would not render the man incapable of committing an act under the definition of the Code, still makes a proper case for interposition on the part of the Crown and of reducing the conviction to imprisonment for a term of years or for life. That is one principle, and the utmost care is exercised in every case to ascertain whether or not in each individual conviction the prisoner comes within its terms. There are other principles that obtain. It would be impossible for example to deny that if, notwithstanding the verdict of the jury, given in the immediate presence of the witnesses and in the hearing of all the evidence, there should develop other evidence not at the trial producable, or other proper ground to create a reasonable doubt, that reasonable doubt finds interpretation in the decision as to the execution of the penalty. I do not need to pass over again the arguments that have been advanced, much more ably than I can advance them, by the Minister of Justice in previous debates. I think the sense of the House remains pretty much as it was in those previous sessions; I do not know that my own conviction on the subject remains undisturbed by the discussions that have taken place. It would seem to me hard to credit that any one could during many years come in contact with the administration of criminal law and come in contact with the criminal himself as one in the practice of such law must necessarily come, and still believe that there could be as full and adequate prevention of the crime of murder by any system of imprisonment as there is by the holding out of the possibility of death itself.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend from St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike) deserves very great credit for the persistence with which he has been bringing forward this Bill year after year against the manifest conviction of the House. His motives are certainly most honourable, and they are dictated by a cause which everybody appreciates, even if we do not agree with his convictions. To-day, if I understood his observations aright, I thought that he would have been satisfied if the Government had seen its way to accept his Bill partially if not in toto; if the Government had been willing to abolish capital punishment in the case of rape and in the case of murder committed by women and children. At the present time, so far as the first of these is concerned, I do not think that there is any necessity of changing the law. The offence, if I remember aright, is punishable by death or by imprisonment for life or for a period subject to the discretion of the court. The offence is, we are all happy to observe, one of rare occurrence in this country. In the province from which I come, I know of only one conviction during the last fifty years. In that case the prisoner convicted was sentenced, not to death, but to life imprisonment in the penitentiary. Whether he fulfilled his whole term I do not know. As far as crimes committed by women are concerned, in the province from which I come only two sentences have been executed against women during the last sixty years. Undoubtedly there is something revolting in the idea that a woman should be sentenced to death. The member for St. Lawrence must remember the case which occurred in the county of Terrebonne not far from Montreal. The woman was convicted the same time as the person who actually perpetrated the crime. There is no doubt whatever, notwithstanding the sympathy we may have for her case, that of the two she was the more guilty. She enticed a young boy to commit an awful murder, and if there was more guilt on the head of one than on the other, no man could resist the conviction that the woman was the more guilty than the actual perpetrator of the deed. The question as to whether the woman or the actual perpetrator of the deed should be executed is one worthy of consideration. I mention this to my hon. friend simply to show that it is not sufficient to be guided solely by sentiment, and that there may be reasons why the law should be left as it is at present, whether the offender be a man or a woman. I am not aware that a boy has been executed in Canada within the memory of any living man. My hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) and my hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike) have

alluded to the painful case of that boy in Manitoba. So far as we can judge from the reports in the newspapers, it is a horrible case, but I hope there may be redeeming features which will permit the Minister of Justice to report favourably to His Excellency in the matter.

My hon. friend has stated that capital punishment has been abolished in several countries. I do not know whether it is on this occasion or on a previous occasion that he referred to France. Capital punishment, so far as I am aware, has not been abolished in France; but in that country, during the presidency of Mr. Fallières, it is well known that during the first six years of his seven years tenure of office he would not sign a single sentence of execution, but public opinion at last revolted, and under the powerful force of public opinion President Fallières had to abandon his own private views and at length was compelled to see that the law was carried out.

The matter to which my hon. friend has given his attention, and to which I have no doubt he will give his attention again if the House does not agree with him to-day, is one which has appealed to many thinkers, and we have had very weighty opinions on both sides of the question, some holding that the death penalty should never be abolished in the case of murder. At the present time, although rape carries with it nominally the penalty of death, with the alternative of imprisonment, no man, no matter what the circumstances are, is sentenced to death for that crime, so that there is no necessity for considering that aspect of the case. But, there has undoubtedly been a sense prevailing in the great majority of the nations of the earth that murder should be punished by death. It is a painful thing to say so; it is a thing against which our instincts revolt; but, after all, if the crime is to be thus punished, I do not know that any serious injustice has taken place. I know that there is no duty which comes within the purview of the Government—I am sure it is the same with the present Government as it was with the last Government—which is more painful than to have to pronounce whether or not a prisoner shall be condemned to death. I am sure that with the present Government, as with the previous Government, the facts of the case are scanned with great diligence and always with the view, if possible, to find any reason for exercising clemency, and if any reason be found, clemency is recommended to the Governor General. There are cases, however, so heinous that it is felt that the ends of justice would not be met if the penalty provided by the law were not carried out.

Whether or not the penalty of death is a deterrent is a much mooted question. Education has more to do with the prevention of crime than even the deterrent effect of the punishment, and in this country it can happily be said that cases of murder are very few in fact, amongst the native population they are becoming less and less frequent. All the cases which have taken place recently have been amongst a class of foreigners who come from a country in which the crime of murder is a daily custom. Without being invidious, I believe that many crimes of that nature have been committed by Italians who came from the south of Italy, where it is the pernicious habit of every man to carry a stiletto. The carrying of weapons is prohibited in this country by law, and I have no doubt that a generation hence these citizens will be just as peaceful and orderly as are our own people. We come, however, always to the same problem: What is the most effective law? Shall we continue the law which we have had on the Statute Book ever since the country has been a country, and which is still the law amongst the most civilized nations of the earth, or shall we be carried away by a feeling of humanity, which is most commendable and most honourable, I admit, but which, after all, will not serve the ends of justice as well as does the present law?

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all delighted with the humane tendencies of the gentleman who has introduced this Bill so frequently and who hopes by knocking at the door of Parliament continuously to at last effect an entrance because of the very weariness of the inmates. I am not attributing to the hon. gentleman, I hope, an unworthy motive. We are well aware that he is a gentleman of such distinguished characteristics that his influence in Canada is always for the best and his views are always regarded with great respect. There can be no question also that it is advisable that a leaning to gentleness and kindness should, if possible, characterize a nation as well as an individual, and the hon. member (Mr. Bickerdike) exhibits on behalf of this House those very advanced characteristics which possibly at some time in the future may be crystallized into a form of law. No one, I pre-

sume, says his views are inadvisable in the abstract or that they are wrong in principle, but they are not adoptable at present because they are inexpedient. That, I believe is the general view of the most advanced thinkers. We must however, say that all credit is due to the hon. gentleman for leading us in the paths of virtue and human kindness, and we recognize this and the country recognizes this, and the persistence of the hon. gentleman will no doubt, in itself, have a very salutary influence.

There are some very singular things in connection with the consideration of human life and the taking of it away. God takes away human life. If we believe in God—and I presume the hon. member for St. Lawrence does—God takes away human life through at least His natural instruments. He has arranged it so that the slightest infraction of His law meets with the penalty, and if at any time a deadly sin is committed, that penalty is death. There is no consideration, except perhaps it may be through an abstract principle of the grace of God or some other remote consideration of that kind, such as an analysis of the prompting of the Divine mercy which we cannot consider since they are infinite, and since therefore, they are beyond the grasp of a finite mind, they can be dealt with only in an approximate way. And since they can be dealt with only in an approximate way, these are matters simply for analysis and not for final decision. Whilst we cannot argue about it for the reasons I have given, we can, nevertheless, adopt the means that we see employed by the highest power in carrying out the purposes of the world, and if, therefore, we would imitate the Creator, for a deadly sin we would provide the penalty of death. It must be remembered that there is a very great deal in this which the hon. member has not touched upon. He represents with all his kindness the advanced school of pure utilitarism, that is to say, what ministers to the general comfort and to the general peace of mind. What is influencing him is what we might call the general well-being in an abstract condition of perfection in humanity That is the undercurrent of his thought, and the consideration that is influencing him in bringing forward this measure. Such a consideration as that is absolutely the wrong point of view to take in considering this or any other question founded upon the principles of conduct. It is to deny altogether the priori and to say that there are no abstract abiding principals in the world which are infused into us in some way which we cannot grasp, but which, nevertheless, come to us exactly as the principle of life itself comes to us. We can make nitrogen, hydrogen and oxygen and those other things which go to make up the hemoglobin, but we cannot infuse into the compound the vital spark which starts off the circulation and produces the life of man. Therefore, there is something behind it all which we are ignoring when we are eternally looking at our own reflection in the mirror of nature. That must be thoroughly recognized or else we sink down to the level of the brute that crawls upon all fours. We have, strange to say, recognized the extraordinary character of the universe, its illimitability, the fact that space is infinite and beyond our comprehension, that the theory of motion itself is beyond our comprehension. Nevertheless, the principles of conduct move us to an immediate and final consideration, without giving to them in any sense that which we would give to them in reference to these eternal principles to which I have referred. If we are circumscribed within the confines of this narrow sphere within which we live, then those principles of utilitarianism which the hon. gentleman advocates might well be so considered. But it is not so, and when we see that the eternal Creator of it all has laid down an inviolable law which cannot be infringed, which even the youngest child that ever was born and some indeed that are not born cannot infringe without the penalty being exacted mercilessly, it must be apparent that we cannot regard these things as some humane gentlemen pretend to do. The hon. gentleman himself is not so much older than I am, that it would be presumptuous in me to say he has made a mistake in his consideration of life. Life is not a Sunday school, nor is it, for most of us, that easy affair which possibly it has been to him. It is a most serious and awful thing. It is not a comedy nor a drama, but a tragedy. We must bear in mind that life is not to be considered in the light of these humane principles which the hon. gentleman has laid down. If we are to be scientific, we must examine the facts as they are. If we are to be philosophical or religious, we must examine the facts as they are. If however, we are simply to be utilitarian without regard to those other two great divisions of thought, we will no doubt follow the course adopted by the hon. gentleman. We will live in places where it is more

offensive to have a hanging or an execution than it is to face the alternatives. If the hon. gentleman lived in a mining camp, where murders were frequently committed, he would at last beyond a doubt be prevailed upon to say, "This must be stopped; the men who have committed these crimes cannot be confined, and because we have no place within which to confine them, so we will have to take them out and shoot them." Why is the extreme penalty necessary? We admit that in many cases confinement would probably do, and I must confess that I shudder at the thought of hanging the young. I shudder also at Hell, not from fear of it, but at the awfulness of it. I suppose the hon. member (Mr. Bickerdike) has not given up his belief in Hell, and if he has not, he must know that while the torment of a hanging or execution ceases after a few struggles from the unfortunate victim, the torments of Hell endure forever. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is versed in Purgatory.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I have never been there.

Mr. BURNHAM: The hon. gentleman will do well if he ever gets there. In this system of the Almighty a form of punishment is exacted, not merely, as I understand it, for the purification of the individual concerned, but as an example to all mankind, and it must be remembered that example, and not vengeance, is at the basis of all this. The lax and the lazy, the indolent and the vagrant, all who are inclined to degenerate, must understand that when they commit a terrible sin they must pay the penalty. If we adopted the plan of turning the other cheek, our act might be, according to the theory, a very fine one. But strange to say, the Son of God who advocated that cause, was himself the victim of a different system. We can only understand these things as they are presented to us. The Highest Power of all exacted the penalty of death—there must be satisfaction. I do not suppose that the satisfaction was that of vengeance, for though the men of whom we read in the Old Testament gloried in the vengeance which they considered so delightful and so necessary, it would be absurd to suppose that the Creator of the universe would execute vengeance upon mortals who exist upon a planet so small as to be invisible from the sun. These things must give us pause. We think too highly of ourselves and too little of the Almighty, I believe. It is upon a different ground, upon the ground of necessity, that this infliction of the last dread penalty is to be justified. In the family, mistaken kindness to a son may cause his ideas to become lax, with the consequence that he grows up a shiftless good-for-nothing. But had he been dealt with a little more stringently, a little more strictly, he might grow up a good man. That may be the basis of it all. We are not competent to form opinions in opposition to the laws of Almighty God. One must not set up his theories, collected here in the House of Commons or in his study, in opposition to these laws. In olden times people followed more or less the dictates of nature, but we now-a-days have become so refined that we regard nature rather as a nuisance, as a very vulgar means to an entirely different end. People should study the natural sciences. Our study of those sciences has taught us that that which was once thought to be the thunderbolt of Jupiter is in reality a fusion of hydrogen and nitrogen gases at high electric tension. These studies have caused us to understand that the form of the crystal is due to a certain degree of chemical tension, of heat or otherwise, a regular falling into their places of the molecules that compose it. And so the common carbon, under intense heat and vast pressure, becomes the clarified crystal that we call the diamond. These things give us a different conception of life and cause us to see that there is something in the purpose which God has unfolded, something in the law and order which he has inculcated. They teach us that we must not give way to every little heartfelt impulse, for that course is not in accordance with the laws that govern our life. If what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bickerdike) says is true, that we should always be kindly, long-suffering, humane and forgiving, then the Maker of the universe has made a huge mistake, for he has not brought it about that way at all. Nor is there any warrant for it in the Scripture nor in history. Possibly the evolution of mankind and of nature, by strong and subtle promptings, may bring us to that conclusion, as it has brought us from time to time to other conclusions, but we should not reach such conclusions by argument that is in direct opposition to the natural manifestations to which I have been referring. The case of rape referred to by the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) calls to mind the remarks of the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). That hon. gentleman said that whatever might be the

theory of the speakers in the House with regard to the necessity or otherwise of capital punishment, it was necessary if the lives of the lonely settlers on the prairie were to be preserved, and if the women were to stay upon the farms. He said, as nearly as I can remember: If you remove the dread of the death penalty you will make it impossible for farmers of the West to continue their work, for their womenfolk will not remain in remote parts of the country but will come nearer to the centres of population where they will be able to feel safe. There you have the natural necessity of the case. One statement of that kind is worth all the theoretical argument that might be advanced in a week's time in this House. Facts are the things which must rule us. The mere taking of life is, I fancy, that which presents the picture of the greatest horror to the hon. member for St. Lawrence. Is not that so?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: Yes.

Mr. BURNHAM: I can well understand that to a gentle soul things of that description are dreadful. And, that being so, a war such as the present is beyond all conception dreadful. But it so happens that it is sometimes necessary, in order to stop an assailant, to take his life. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that if he were attacked, and if it were a question of his own life or that of his assailant he would not kill that assailant if he had the power?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: That is the only ground, I believe, on which the killing of a man is justified—self-defence. That is the only ground upon which such an act is justified by Scripture, history or reason.

Mr BURNHAM: That is the ground upon which men are hanged; self-defence is the justification advanced for capital punishment. I repeat that no one for a moment accepts the ghastly doctrine that the reason for capital punishment is that society must wreak vengeance upon the criminal. It is because we must defend ourselves. This modification is asked for not so much in the interest of men as of women and children. That lets the cat out of the bag. There is no justification for the rest of the hon. gentleman's argument. We are not concerned with the rest of his argument because, if he admits that self-defence justifies decapitation, or hanging, or any other form of capital punishment, if that is the ground upon which he bases his argument, it is met. The equation being declared, there is no difficulty and therefore no justification for his Bill. We have met his objections; we meet them now.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: Would you hang the boy?

Mr. BURNHAM: No. The reason I would not hang the boy is not because it is a violation of the principle I have laid down but I do not think that a boy could be competent within the meaning of the law. I think that a boy should be taken as not possessing the ability—the ability of a man—to consider what he did. If a boy of sixteen is as old as a man is at twenty-one, if he thoroughly understands the nature of his action, I would say hang him. So far as my experience goes, boys of sixteen are very irresponsible. They might be influenced on the spur of the moment by some one else, or through some fascination amounting to hypnotism to do something which, with consideration, they would not do. But, I do not believe that they can be guilty of the nefarious and hideous villainy that must characterize the act of the true murderer. I do not think they are capable of it. Therefore, I would say that I would not hang a boy under any circumstances. But nowadays women are to be considered as men. They do not want woman suffrage; they want equal suffrage. They do not want to be distinguished as electors they wish to co-operate with men and since men and women are to be the same electoral entities, they must appear before the law on an equal footing without distinction in every possible case. This is one of them. If I am liable to be hanged, my wife, if I have one, must be liable also.

Mr. GRAHAM: You ought to have one.

Mr. BURNHAM: Of course, that is another matter.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: It is time you had.

Mr. BURNHAM: Now, you are trying to put me off the track. I think we should deal with these questions on their merits. I would like to say, with the permission of the House, that I desire to resume this question at eight o'clock, when I shall have given it further consideration.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at 8 o'clock.

Mr. BURNHAM (continuing): Mr. Speaker, I do not purpose to continue my

remarks at length, but I would say that before six o'clock I understood that we had arrived at an amicable conclusion, namely that the hon. member for St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike) agreed that we were entitled to slay people if they desired to take our lives, or in other words, in self defence. The theory of capital punishment is founded on self defence. On that we agreed, and the necessity of the Bill is therefore not apparent. It is, of course, possible to substitute imprisonment for capital punishment; but it has been ascertained in many countries that life imprisonment is not by any means the deterrent that capital punishment is. In those countries where it has been thought expedient to inflict capital punishment as rarely as possible, in the absence of superior conditions and the progress of education, it has been found that serious crime increased. I make this statement, but I do not intend to back it up by statistics, nor to implement it in any way. I simply wish to say that I am aware that in some countries or states where they had capital punishment and gave it up from humanitarian impulses, they had to restore it, serious crime became so rampant. The corrective which the hon. member for St. Lawrence is looking for is that of superior education and a general improvement of general conditions. Those things alone will bring about that state of things to which the hon. member looks forward; and when it comes it will be recognized and the various measures which are now employed, which are extremely severe and whose ghastliness alone the hon. member admits is the cause of his dislike for them, will disappear. Conditions are not so savage as they used to be. People do not hang for sheep stealing or poaching or other little amusements of that kind; but there was a time, and there are conditions in this world, in which the very severest and most terrible measures may be necessary in self defence; and it would be a serious thing if a Bill like this should pass before its time. From the testimony given by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and some other western gentlemen, it would be a very serious mistake to bring it on even if it resulted in only one or two serious crimes before the impropriety of its abolishment was discovered. We must safeguard life at all hazards, we must be extremely careful of it, much more so than of those who commit the crime of murder. In the course of time we all hope to abolish capital punishment, or rather hope that it will render itself unnecessary; it will abolish itself, and we hope indeed that all forms of punishment will in time disappear since the necessity for them will have disappeared; and we hope also that the whole human race will find that its future does not prevent the terrible aspect it does at the present time. I might as well go further in my spirit of altruism and hope for the best for the Opposition.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (South Renfrew): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to my hon. friend (Mr. Burnham) endeavouring, as he says, to explain the inexplicable. Whether he succeeded or not I am really at a loss to know; he may have and he may not have. But although he is not in favour of capital punishment, he nearly smothered us with language. He has arrived, at the conclusion, however, that the abolition of capital punishment is right, and his concluding remark is that this is not an opportune time to enact such legislation. He has converted himself at least, by his argument, to practically the same viewpoint as the hon. member (Mr. Bickerdike). I do not agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Burnham) that this is not a proper time, unless we are prepared to say that we are less advanced than many states of the Union which, having passed Acts for the abolition of capital punishment, have not re-enacted that legislation again, so far as I know. It is not to my mind a matter of theology, and I would not like to undertake the task of discussing that deep subject with any person, much less with my well-informed friend from Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), because I admit he would have me lost in that discussion. It It is a question of the protection of society, and how that can be accomplished with the minimum of harm done. It must be remembered, in listening to the arguments against this legislation, that the same arguments were advanced in every country where it was proposed, but the answer has been as I have said a moment ago, that with one or two exceptions no country has returned to capital punishment that ever made the experiment of its abolition. The result must have been good, else that would not have been the case. It is true also that in every reform there are men who put their feet against the cleats as if they were in a tug-of-war and refuse to be pulled so long as they can keep their dead weight holding back. But public opinion is going to crowd

the Parliament of Canada, whatever Government is at the head of affairs in this country, on until it gets the courage to adopt this great measure of reform. A few years ago had anybody told members of this House that practically all Canada would have adopted woman suffrage, he would have been laughed at. There were a few advocates of woman suffrage in the legislature of Ontario, in which I had the honour of having a seat at that time, but so few that it was difficult when the late Mr. Smith of Peel, a few years ago, introduced a resolution to that effect for him to get a sufficient number of members to stand up and have a vote taken on the question; there was almost a solid legislature against it. Now there is a solid legislature for it. Go through the western provinces, as I had the privilege of doing a few weeks ago, and we find the people unanimous for women being put on a plane of equality with men in this respect. I venture the assertion that it will not be very long before this House takes the same stand, and I think it should. Then take the temperance question. It is not so many years ago since prohibition was looked upon as a movement so far in advance of the time that the majority were against it. To-day the people are almost unanimous in favour of very advanced legislation, and most of them, I think, are in favour of the complete abolition of the traffic in intoxicating liquor as a beverage. It should not be discouraging to the member for St. Lawrence division to find that even in the parliamentary ranks there are men with these old conservative ideas of going slowly in these matters.

Mr. BRADBURY: Because you have so many Conservatives over there.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know that there are many anywhere now who would call themselves Convervatives. However, Sir, that does not mean that this legislation should not be passed. I think we owe a debt of gratitude to the member for St. Lawrence for continually pressing this matter. It is the one great thing he has in his mind, and I heartily approve his stand in regard to it.

From my earliest recollection I have been impressed with the view that capital punishment should not be exercised in any country in the world. In our present condition of enlightenment there is no need for it. On what ground do we punish the criminal? The chief ground is the protection of society. The second, which ought not to be forgotten, is that of giving the individual an opportunity of reformation. That is not a light matter. It is not within the purview of man to take away from any human being the opportunity of reformation, unless he is absolutely sure that it is necessary to do so in order to protect the public. Is the punishment of hanging or the death penalty an example more striking or more effective than any other form of punishment? I can answer only by presenting the experience of countries which have abolished capital punishment. I have read everything I could get on this question during the last twenty years and I am firmly convinced that the experience of other countries teaches most clearly that life imprisonment has just as deterrent an effect on crime as has capital punishment. It may not be your view; it may not be the view of others, but the practical test of the correctness of that view must be found in the experience of other countries. That is as to the past. As to the future, surely imprisonment for life protects the public just as much as hanging. The criminal is shut out from society and has no opportunity of committing crime, but he has an opportunity, if the reforms which ought to take place and must take place are carried out, to contribute to the maintenance of himself and his family, or if he has no family, to contribute something to the welfare of the public. I have always taken the position that our criminal law should be so administered that the man who by his own act has caused the support of those depending upon him to be taken away should be allowed a certain amount every day for his work and that a portion of that amount should go to the sustenance of his family. To come back to my contention, surely if a man be incarcerated the public is just as safe from his depredations as they would be if his life were taken.

The next point is the reformation of the individual. This may be called sentimental. Some will say that a man sufficiently hardened to take the life of a fellow-being is not susceptible of reformation; that it is sufficient to give him two or three months to make his peace with his Maker. I cannot accept that view; I believe that is going beyond the purview of mankind. No human being is so bereft of all that is right that in his constitution there is nothing good. It may be small; from the human standpoint it may be almost imperceptible to some, but I contend that the Creator never sent a being into this world who did not possess some

good traits of character which if developed would lead him into a higher and better life. Our criminals become such largely through neglect during childhood and youth, and through the influence of their surroundings. Some are criminals through heredity, and that brings us back to the original position that the forebears of this man, who is said to be a criminal through hereditary instinct, must have been surrounded by conditions and circumstances that led him into criminality. I must admit that in these times of stress, we are, perhaps, losing sight of the proportion and value of human life; but if we value the future of the human family as well as the present, is it not well worth while to make an attempt, on behalf of those by whom we are surrounded, on behalf of the criminal, to secure the reformation of that criminal? If there be joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, is it not worth while that the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada should give several sinners each year full opportunity for repentance? The evidence on which a criminal is convicted is, I suppose, in nine cases out of ten, purely circumstantial. I admit that in very few cases does the administration of justice, as justice is displayed on our statute book, go wrong in Canada. Perhaps there is no country in the world where justice is meted out so efficiently as it is under the British flag. But notwithstanding that, we do take human life; we take it by statute. There are over two hundred men in this Parliament, and we arrogate to ourselves the right to pass a law which gives one human being the right under certain conditions to take the life of his fellow-being. I could never bring myself to feel that I was justified in going that far. Fully convinced as I am that society would be as thoroughly protected by life imprisonment of the convicted one as it is by capital punishment, and that an opportunity should be given for the reformation of the criminal, I am unable to see any reason why I should change my mind in favour of the death penalty.

I was pleased to see to-day on the floor of the House a former member of the Ontario Government, and I am of the opinion that if he could have spoken his mind in this House this afternoon, his views would have, partially at least, coincided with those of the hon. member for the St. Lawrence division. I had the honour of preceding as Provincial Secretary of Ontario the Hon. Mr. Hanna, and my predecessor was the late Mr. Stratton, who had the idea that the Central Prison at Toronto should be removed from the centre of that city and that different treatment should be meted out to those sent up for less than two years. I was very strongly of the same view. When the Hon. Mr. Hanna came into office, he proceeded along lines of prison reform, and the very same arguments that I have heard here this afternoon in favour of capital punishment were uttered against his propositions for prison reform. He took the ground, after full investigation in some of the states of the Union where the methods of dealing with criminals have been greatly revised, where capital punishment has been abolished, that there was a better method of treating our unfortunate brethren than by the utmost severity of the law. He took the viewpoint expressed a moment ago by myself, that if there was something good in humanity it should be cultivated, and that it was the duty of the state not to crush out with an iron hand what is good, but to give it an opportunity to develop, and sooner or later, in the majority of cases, the man whom we formerly looked upon as a criminal might become a benefit and even an ornament to society. He established the prison farm system, and the prisoners do the work of the ordinary farmer; out of doors engaged in healthy occupation. They are not only improving themselves physically, but they are earning for the State and they are producing for their own maintenance as well as for the maintenance of others, and although it is true that occasionally a man does not respect the liberty thus given him, the records of the Province of Ontario will show that this reformation in the treatment of prisoners has been good not only for the individual, but for the State.

From various states of the Union and from other countries have come men to investigate the system of prison reform which is in its early stages in Ontario, with the object of adapting that system in their own country. The very same principle that applies to the treatment of men convicted of minor offences can be applied to the treatment of our unfortunate, yes, vicious fellow men who have committed greater crimes. This advance movement in the mehod of treating criminals may be slow, but leading men of the Dominion, who are not in public life, but who have the keeping of their brethren in their care, men high up in the ministry, men in the professions, thinking business-men, are joining

in a movement to urge upon the Parliament of Canada at least to try the experiment of the abolition of Capital Punishment. This reform will come in this country just as surely as these other reforms have come, and it is the duty of this Parliament not to hang back until it is crowded and shoved along, but to lead the way in this great reform, in which they will certainly have the support of the best people in the country. I am strongly in favor of the proposition of my hon. friend.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition to-day referred to the duty of members of the Government. To those who have not been members of a Government and who have not had to deal with this very serious question, I might implement his remarks by saying that it is one of the most difficult of the problems that come before a Government for solution. Imagine men sitting around a Cabinet Council with the life of a human being in the balance! The Minister of Justice makes a report. What is the report? Not that the man ought to die, but that under our law he ought to die. The Minister of Justice is not responsible; he who signs the Order in Council is not responsible, but we, the representatives of the people are responsible for compelling the members of the Government, even those who do not believe in capital punishment, to agree to the taking of the life of a fellow being. It is a very difficult position for a member of the Government to be in who holds the views that I hold. The system is all wrong. Punishment should be meted out by the statutes of our country so far as we can go to make the punishment adequate, but it ought not to go so far as to take the life of a fellow being. In the years that are to come, when those who succeed us, perhaps some of the younger men in the House, now look back at what is taking place this session on this question and at what has taken place at previous sessions, they will wonder why men were so slow, why men were too timid, why they hesitated to take this forward step in Canada when they had such striking examples elsewhere in the world. After the suggestions of my hon. friend from St. Lawrence have been on the Statute Book of Canada, after the operation of the law which he suggests has been shown to be beneficial instead of detrimental, then when the history of this country comes to be written, the name of Robert Bickerdike will stand out brighter in the pages of our history than that of others amongst us who talk louder and longer on other questions, but who have no more seriousness, no more strength of purpose, no more perseverance—if as much—than has my hon. friend. I intend to vote in favour of his Bill.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer humble apologies on behalf of that section of our community which obeys the law, which maintains the State, and which, speaking generally, conforms to the rules of life laid down by God and man. It is apparently the view of my hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike) that this element of the community is of a negligible character, and the only thing to be considered is the right, interest, and advantage of those who set at defiance the laws of God and man. In my view there is no foundation for the suggestion that the proposal now before the House is in the interest of the sacredness of human life. My emphatic protest against it is that it is an attack upon the sacredness of human life. I have listened to the eloquence of my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) in regard to the opportunity that should be given to the convicted murderer for reformation. I am here to speak on behalf of the victim, and to ask where does consideration for the victim come in? Where and how does the victim have an opportunity to make his peace with God, who has been hurried into the presence of his Maker by the hand of a murderer? You say, but the murder has been done. That is true, but murders are done to-day, and other murders are done to-morrow, and the obligation is laid upon the members of this House, representing the people of Canada, to see that such measures are placed upon the statute book and such administration given as will secure as far as possible, that no man, woman or child shall be hurried unprepared into the presence of their Maker by the hand of a murderer.

I was somewhat touched by the suggestion that those who are not in favour of the murderer as against the murdered are therein non-progressive. Permit me to point out that all that has been argued here to-day was argued thousands of years ago amongst many savage tribes, and amongst many tribes the principle still prevails to-day that a murder can be condoned by the payment of money. Surely that is a much better principle than destroying the life of the murderer, better than placing the murderer in duress at the expense of the state? We are not going forward when we are heading to the condition

of savagery which prevailed thousands of years ago, as history tells us and which prevails to-day, as we know of our own knowledge.

It is a question of stupendous importance; it touches the heart and mind of every responsible member of Parliament, of every man charged with responsibility in connection with the matter, and I certainly want to discharge my duty, as our friends here want to discharge theirs. It is an easy way of escaping responsibility—and this is the logic of the attitude taken—to say that the murder having been committed the only question to be considered is the good of the murderer. I submit that the question to be considered is the future good of society and of the State, and if it should unfortunately be the case that the good of the murderer does not run on all fours with the good of the State, then in my humble judgment so much the worse for the murderer. His was the choice not the unfortunate victim's. The State has to consider the question of the greatest good to the greatest number, and I submit that that question is decided by taking such a course as shall tend in the largest possible measure to protect the interests of the law-abiding section of the community against the passion or rapacity or other evil desires that may be conjured up by those who are not of a law-abiding character. It has been stated that some of the states of the Union have declared against capital punishment. I am sorry I am not as familiar with the course of history in the neighbouring republic as some of our friends seem to be. I am somewhat familiar with recent history, however, and I would ask whether the state of California is one of those that have abolished capital punishment.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: Not yet.

Mr. OLIVER: Because I recall that at the time of the San Francisco earthquake advantage was taken of that terrible tragedy by the criminally inclined to commit murders and robbery, and under the authority of the Governor of the state, so I am credibly informed, the late General Funston posted soldiers in the streets with orders to shoot on sight any one caught in the act of robbing a body, or pillaging of any kind. Who will say that that was not a wise and humane course to take? Or are those states in which we read of lynchings taking place, the states that have declared against capital punishment?

Mr. PUGSLEY: No.

Mr. OLIVER: Well, I am here to make this argument. Wherever an aggrieved citizen or family feel that substantial justice cannot be expected at the hands of authority, then under the law of God that is planted in the heart of man, the law will be taken in the hands of those that are aggrieved. That is the lynch law that prevails and has prevailed for ages throughout the United States. There is no state of the Union today where it does not prevail on occasion. I do not think there is any example that can be drawn from history, recent or ancient, that will prove that those who commit the most terrible offence against humanity should not be dealt with according to the laws laid down in Scripture and implanted by the Divine Power in the heart of mankind.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY. (St. John City): I desire to say a very few words upon this question. I agree that the measure introduced by my hon. friend from St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike) is one of very great importance, and deserving, I think, of the very serious consideration of this House. I notice that a difference of opinion has been expressed as to what has taken place in other countries which have done away with capital punishment. My hon. friend the Solicitor General stated that he knew of countries which had adopted legislation abolishing capital punishment, but which had gone back to the law as they had it before. That statement was denied by my hon. friend who has introduced this Bill, and I am inclined to think that my hon. friend from St. Lawrence is in the right, and that there are very few, if any, countries, that have taken what is regarded by a great many people, and myself among the number, as a forward movement, and have afterwards reversed their action. I think the measure is one that ought fairly to go to a special committee to investigate the results of similar legislation in other countries, more particularly in the United States. I am inclined to think that the records will show that, so far from the abolition of capital punishment leading to an increase of crime, the effect has been quite the reverse. I am inclined to think that those persons who commit murder have but little regard to the consequences to themselves; I doubt if many who have in their hearts the desire to do murder are deterred by the knowledge that the penalty may be the loss of their own lives.

It is a most serious thing to take human life. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has asked why regard should be paid to the welfare of the murderer, seeing that he has sent his victim into eternity without warning and without opportunity to repent of crimes of which possibly he may have been guilty. But the law to-day provides that all possible mercy shall be extended to the murderer and that before he is called upon to pass into the presence of his Maker he shall have opportunity to repent in order that, if possible, he may leave this world with his sins washed away. That shows that society has some regard at all events for the future well being of the man found guilty of murder. If imprisonment for life would be an equal deterrent from crime, surely it would be better to provide that punishment rather than that the law should take the life of a human being without benefit to society. It is true, as the hon. member for Edmonton says, that society must recognize the horrible nature of the crime of which the murderer is guilty. But taking his life will not restore the life that he has taken; it can do no good to the murderer's victim. So, it seems to me the only way in which we can regard this punishment is from the standpoint of the protection of society. I have heard it said that in the city of St. John, less than a hundred years ago, a negro boy, thirteen years of age, was hanged for the crime of theft—for the stealing of a loaf of bread he was convicted and sentenced and the sentence was executed. The Governor could not commute the sentence; the boy had violated the law and it was the duty of the officers of the law to inflict upon him the penalty for his crime. But public opinion was so aroused by the brutal result of the enforcement of the law, that an amendment was soon made doing away with the penalty of death except for the crimes of murder and rape.

My hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike) has challenged—and I think has challenged on good grounds—any opponent of this Bill to point to any country in the civilized world which has done away with capital punishment and afterwards re-enacted it. The fact that the experience in this respect is all one way seems to me a strong argument in favour of passing this measure. I would ask the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen), who is leading the opposition to this Bill, if he does not think it would be wise and proper to let the measure go to a second reading and let it be referred to a committee to obtain reliable information on this subject for the information of the House and the country.

My hon. friend from Edmonton asked whether the states of the American Union in which the death penalty had been abolished were those in which so many lynchings had taken place. My information is that those states of the Union that have done away with capital punishment occupy the very first rank among the civilized states of the world, and that those states in which lynchings have been most frequent are those in which the death penalty is still exacted for the crime of murder. It is the fashion among some hon. gentlemen—and I am sorry that the hon. member for Edmonton seems to have fallen into that error—to reflect unfavourably upon the state of society in the neighbouring republic. I have been in many parts of that country, and I venture to say that taking the states of the Union one with another, and taking their people one with another, they stand in the very first rank amongst the civilized peoples of the world.

I appeal again to the Solicitor General not to stop this Bill at its present stage, but to let it go to a second reading, to be referred then to a committee to collect information upon this subject upon which the House and the country can rely.

Mr. LAFORTUNE (Montcalm) (translation): Mr. Speaker, kindly allow me a few remarks anent the question now before the House. The subject is of the greatest importance and deserving of our very earnest consideration. Every year the House is called upon to pronounce on this proposition, which our learned friend brings forward with characteristic perseverance, study and energy. I do not intend this evening to repeat all the arguments which I have had the opportunity already of bringing to bear in this debate, I merely wish to call attention to a few points, the House having long ago heard the pro and con of this important discussion. Any lengthy remarks on my part would be out of place.

First of all, I may be permitted to reply to the honourable and learned member for St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike) who, when this question was last debated, took me to task because I did not share his views. My object in taking the floor is to reply to the unfair references of the learned member. He states I am in favour of capital punishment because the more hangings, the better for me. That is quite uncalled for, and the distinguished member in speaking thus was most unfair.

What benefit does a Crown attorney reap when cases of capital punishment increase in number? That does not add to his fees? What interest can the legal representative of the Crown have in the matter? None whatever. Our grief is profound and our misgivings many when we have to insist on the law taking its course after a jury has brought in a verdict of guilty against an individual. How deep our regret when we have to move for a sentence of death! How cautiously we proceed! First of all the facts are investigated by men quite competent and wise. They decide as to whether any one is liable to prosecution. Then the grand jury takes the matter in hand, and no precaution is overlooked that may prevent a possible mistake. Yes, I reiterate my statement, nothing is neglected and in case of doubt, if we are not fully convinced of the guilt of the accused, we instruct the jury to render a verdict in favour of the prisoner. People are fond of talking against miscarriages of justice, miscarriages that never have taken place. It has been stated that an Italian who had been adjudged guilty and was reprieved later on the recommendation of the Minister of Justice had been the victim of a judicial error. I was Crown prosecutor at the first trial. The jury failed to agree and the case was postponed to the next assizes. The prisoner claimed that he had not produced all his witnesses and taken advantage of all his privileges. For those reasons we adjourned his case to the next term so as to give him an opportunity of preparing his defence. His means being insufficient to allow him to bring his witnesses to court, the Crown undertook to pay their conduct-money. So we obtained the evidence of witnesses whom he claimed would testify on his behalf, but their testimony went against him and left no doubt as to his guilt. Later on, after serving a term in gaol, he was sentenced to hang, but the Minister of Justice thought fit to recommend his enlargement. I do not blame the hon. the minister but there had certainly been no miscarriage of justice. The guilt had been established beyond all doubt, but certain parties who had testified against the prisoner thought fit for one reason or another to swear to an affidavit that might justify the Minister of Justice setting him free. Again I say there had been no error, but the pardon was a mere act of clemency on the part of the minister.

It has been said and repeated on all occasions that capital punishment is absolutely ineffective and does not act as a deterrent; that it is too severe, and should be abolished; that the laws of humanity do not countenance the infliction of the sentence of death on human being. Quite easy to argue and quite easy to bring to pass. My observation, however, and my experience have fully satisfied me that since the infliction of the death penalty on murderers, there has been a marked decrease in the number of murders.

One can easily make the statement that the extreme penalty is no deterrent; but I claim that if capital punishment be done away with, crime will increase a hundredfold. Many criminally inclined wisely fear the scaffold, and were confinement the only punishment, many more among them would become murderers. It has been urged that it is wrong and inhuman to take the lives of the culprits; but when assassins, bandits and murderers kill; when they strike right and left, who among them has ever stayed his hand, impelled by like consideration for his victim? Murderers find time to effect their reconciliation with society and make their peace with their own conscience and with God. They have ample opportunity to arrange their domestic matters, while the victims they have ushered unprepared into eternity without a moment's notice may not have had the opportunity of making preparation, of putting their affairs in order, and especially making themselves ready for the life eternal.

Well, my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is that such an argument takes into account only one side of the question. Had this mode of dealing with criminals not been attempted elsewhere, were we without any experience from other countries, we might perhaps say: Let us do away with capital punishment and judge of the results in the next few years to come. But the experiment has been tried and the states which introduced the new system had to return to the old, on account of the large increase in crime.

I am quite aware that no reasoning on my part will convince any of the hon. members who have taken sides on this question; and it is far from my thought, quite far indeed, to say anything that may stand in the way of my hon. friend's efforts.

Should his proposition prevail, so much the better for him; and if I could anywise help him, I should do it quite heartily. What could I deny the hon. member from St. Lawrence? He is an old friend of mine, a generous man, an old fighter who always answered the call when his services were required. Were my convictions different, I should be the first to side with him; but it is a matter of conscience with me to raise my voice against this Bill.

I am merely setting forth my personal views on the matter, without any desire to turn the House against the project. Ordinarily people may be persuaded to change their opinions; but this does not obtain in the House of Commons, where every speaker expounds his viewpoint without in any way attempting to influence his fellow members.

Wherefore I say to my honourable friend, that the time is not ripe for a measure of this nature; that the House could not put it on the Statute-books, because I believe it is not in the country's interest. My honest conviction is that its effects on general morality would be disastrous.

How often have I heard criminals declare: Were it not that I may hang for it, I should have seen that you dissapeared long ago. . . or again: that you would not sleep alive tonight. How often have I listened to similar utterances since I am become a member of the Bar, not mixing with criminals, but as Crown attorney having to meet constantly prisoners who are brought before the Court.

During my inquiry, as Royal Commissioner, into the St. Vincent-de-Paul penitentiary, I examined the files of all the prisoners, over five hundred of them. Many had been sentenced to hang but the penalty had been commuted to confinement for life.

Many of the prisoners whom it is sought to protect by substituting perpetual imprisonment to the gallows, on the plea that the ends of justice would be met, are not satisfied with that commutation. And I beg to say to the learned member, who fathers the present Bill, that within the walls of St-Vincent-de-Paul I heard murderers declare that they would have much preferred hanging to languishing all their lifetime in a prison. Not only did they feel their own personal responsability and guilt, but they lived to regret an action which brought shame to their wife, their children, their brothers, an entire family and sometimes more than one, for whom the life sentence of one of their members is a perpetual disgrace. If on the other hand the culprit expiates his crime on the scaffold, his wife at least regains her freedom and the crime is not a matter of reproach from morning till night as happens when the criminal is confined for life. After an execution, the victim passes into oblivion, society is rid of him. If he be simply imprisoned for life, no month or week or day goes by without recalling to his relatives the fact of his existence. Thus it happens that a large number of those innocent families finding the memory of the past unbearable and still more the thought of the future have to leave the country, some of them even changing their name so that the public may not recognize in them the wife or children of a life convict. More grief is caused by a life sentence than by an execution.

My learned friend aims at affording society a larger measure of protection. He would do away with capital punishment in order to protect, as he states, the unfortunate relatives of the prisoner. Well, my opinion is that the new system would be a greater chastisement to them, that the penalty, instead of being an alleviation, would be a greater hardship, and your measure would fall short of its aim.

Mr. Speaker, I have nothing more to say on the question; I felt that in justice to myself and to the electors I represent, my duty called for those few remarks. I have spoken in all earnestness, fully convinced that the House should not pass the Bill.

Mr. GEORGE H. BRADBURY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would not have felt called upon to say one word here to-night on this very important question were it not for the fact that during the discussion this afternoon a matter was mentioned affecting my own constituency. One of the foulest murders that has ever been committed in the West was committed at Rockwood within the last year, and the hon. gentleman who is fathering this Bill (Mr. Bickerdike) has taken a very active interest in asking that the sentence of the court be set aside by the Government on the ground that the young man who committed the crime was, as he claimed, only sixteen years of age. This young man came to the district outside the town of Stonewall two or three years ago and secured employment with the Vincent family, one of the oldest families in that district. He was taken into the confidence of the family and treated more like their own boy than the hired man. Mr. Vincent had gone to the city and sold his wheat. The boy was with him and he knew all about it; he knew that Mr. Vincent had received $1,700. They came back to the farm. The boy got there first, shot the wife, Mrs. Vincent, and killed her.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: Intentionally?

Mr. BRADBURY: It is the plea of the young man himself that the shooting of Mrs. Vincent was accidental, but he is the only one who says so. He made no attempt at all to render any assistance to the woman after she was shot. When the husband came home he took the first opportunity to shoot him too. He shot him, rendering

him unconscious, and then he went and got a shot gun, blew the man's head off, got the money and got away with it. Yet, we are asked to believe that the shooting of Mrs. Vincent was accidental.

I do not understand that the enforcement of the death penalty is a matter of vengeance. The law, I believe, is administered for the purpose of preventing the perpetration of crimes of this character. If there ever was a case calling for very careful consideration by council I would think it would be this one. I am not going to discuss the general principles of the Bill submitted by my hon. friend. There is room for discussion both ways. There is no doubt that there are cases in which there are extenuating circumstances, where murders are committed hastily, where, for instance, a man in a passion will lift up a gun or an axe and take another man's life. These are cases in which there might be some jurisdiction for granting a reprieve, but careful consideration must be given when it is evident that a cold-blooded murder has been committed after having been planned, no doubt as this murder must have been planned, by this young man. They claim he is only sixteen years of age. I have not been in the district since this murder was committed, but I have letters from my friends there who claim that the boy is over twenty years and that he has the appearance of a man. I think that indicates that he is much older than he claims to be. But, whether he is sixteen years of age or not, he had been working for some years in the district, he was thoroughly responsible and knew what he was doing, and if crimes of this kind are to be committed in this country without punishment such as the law provides, I have very grave doubts as to the country being able to maintain its proud boast that it has never had a lynching. Why? Simply because the law has been administered. If a man was guilty of murder he was almost sure to suffer the penalty provided for the offence. When I went to the West some thirty years ago gamblers used to come across from the other side of the line. The red-coated mounted police were patrolling the boundary in southern Manitoba and when these gamblers would fall out, one would say to the other: If I had you over on the other side of the line I would blow your brains out. Why did they not do it on this side of the line?—because they knew that if they did it they would suffer the death penalty.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: Was there not capital punishment on the other side?

Mr. BRADBURY: There was, but, unfortunately, the law was not administered as it was here. With reference to this murder of which I have spoken, I hope that this application will receive very careful consideration at the hands of the Government, as all matters of that kind must. It is a very serious matter to take the life of any man either by law or otherwise, but I firmly believe that if capital punishment were done away with there would be more lives taken in this country than there are at the present time.

There is no question but that the fear of the gallows has saved many a man's life. Everybody in the western country knows that this is the case and the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) who spoke so feelingly, knows that it is true. I am not bloodthirsty enough to wish to take any man's life. I heard the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) a few moments ago make the statement that the taking of a life by law would not do any
9 p.m. good to the party who had been murdered. I agree with my hon. friend thoroughly, but the law was not designed as a matter of vengeance, or to do any good to the party murdered. It was designed to set an example, to deter others from committing the same crime that the condemned person was suffering for. The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) made an eloquent appeal. I sympathize with the sentiments expressed by the hon. gentlemen who are advocating this bill, but, there is no analogy between the prison reforms that are taking place in Ontario and in other parts of this great continent, or between men who have committed some petty crime and found their way into the penitentiary, and a cold-blooded murder where a man premeditates a crime and goes out and deliberately murders another.

Another argument advanced by these hon. gentlemen is that you are ushering a man into eternity without giving him an opportunity to prepare. That is a sound argument, but what about that man and woman who were ushered into eternity by this young man without a moment's notice? They were given no time to prepare. It might as well have been their own son that committed that murder as the man who did it because he was treated as a member of the family. What about the children, the orphans, the brothers and sisters left to mourn the death of their

parents? If this crime is not punished according to our present law, what is there to prevent other crimes being committed by men of this stamp? We have had several cases in that western country of young English boys coming out and committing horrible crimes.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: Not English boys.

Mr. BRADBURY: English boys from the Bernardo school—more than half a dozen cases of them. It is a serious question and one that ought to be weighed very seriously by every member of this House before voting for a bill that would in any way lessen the penalty for murder. In view of that fact, in view of the murder that has been committed among my own friends, and the possibility that this matter will come before the Government on an application for a reprieve and that petitions have been largely signed all over the country—for it is no trouble to get a petition of this kind signed, as people become hysterical on such occasions and thousands and thousands of people will sign it who know nothing at all about the evidence, who do not weigh the matter but simply sign the petition because they think it is kindly and right thing to ask for the life of this young man—I take the position I have taken. I do not intend to say anything more on this Bill and would not have spoken if this case had not been brought forward as one reason why a Bill of this kind should be passed. This is a case which I think should emphasize the necessity of keeping the law just as it is, leaving the law to take its course.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no right to further intervene in the debate, having spoken once. I simply rise to refer to the request of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) to allow the Bill to pass the second reading and be submitted to a committee of the House, and to give my reason for the position I think the House should take. He based his request upon the fact that a statement of mine to the effect that there have been countries in Europe, if not States in the American Republic, which had abolished capital punishment and afterwards reverted to it, was denied by the hon. member for the St. Lawrence division (Mr. Bickerdike), and that consequently there was a state of disputed facts that might well be submitted to a committee. I do not think that a very strong case could be made for a submission to a committee on so narrow a dispute on facts as that. I observe this, and I had it in mind at the time I was speaking before, that in the debate in 1915 the Minister of Justice referred to several countries as in the category I described. He referred to Austria-Hungary as having abolished capital punishment and having again returned to that treatment of murderers, and asserted as a fact that this had been the case. He referred also to the cases of Brunswick, Cobourg, Nassau, and Oldenburg which abolished capital punishment in 1849; Saxe-Meiningen and Saxe-Weimar in 1862 and Baden in 1863 and to Saxony which abolished it in 1868, all of whom returned to capital punishment under the Imperial Criminal Code of 1872. He referred further to the case of Russia who abolished capital punishment in 1850 and again returned to it, and for many years continued the practice of capital punishment.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then repealed it again.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not altogether. But even if they had it would still be a case of a country that had abolished capital punishment and returned to it and so would come within the class to which I referred. It is true that in 1907 capital punishment was again abolished in Russia, and again I am relying upon the minister's statement, which he says he very carefully affirmed. He says that while it was abolished in 1907 it was not wholly abolished, but was retained only for the offence of the murder of the Emperor or Empress of Russia or the heir to the throne. It may be that under the newer conditions that now obtain in Russia the lives of the people generally may be considered as sacred as those of the Emperor or Empress and the heir to the throne. He referred also to certain states of the American Union as having long ago abolished capital punishment and having then found the error of their ways. He referred to Rhode Island, Colorado and the state of Maine, and said:

> It is true, some of these states have since abolished it again. But, so far as the hon. gentleman seems to find what he regards as an unanswerable argument in the fact that that those states that have abolished capital punishment have never repented their action.

Those are cases, several of them in Europe especially, where there has been reversion, that is where capital punishment once abolished was afterwards restored. I have read the speech of the hon. member for St. Lawrence division following the Minister of Justice. I have read his speech again in 1916, and I listened to his speech to-day; but I have seen nothing to contradict the individual instances given by the Minister of Justice. I shall not refer to the subject further than to say that if I have observed the course of the debate cor-

rectly I do not think that the sense of this House is to the effect that there should be any serious intention on the part of this Parliament at this time to abolish capital punishment. The discussion is well worth while, but it would be saying too much to gather from this debate that there appears to be a sense of the House looking to a serious consideration of its abolition now. I think myself the vote of the second reading might well take place.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I presume I shall be expected to reply to some of the very unjust criticisms that have been offered to the Bill which I introduced. I would say to my good friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) that the statement I made was this, that no country or no state in the world that had abolished capital punishment had resumed it at the present time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Resumed it since.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: Resumed it at the present time. I know that there were some cases, as in Russia, which, as my hon. friend said, abolished capital punishment for everything except the murder of the crowned heads.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What about those states in Germany?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I have some doubt about them. But it may be possible that Austria-Hungary, from some things that they have done recently, would return to capital puishment. But I do not think that our House should follow them.

Mr. BURNHAM: Would the hon. member prefer to follow the examples he has cited or those in Great Britain and France?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I would prefer to follow Russia just now.

Mr. BURNHAM: Yes, I thought so.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I hope that within a week this House will send a cable to Petrograd congratulating Russia on having abolished capital punishment entirely, and also upon the removal of all German influences in that country.

My good friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) has undertaken to say that that young man was guilty of murder. I have in my possession ten thousand or fifteen thousand signatures of people who say he was not.

Mr. BRADBURY: He was found guilty by the trial judge.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: Found guilty by the jury and sentenced by Judge Macdonald—and I hope Judge Macdonald will be ashamed of himself for doing so.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I hope the hon. member does not mean to cast any reflection upon the Bench, because he would be distinctly out of order in doing so.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: Well, may I express my opinion about the jury? I still say that I am ashamed of him, if he is not ashamed of himself. I am sure there is not any man in Canada, in this House or out of it, who would stand for hanging a woman or a child, notwithstanding what my leader said this afternoon. I cannot believe it possible that a man who is a man would stand for hanging a woman or a child, and I do not think that any of those who have spoken to-day would do so. They might give somebody else thirty pieces of silver to go and do it, but they would not do it themselves. The right hon. leader of the Opposition spoke of President Fallières this afternoon. I think that President Fallières was the greatest and best man that France ever produced. What did President Fallières say? He said that if the judges who condemned a man to death had to do the hanging, there would be no more hanging. I have a better suggestion than that, I should like to see my good friend the leader of the Opposition and my good friend the member for West Peterborough do the hanging. I think that under those conditions hanging would soon stop.

Mr. BURNHAM: I have seen men whom I would hang with pleasure.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I have not the slightest doubt of that. Any man who would stand up in this House and say he wanted to hang that boy would do almost anything.

Mr. BURNHAM: I did not say that.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) said that he was very much pleased that justice in Canada was administered in such a just and equitable manner. I question very much whether he was correct in that view. I knew a man not four hundred miles from Montreal who stole a horse and buggy. He was sentenced to penitentiary for two years, persecuted right to the end by the man he stole the horse and buggy from, while the man he stole the horse and buggy from stole a whole railroad and burst a bank—and he was knighted. I think your

whole system of punishment is wrong. You should punish with a view to making better men and women when you put them into prison. You punish for revenge, but you have no authority from Scripture to punish at all. There is not a verse in the word of God from Genesis to Revelation that gives you authority to punish a man at all or to hang him. I challenge the whole House to find it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There is no use appealiny to the other side; they are not familiar with the Scriptures.

Mr. BURNHAM: I asked you about hell.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: The member for Montcalm (Mr. Lafortune) apologized for what he was doing. What do they say in France—qui s'excuse s'accuse? He said he was sorry when he had to hang these men; it pains him very much—but he takes the pay all the same. It is blood money, but, like Pilate of old, he washes his hands of it and turns it over to the jury, asking them to be merciful—after saying everything he could against the prisoner.

The Minister of Justice said that he had divine sanction for hanging these poor criminals and sending their souls into eternity. I challenged him then to produce that authority, and I challenge him now to do so. The Minister has no divine mandate to hang a boy. If he has such a mandate, it should be placed on the Table of the House so that members on each side may examine it, so that it may be incorporated in the Canadian Archives, to enable generations yet unborn to realize that in the year 1917 there was in the Canadian Government a Minister of Justice who had divine authority for hanging a boy. With all due respect to the Minister of Justice, his extravagant utterances on this subject could have been inspired only by a prejudice. Take the case of self-defence. I contend that only in self-defence, if at all, are we justified in taking human life.

Conceiving that a man has the right under natural instinct and statutory laws to kill another in self-defence, can any man establish self-defence by shooting another who was known to be as helpless as if handcuffed with his hands behind his back? Then, it is no better in principle for the state to do this than it is for a citizen. Society has no more right to trifle with the most sacred work of God than the individual has. The minister sends a young boy, handcuffed and guarded by the police, from a modern penitentiary of cement, granite, steel and armour plate, takes him out upon the gallows and hangs him until he is dead. Surely my friends won't say that that boy was hanged in self-defence.

Mr. BURNHAM: I ask the hon. gentleman, since he draws so much upon his vivid imagination—

Mr. BICKERDIKE: That is no imagination. The boy is condemned there in Winnipeg.

Mr. BURNHAM: —regarding the horrors of condemning this young man to death—

Mr. BICKERDIKE: This child.

Mr. BURNHAM: May I ask the hon. gentlemen, then, how he escapes condemning the work of the Creator in condemning to eternal punishment a man who had committed a sin like that?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: That is too deep for me; I give it up. It is a question that would require a notice of motion. Seven and one-half millions against one poor unfortunate fellow locked up in a penitentiary —and yet you say you are going to hang him in self-defence. I should like very much to touch the heart of the Solicitor General. I know it is difficult. I mentioned a case last session, and as I think he did not grasp it, I submit again that where the equities are equal, the element of mercy should hold the balance of power in deciding this question—the awful suffering and remorse of the family of the victim of a homicide. I agree that it is hard on the family of the deceased, and my sympathy goes out to them. Whether his death was the result of an assassination or a justifiable homicide, it is all the same to them. But, for that reason, would you have two widows, two sets of orphans, and two sorrowing parents? I do not think that capital punishment does any good. The family of the prisoner are just as innocent of an offence as the family of the deceased, and are just as much entitled to compassion and sympathy. For example, a man commits murder. He probably got drunk, or was by environment made a criminal. He has a good wife and also children; a good mother and father, and a large number of relatives, all innocent people, and profoundly grieved that the offense was committed. The accused is tried, convicted, and sentenced to be hanged. The very thought of taking the life of the husband, father, brother and son breaks a multitude of hearts. The time has healed the wounds that grief for the victim rent, but as the

days roll by and the time approaches for the execution of the prisoner, the heart of the mother and the father all but breaks, the affectionate and tender cord of love that stretches from the altar to the scaffold is crushed but not broken, and the heart of the wife is burned to its very socket. She goes to and from the awful death cell. Little innocent hearts of children are crushed like the tender blades of grass beneath the angry heels of cannon on the German battlefield, yet they are all innocent. The brother and sister suffer for his sins, and see his ghost-like form in their dreams of repose. As the day draws near, the father and mother with tottering footsteps visit the death cell, and their minds wander back to the time when a little boy said his prayers at his mother's knee, and they ask God why they have this affliction to bear. The wife, children, relatives and friends all bid him good-bye and leave with breaking hearts, bitterly thinking of tomorrow. With heart-breaking despair, the mother prays God to spare her son, and as the time flies by the height of Heaven could not measure her sorrow. The father's hair turns gray over night, and the very souls are all scarred and forever seared over by the thought of the vengeance visited on their unfortunate relative, son and husband and father. The parents are hurried to their graves by broken hearts; the wife tries to forget, but cannot forgive; and the hearts of the children, relatives and friends are hardened by the harrowing example of killing by the State. Two families are in mourning, and the prisoner's family crushed and heart-broken by a protracted suspense, and that amounts to cruelty to the innocents. Then why make two families instead of one desolate.

Then, suppose he was innocent? There have been cases—we have had such cases right here in Canada—of innocent men being hanged. There was such a case not long ago in the United States, and I will mention others before I get through. The State cannot retract what it has done. If life imprisonment would serve the same purpose, would you not prefer it to the death penalty?

It is this spirit which must modify the law. Even if hell and death alike were necessary to be emphasized as penalties for the wicked in more barbarous ages, it is heaven and life which are to be chiefly taught as rewards for the good in the better and gentler days that are dawning. And this expresses a similar view to that maintained by the most competent judges, that pushing the death penalty only makes it worthless as a deterrent in communities that have reached the state of settled obedience to law.

It appears to me, therefore, to be in harmony with the highest teaching of life that if the death penalty be the greatest deterrent in Canada in the twentieth century, then Christianity has not succeeded in influencing men's thoughts as much as the so-called pagan pre-Christian philosophers of Rome. They had so prepared men's minds and developed men's characters that the death penalty was able to be abolished in Rome within five hundred years of Rome being founded, whereas some of our judges on the bench and most of our Christian bishops to-day in England say that capital punishment should not be abolished because it is the most powerful deterrent.

The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) spoke about this young man who had committed murder. To hear the hon. gentleman talk you would think that there was no capital punishment in Manitoba, and that it was for that reason that this crime took place. But that is not the case at all, for capital punishment is the law for Manitoba. I hope it will not be so for long.

Theoretically, from a contemplation of the claims of a Christianity exercised for nearly two thousand years, I should have expected that capital punishment would not now be the only and best deterrent from crime, and upon grounds of theory alone I should have felt justified in advocating that England, the professed pioneer in our humanitarian reforms, should have been willing to set the great example to the world of abolishing capital punishment as the proof of the sincerity of her claim. She has, however, lost that honour. Others have preceded her in the field, and with more matured faith in human nature and in the progress of culture, have removed its stigma from their statute-books. The result has been so thoroughly satisfactory, and the success has been so commensurate with the state of cultured civilization, that Canada has no excuse for now holding back from the same step, unless she is willing to stand self-convicted of a lower civilization and of a more perpetuated brutality than those nations who have found themselves fit to be freed from the yoke of death.

If Canada is lower in civilization than the countries wherein capital punishment has been successfully abolished, where is the boasted value of the freedom of her institutions, of her religion, of the development of her humanity and of her culture?

Any sufficiently civilized country that has enough faith may fearlessly abolish capital punishment from her statute-book. The actual valuelessness of capital punishment as a deterrent, and of its evil effect as an incentive to induce similar crimes, is to be gathered from the records of every land.

With the progress of civilization the inviolability of human life is more and more recognized. The idea of the dignity of man, of the inviolability of life even in the newborn child, is derived from Christianity, and a higher civilization must seek to proclaim it in legislation. But each execution speaks a different language. It proclaims in a loud voice to the crowd assembled round the scaffold that the State does not consider itself bound to respect human life, and that it regards itself as authorized to do that which is a crime in the individual.

My hon. friend from Edmonton said that there was Scripture authority for hanging. I maintain that there is no such authority. But there is a commandment which says "Thou shalt not kill;" and all the legislation in the country will never get the "not" out of that commandment. That applies to the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) as well as the leader of the Opposition and the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen). That commandment was given amidst the thunders of Sinai. It does not say that the state may kill and that the individual must not; that the state may murder a man but that the individual must not murder. There are no exceptions to that law.

Mr. BURNHAM: How does the hon. member then make an exception?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I do not.

Mr. BURNHAM: The hon. gentleman makes an exception of self-defence.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I say the command is plain—"Thou shalt not kill". Of course, the hon. member (Mr. Burnham) will say that the word "not" should not be there.

Mr. BALL: The Old Testament Scriptures say "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." And Christ himself when he was being taken, and when Peter drew his sword and cut off the ear of the High Priest's servant, said "They that take the sword shall perish by the sword." What construction does the hon. gentelman put upon these words in the Old Testament Scriptures and in the New?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: It seems to me the matter is very simple. Christ's words were "They that take the sword shall perish by the sword." But does that mean that all our returned soldiers must be killed? Surely there is no argument in these words against what I have said. And it is true the Old Testament Scriptures contain the words the hon gentleman (Mr. Ball) has quoted. And those words are perfectly true. For that is what has been done, and is being done to-day even here in Canada. But the "shall" there was not a command but a prophecy.

Mr. WRIGHT: What word, then, would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bickerdike) have used?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: You find the same used in the declaration that in the latter days perilous times shall come. Why, Moses himself was a murderer. He killed the Egyptian with whom he contended. Yet his blood was not shed by man.

Mr. BALL: What construction do you place upon the words, "They that take the sword shall perish by the sword"?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: Why, that means that the Lord was opposed to war. There is no other construction possible. Any Sunday-School child will tell you that. The construction is that the law does not approve of killing at all, neither with the sword of Peter nor the sword of anybody else, not even with the sword of the Kaiser.

Mr. GRAHAM: Christ would not allow even the ear of the murderer to be cut off.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: There is a justification for everything I say to-night, because we find that the only letter that was ever written by our Lord Jesus Christ was the one written by Him in the sand when He sat as a jury trying a poor woman who had made a mistake. When He finished He, as if to interpret the letter He had written, said to the woman: Where are thy accusers? and the woman answered him, Sir, there are none. That was the letter supposed to be written in the sand.

Mr. BURNHAM: What about those people who go into outer darkness, where there shall be weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: The only one that I have seen gnashing his teeth to-day has been my good friend the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham). When I hear a minister of the gospel—I am speaking about Protestant ministers—preaching in the pulpit on Sunday about Jesus Christ's sacrifices and the forgiveness

of sins, and on Monday advocating capital punishment and revenge, I say that he is neither more nor less than a sounding brass and tinkling cymbal, and I ask the old question: Was it he or his parents who sinned? for that man was certainly born blind.

May I be permitted to quote from a good friend of mine in New York, Mr. Thomas Mott Osborne, one of the greatest authorities on capital punishment on this side of the Atlantic, if not in the world. He says:

Certainly we ought to be in no way behind Russia in conserving human life. There is no question as this one of capital punishment which calls for plain common sense in dealing with it. It is not an abstruse question. The ridiculous thing we do in prisons with our prisoners will not bear being brought to light. For instance, what is the advantage in shaving the heads of prisoners? What is the use of treating a man in such a way that he is stamped as a convict when he goes back into civil life? I plead for this question to be approached in a reasonable and intelligent manner without trace of hysteria. There is no doubt that a lot of men are in prison who ought not to be there, but it is equally true that there are a lot who are not there and ought to be there.

Perhaps my hon. friend who was knighted might be amongst them. Mr. Osborne goes on to say:

It is not advisable to get sentimental about the men in prison, for in all my experience I have discovered only two men whom I thought were really innocent and ought not be in prison.

The whole question of capital punishment must be viewed from the point of the advantage of society.

It is no use discussing that question from any other point of view in any country.

If it is for the advantage of society that men ought to be killed, then let them be killed.

But we have first of all to see that it is for the advantage of society. If it is for the advantage and protection of society that men should be killed, let us kill them; but if not, let us not do so.

Equally, if it is to the advantage of society that a man should be shackled for life, then let him be shackled. The advantage and interests of society must be the first consideration. As with a man who has the smallpox. You send him to the hospital and quarantine him, not only to protect society, but also to protect himself.

That is what we do when we send a man to penitentiary for life.

The certainty of punishment is far more effective than the magnitude of it. A man will be in more fear of punishment if he knows that when found guilty the hand of the law will certainly fall upon him, and exact the penalty. That is clearly seen in the punishment of our own children. It is also proved by statistics. In the state of Maine capital punishment has been abolished, re-introduced and abolished again, with the result that there has been a greater percentage of convictions with the absence of capital punishment than with it. A jury is not so ready to convict a man if they know that the penalty will be death, but they will find a man guilty more often if the punishment is a mere nominal one. The statistics for the state of Maine show that when capital punishment was in force only 27 per cent of convictions followed the indictments. When it was removed that number increased to 59 per cent. When capital punishment was re-introduced the figure dropped to 30 per cent., and when it was abolished again the number increased to 60 per cent, thus showing that there are a greater number of convictions with the absence of capital punishment.

Mr. GRAHAM: Maine was one of the states that the minister said had abolished capital punishment and had reinstated it. I see it has abolished it again.

Mr BURNHAM: Does the hon. member overlook the fact that some of the states abolished capital punishment because the citizens wished to have the privilege of killing people without being punished for it? You will find that to be the case in some remote districts.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: Mr. Osborne goes on to say:

I personally have put more men to death than any other man in the United States. I have executed forty men during my term of two and a half years as warden of Sing Sing prison. I did not attend the executions, and on all occasions except two I was absent from the prison as a protest. But there is not a man who has anything to do with executions directly who does not hate it.

There is also the uncertainty of execution which has a great influence on crime.

He goes on to prove that of the criminals condemned in the state of New York only about 1.3 per cent were executed. He goes on to say:

It is claimed that capital punishment frightens people from committing crime, and because of fear they will refrain from murder. But where is there a man worth his salt who will change his line of conduct because of a fear of punishment? I have never yet found a crook who is frightened by the severity of the law. There might be a few cowards outside who are prevented from murder by fear of the chair. But the example of the state makes murderers. There are boys in the underworld who regard the men who go to the chair as heroes, and there is not one man who goes to the chair who does not go there bravely and ready to meet his fate. For every man you put to death, there are six boys ready to spring up in his place. The

fear of punishment is not a deterrent. There are two kinds of a murderer—one who commits a crime in the heat of passion or when enraged by liquor, and the other who deliberately plans a murder and who also at the same time plans his escape from the law.

It has been conceded by some of the most eminent physicians that any man committing a murder has an unbalanced mind at the moment. At the moment, at least, he is temporarily insane. He may be enraged through a sense of being wronged, or through kindred emotions, and is in no mood to weigh the results of his acts, or to take account of punishments confronting him. It is sad to believe that much of the prejudice in favour of the gallows may be traced to three discreditable sources. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) has cited those.

Let me close by saying that capital punishment, although sanctioned by the letter of the old Biblical law, is contrary to its interpretation in the light of Christianity.

I would like to have an opportunity of making good the statement I made to my hon. friend, the Solicitor General, because I would not like to have him think for a moment that I would contradict him without being quite sure. Therefore, if it is agreeable to the House, I would move the adjournment of the debate to enable me to bring the documents down.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The debate cannot be adjourned after the mover of the second reading has replied. There cannot be any more debate.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: The second reading has not been passed yet. If my hon. friend is going to adopt the Bill, all right.

Up to now the Bill has not had a second reading. We have simply been debating it. For that reason I would move that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understand the hon. gentleman is not through with his speech, and it is on this account he asks for the adjournment of the debate.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Is the hon. gentleman tired out?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: No. This afternoon I flatly contradicted the Solicitor General, one of the men I have the most respect for in this House, and I wish to convince him that I am right. I have not the necessary documents with me to do that, but I have wired to Montreal for them, and it is for that reason that I ask for the adjournment of the debate.

[Mr. Bickerdike.]

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

On motion of Sir George Foster, the House adjourned at 10.10 p.m.

Friday, April 20, 1917.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

APPOINTMENT OF MR. U. TREMBLAY.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had directed the Clerk of the House to lay upon the Table his recommendation and the Clerk's report in the matter of the appointment of Mr. U. Tremblay to the Blue Book Translation Branch of the Translation Staff of the House of Commons.

FREE WHEAT.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I lay on the Table the Order in Council asked for yesterday by the leader of the Opposition, placing on the free list, wheat, wheat flour and semolina.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is there any correspondence attached to the Order in Council?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There is no correspondence.

OLIVER EQUIPMENT.

Sir EDWARD KEMP laid on the Table of the House, Memorandum as to Oliver Equipment, (already published in Revised Hansard, page 577).

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF CONFEDERATION.

PROPOSED CELEBRATION.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER moved:

That the following words be added to the resolution adopted by the House on Wednesday, the seventh day of February last, appointing the Committee to consider and report upon the Fiftieth Anniversary of Confederation: "And that the Committee is hereby empowered to meet in joint sittings with the like committee of the Senate."

Motion agreed to.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate informing Their Honours that this House has amended its resolution of Wednesday, the seventh day of February last, appointing the Committee to consider and report on the matter of celebrating the Fiftieth Anniversary of Confederation, by adding thereto the following

words: "And that the Committee is hereby empowered to meet in joint sittings with the like Committee of the Senate;" and requesting Their Honours to similarly amend their resolution passed the same day, in connection with the same subject.

Motion agreed to.

RIVIERE OUELLE-MURRAY BAY STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

On the Orders of the Day.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Will the Minister of Railways give me some information about the service of the steamer Champlain between Rivière Ouelle wharf and Murray Bay? I received a letter from the minister stating that I had evidently been misinformed. The Montreal Gazette, however, of this morning publishes an official advertisement of the closing of the branch line between Rivière Ouelle Junction and Rivière Ouelle wharf.

Mr. COCHRANE: I still stand by my letter. I said the service was not going to be taken off and it shall not.

SUPPLY.

On the motion of Sir Thomas White for Committee of Supply:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not object to the House going into Committee of Supply. I understand that we are to take up the Civil Government Estimates, but this will not interfere with rule 17 (c) which requires that the estimates of any department shall be first taken up on a day other than Friday.

House in Committee of Supply. Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Department of Customs—Salaries and Contingencies, $353,100.

Mr. REID: We have just the same number of officials as we had last year. The estimates for the salaries of those officials was $328,237.50 last year; this year the salaries amount to $328,100 or a decrease of $137.50, the reason being that we have reduced the number of officials in subdivision (a) of the Third Division from 27 to 23, but we have added four in the subdivision below that, thereby reducing the total amount. We have, of course, added the statutory increases. There have been no other changes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There is an actual economy of $137.50 in that department?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is a great example for the colleagues of my hon. friend.

Mr. REID: We have really done better than that because in that amount is included the payment of officials who are serving overseas.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Do I understand that something will crop up later on which will wipe out this saving?

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. MURPHY: Although a resident of the city of Ottawa, and the representative of a constituency part of which is within the city of Ottawa, I was unaware until recently, when the Parliamentary Committee on Returned Soldiers met here shortly after the adjournment, that a number of drastic, I had almost said revolutionary, changes have been made in the Civil Service Act. These changes are so important and so few members of the House may be informed regarding them, that I think it is absolutely necessary at the outset of the considerations of these Estimates that the attention of hon. gentlemen should be drawn to them. If members of the committee will get No. 4 of the printed proceedings of the Parliamentary Committee on Returned Soldiers, they will find most of these changes set out in the evidence of Dr. Adam Shortt, Civil Service Commissioner, generally referred to, erroneously, as the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. For instance, at page 370 he refers to an Order in Council that was passed on the 12th of October, 1916, and explaining the gist of that Order in Council, he says (page 371):

> It comes down to this, that the only person eligible to enter the Service in the regular way at the present time are those below the military age, and that age has been reduced by this Order in Council from 18, which was formerly the minimum, to 16, and those over the military age. Formerly they could not be admitted above the age of 35, now they can be taken in to an indefinite age.

I submit that that is scarcely a provision that would apply to returned soldiers.

> —which is dependent upon the judgment of those who issue these certificates, or who suggest them for employment.

He then went on to explain that the discretion as to the admission of persons over thirty-five years of age rested jointly with the departmental heads and the Civil Service Commissioners. Further on he explains that whereas in the past it had been

customary to employ temporary help for a period of six months only, by this Order in Council that time limit was abolished, and on page 371 he says that any one taken on temporarily could now be kept on until the end of the war, in any department of the inside or outside service.

Mr. REID: Is the hon. gentleman objecting to that?

Mr. MURPHY: I am not objecting to anything as yet, but am merely stating the changes that have been made, so that the committee may discuss the minister's Estimates intelligently and find out to what extent he has availed himself of these Orders in Council. On page 372 Dr. Shortt further explains that on the 1st of January, 1917, the following Order in Council was passed:

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, under and in virtue of the provisions of section 6 of the War Measures Act, 1914, is pleased to order that section 22 of the Civil Service Act, 1908, as amended by chapter 8 of the Statutes of 1910, relating to the appointment to the position of messengers, porters, sorters and packers, and to certain other positions, shall be and the same is hereby amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

(3). Any person who has been on active service overseas in the Military or Naval forces of His Majesty during the present war may be appointed either temporarily or permanently to any of the said positions upon his satisfying the deputy head of the department in which he is to be appointed that he can read and write and also that he has the usual qualifications required with respect to character and health.

As Dr. Shortt went on to explain in his evidence, that removed all restrictions for the future and threw that class of the Civil Service open to appointments made practically by the minister of the day. That is perhaps the most drastic of all the changes. There are others that I need not refer to at the moment, but I think it is important that the committee should understand that by Order in Council the statutory law of this country relating to the Civil Service has been changed in several very important particulars, and before we pass these estimates the committee should know to what extent these changes have been taken advantage of by the responsible heads of the different departments, and how many persons have been employed under the new regulations. I now invite the Minister of Customs to give us that information regarding his department.

Mr. REID: This Order in Council gives us power to appoint a man over thirty-five years of age. Under the Act a man had to bu under thirty-five or over eighteen years of age. Speaking for myself, I think that men between the ages of eighteen and thirty-five, if they are qualified for overseas service should be given a position in the overseas forces. In filling vacancies in my own department, I try to find a man who is ineligible for military service, and if possible the relative of an overseas soldier. As my hon. friend has explained, this Order in Council extends the age limit, but the appointments are made in the usual way through the Civil Service Commission. I think this new provision is a good thing. It would hardly be fair for us to fill vacancies with men who were qualified for overseas service. With regard to the outside service, appointments are always made on the minister's recommendation, and so far as my own department is concerned preference is always given to a returned soldier. The Order in Council to which reference has been made provides that vacant positions in the Civil Service are first to be offered to returned soldiers, and since the passing of that order, so far as I can recollect, every position filled in my department has been filled by the appointment of a returned soldier. I believe there was one case, which was mentioned prior to the adjournment, in which an appointment was made temporarily until a returned soldier could be found to fill the position. The position was a small one at some port in eastern Canada.

Mr. MURPHY: What the hon. minister has stated is no doubt very interesting, but it does not touch the points I endeavoured to bring before the committee. The first point is as to the increased age at which appointments may be made. At page 371 of the evidence appears the following question and answer:

Q. But if the discretion is all right he can be taken in at seventy?

A. Yes, but usually, unless there are special circumstances, not over sixty.

But the Order in Council of January, 1917, opens up a much wider field. It takes out of the hands of the Civil Service Commissioners altogether the appointments that have rested with them under the Civil Service Act and hands them over to the minister of the day. At page 373 of the evidence you find this:

Q. In other words, these appointments may be made outside the Civil Service Commissioners altogether?—A. Yes.

Q. By the Deputy head?—A. Well, by the head who orders the deputy head to take action.

That is the evidence of Dr. Shortt, of the Civil Service Commission. It will be seen that the Order in Council makes the most radical change in the statute law relating to the Civil Service. I would ask the minister to what extent he has availed himself of this power and how many appointments he has made by virtue of it.

Mr. REID: I am sending for the Order in Council of January, 1917, and when I have it before me I can discuss it better. So far, I have not made any appointments to the Inside Service except on certificate of the Civil Service Commissioners.

Mr. MURPHY: Would the minister please give us a list of appointments?

Mr. REID: The appointments are:

W. A. Deslauriers, P. W. Johnston, November 1, 1915; B. L. Peters, J. J. Wall, W. Worsley, December 1, 1915; J. W. Pilon, J. S. Deachman, R. R. Fitzgerald, September 1, 1916; E. Petrie, K. S. Raynard, October 1, 1916; J. G. Raymond, April 17, 1916.

All these appointments are made at salaries of $800, except that of J. G. Raymond, who is appointed at $500.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: To what positions are these men appointed?

Mr. REID: Clerks in the Inside Service.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Are these new appointments, or are they the filling of vacancies?

Mr. REID: They are all to fill vacancies caused by death or resignation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am not aware that these Orders in Council, which practically supersede the Civil Service Act, were drawn to the attention of the House. I understand from the minister that he is sending for them?

Mr. REID: Yes. I am not sure whether they were brought down or not, but I will have them here in a few minutes.

Mr. MURPHY: Has the minister made any appointments under these Orders in Council, and if so, out of what vote were the appointees paid?

Mr. REID: We have not made any appointments to the Inside Service under the Order in Council to which the hon. gentleman refers. These appointments were made through the Civil Service Commissioners, and payment is made out of this vote.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: As I understand it, those whose names the minister read were returned soldiers?

Mr. REID: No. No appointments of returned soldiers have been made by the Department of Customs in the Inside Service, but, so far as I can remember, we have appointed over two hundred in the Outside Service.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: But these appointments to the Outside Service do not relate to the vote now before the committee?

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. TURRIFF: Were those appointed under the Order in Council all between the ages of eighteen and thirty-five?

Mr. REID: Those whose names I have read were appointed under certificate of the Civil Service Commissioners, and they are all under thirty-five.

Mr. TURRIFF: Do I understand the minister to say that a man between eighteen and thirty-five should not be given an appointment in the Civil Service, but should be given an appointment to go to the front?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. TURRIFF: Yet he tells us that he has appointed to the Civil Service all these men who were between eighteen and thirty-five?

Mr. REID: These appointments were made prior to the passing of the Order in Council of January, 1917. Up to that time we could only make appointments under the Civil Service Act and under the certificate of the Civil Service Commissioners. This meant that appointments were confined to those of between eighteen and thirty-five.

Mr. TURRIFF: The minister has told us that an Order in Council had been passed providing that, as far as possible, new appointments should be made from amongst returned soldiers.

Is there anything in that Order in Council which provides that a returned soldier who was an official of my hon. friend's department should be dismissed on his return?

Mr. REID: No, there is nothing of the kind.

Mr. TURRIFF: Will my hon. friend say if he has dismissed any returned soldiers?

Mr. REID: I dismissed one, in so far as my memory goes.

Mr. TURRIFF: I presume my hon. friend refers to the case of Colonel Spittal?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. TURRIFF: Would my hon. friend tell the House the reason why he dismissed that official of his department who had served at the front for many months and who has returned?

Mr. REID: The reason was this as far as I can remember: Colonel (Major, I believe it is) Spittal was a returned soldier. He returned many months ago. When he came back I understand the Militia Department notified him that they did not require his services any longer. We were paying Mr. Spittal his salary right along and he was not performing any service either in the Militia Department or the Customs Department. I directed the Commissioner of Customs to send for Mr. Spittal, to ask him to come back and take his position, and to inform him that as they did not require him in the Milita Department and as we were paying his salary, we required his services in the Customs Department. I informed him that if he did not wish to come back and take his position, I would replace him. I could not see any reason why, when he came back uninjured, and just as healthy and well as the day he left, the Government of Canada should pay him a salary for walking around the city of Ottawa. I sent for him and took the matter up with him myself. He claimed that the Militia Department, or the Government, had not the power to dispense with his services and he refused to come back to the Customs Department. I said to him: If you will not come back to the Customs Department when you are not working for the Militia, and when they say they do not want you, then, of course, I must dispense with your services and put another man on. That is the only reason why I let Mr. Spittal out. He never was injured at the front like the returned soldiers we are speaking of. I will explain the policy which I have been following in so far as it has to do with soldiers who have returned and who have been injured at the front. They, in my opinion, should have the first chance where there is a vacancy. Mr. Spittal never was in that position and I think myself that if he had any difference with the Militia Department his duty was to come back and take his position in the Customs Department. If he had done so there would never have been any trouble whatever. This is the story in so far as Mr. Spittal is concerned.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend takes the position that it was the duty of Col. Spittal to come back and go to work in the Customs Department, but if Col. Spittal had done so that would have been carrying out the wishes of the Militia Department who were wrongfully endeavouring to dismiss him, and who had informed him that he must take off his uniform and not wear it again. He refuses to obey the orders of the Militia Department simply because he is in the right, and as he was sent over here from the front, where he was doing duty for Canada, by the War Office, he claims that under the Militia Act, and, I think, rightly, he cannot be summarily dismissed without a word. Without any reason, or excuse, or justification whatever, my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, in order to help the Militia Department out, sends for Col. Spittal and says: Either come back to your work or I will dismiss you. My hon. friend dismissed him and the Militia Department are trying to dismiss him and they cannot. There is the position. Here is a man who has done his duty at the front. He is not one of those men, and there are hundreds and thousands of them, who have been sent over to England, and who have been enjoying big salaries all along while doing nothing and who, in many cases, are drawing two salaries, not only a salary from the Militia Department, but a salary from one of the other departments of the Government. Here is a man that the Government want to get rid of because he is not amenable to some of the things they want done, and they take this method of dismissing him. The Minister of Customs has lent himself to carrying that out. My hon. friend is getting very careful all at once of the salary paid to one of the men who has gone to the front in defence of the country, and he should have some better explanation and excuse to give than that which he has put up. That is only a method to bring about his dismissal and to enable the Militia Department to get rid of him. It is certainly not a desire for economy that has induced my hon. friend to take that position. I do not think he did that for the purpose of making the expenditures for this year $130 less than last year. He will have to put up a better explanation before the people will be satisfied that a returned

soldier should be treated as Col. Spittal has been treated by the Militia and Customs Departments.

Mr. KYTE: Is it the policy of the Minister of Customs to appoint no persons to the outside service except returned soldiers as vacancies occur?

Mr. REID: The Order in Council which was passed was for the purpose of giving returned soldiers an opportunity to fill any vacancies and in the administration of the Customs Department I have endeavoured in every case to appoint a returned soldier. The policy I have been trying to follow has been this: I am having a number of returned soldiers trained to act as relieving officers. We have always had a number of men to act as relieving officers in the several provinces so that in case of sickness, or in case an extra man is required for a few weeks, or during the temporary absence of an officer, we have some person to send and replace the permanent officer. I have been endeavouring to have a number of men appointed and educated in the customs service so that when a vacancy occurs in any particular constituency I can send one of these men as relieving officer to fill the position temporarily until a returned soldier would come back to that particular constituency. Then I would appoint that returned soldier to the vacancy and transfer the relieving officer to some other point. I have been following out that policy and as far as I can remember at the present time it has worked well. I do not know at the moment of any appointment that has been made except in that way since the Order in Council was passed.

Mr. KYTE: Take the case of a sub-collectorship that has become vacant in Nova Scotia; would it be the policy of the minister to give a preference to a returned soldier rather than to a person who had not served overseas?

Mr. REID: Yes, that would be my policy, but, of course, there are some cases where the salaries are $100 or $200 and where it is almost impossible to get a returned soldier. There are some vacancies, I do not know whether they are in Nova Scotia or not, where the duties are simply the clearing of vessels, and where the salary is from $100 to $200, on which you could not expect a man to live. In these cases it may be necessary to appoint men temporarily, and then afterwards give the positions to returned soldiers who have been so badly injured that they cannot earn their living by manual labour or by the pursuit of their previous occupation, but whose pensions of from $400 to $600 would be so supplemented by the small salary attached to the positions that they could live comfortably.

Mr. KYTE: I am merely endeavouring to get at the minister's policy, in regard to these appointments. A vacancy might occur in the Customs in my own constituency; in fact there is one, and a young man from the district might return from the war who would be very glad to accept a position at $200. I have in mind the position of sub-collector of customs in the district of West Arichat which has been vacant for four years. The business has all to be transacted at Arichat which sometimes causes inconvenience and loss to the captains of vessels and to importers. Two years ago I asked the minister if he intended to fill the office, and the answer was that no complaints had come to him of any inconvenience on account of his not having filled that office. I desire to repeat the statement made then that considerable inconvenience has arisen in respect of the business arising from day to day. If the minister will say to me that it is his intention to appoint a returned soldier in accordance with the general policy which he has adopted of giving preference to these soldiers, I could understand his keeping the office open until a returned soldier became available.

Mr. REID: With reference to this particular office, when we come to the other Estimates I shall have more information; but if the hon. member should have a returned soldier later on who had been injured to such an extent that he is really not able to do manual labour or to earn his living by his previous profession, I would be very glad indeed to give that man assistance even to the extent of appointing him to the position the hon. member named. I would even go to the extent of opening up the office again. But if he should be a man who was not injured and was able to do some other work, it would be better to hold the position until we get some man who would be able to attend only to such simple matters as the clearance of vessels. I am extremely anxious to hold such positions for men who cannot make anything beyond their pensions. If I should hear of a man of that kind I would appoint him.

Mr. KYTE: The only preference, then, is to men who have been wounded. I understood that all men who returned whether they were wounded or not, would be entitled to special consideration.

Mr. REID: Any man who has been at the front will certainly be entitled to such an appointment. But so far, of course, all the appointments of this kind that I have made have been of men who have been wounded; and I think every one will agree that if we can help those men it is well to do so. Such positions as my hon. friend referred to, I should like to give to men who have been seriously wounded and who could not do any other work. But all men who have been at the front come under the one head, that they are entitled to consideration and shall have it.

Mr. KYTE: First consideration?

Mr. REID: First consideration.

Mr. MURPHY: A word was used inadvertently by the minister a few minutes ago, perhaps inadvertently, that may or may not be indicative of intention under the changes wrought by these Orders in Council. I would be the last to say that that word indicates the minister's intention; but when the hon. minister stated that if any vacancy occurred in a constituency he would send a returned soldier to that constituency, somehow or other that suggested to me that possibly the application by wholesale of these changes to which I have been drawing attention would follow. That may not be the case, and my apprehension on that score may be quite unfounded. But what the minister said, is, that if a vacancy occurred in a constituency he would send a returned soldier to that constituency. By a further section of this Order in Council, even the elementary test of reading and writing is, according to Dr. Shortt, practically abolished for appointment to this lower grade division, inasmuch as the whole matter is now left in the hands of the deputy head of the department, who is, of course, subject to the head. In the absence of the Order in Council, and of the information which the minister says he will give to the House, I shall not press the matter further at this time.

I wish to ask the minister, in view of his express declaration this afternoon, which I must do him the justice of saying is in accordance with his intention expressed outside of the House, that he will give the first preference to returned soldiers, is it his intention to apply that policy to the vacant collectorship at Montreal?

Mr. REID: That is my intention. The position in the city of Montreal is a very, very important one. At the time of the resignation of Mr. White, I decided that it was necessary to have an experienced officer immediately take charge until the question of a permanent appointment was decided on. The man I was going to send at once was Mr. H. C. Blair of the city of Ottawa. Mr. Blair came originally, I think, from Nova Scotia.

Mr. STANFIELD: From Truro.

Mr. REID: From Truro. He has been in the service thirty or thirty-five years. I think there is no man in the Customs Department better qualified or more able to handle a position of that kind than Mr. Blair. Mr. Blair himself in August, 1914, at the time of the outbreak of the war, was very anxious to go to the front; in fact he asked me and urged me to allow him to go, and also applied to General Hughes. He was not allowed to go because he was over age and because we could not spare him at that time. We had educated him as to the needs of the department; he had been given all necessary instructions as to how to handle the Customs business in case war was declared. He was the man who went from Sydney to Vancouver months before the outbreak of war instructing the collectors so that they would know how to act if war was declared. Mr. Blair sent his own son to the front, and to-day he lies buried in France, a wife and small child surviving him. I sent Mr. Blair to Toronto because he was the man who was qualified to go there. He was feeling badly over the loss of his son. I sent Mr. Bertram from Toronto to Montreal; he is one of the best officials in Canada. It required a man like Mr. Bertram or Mr. Blair to take charge of that office at that particular time. Any one who knows Mr. Bertram will say that no other man in Canada is better qualified than he is. My understanding of the Order in Council is that if a returned soldier is entitled to a position as an officer of Customs at a salary of $200, he is entitled to a position in the city of Montreal at $4,500. I have, therefore, taken the same position in respect to this office as I have in respect to the other offices in Canada now vacant and which I am holding. I have sent men from other offices to fill positions temporarily until I can get men who have served at the front and who I believe could fill the positions. I have sent Mr. Bertram to Montreal as collector, and he is filling the position well. In these war times it requires a man of his experience or that of Mr. Blair's to fill that position temporarily,

until an appointment is finally made. If I were to appoint a man other than one who has had experience, it would be necessary to have a man like Mr. Blair or Mr. Bertram work with him for a few months in order to educate him so that he might discharge his duties efficiently. In Montreal we collect $35,000,000 per annum—I think that was the amount collected last year. Most of the shipments from Canada pass through that port. I have stated the position that I took when vacancies occurred, and that is the position I am going to take until I can get men from the front. I know most of the men in Montreal who have gone to the front, and I believe that any man who goes to the front and does his duty for his country should get that position as well as any other.

Mr. TURRIFF: Is my hon. friend holding that position open for the return of the hon. Postmaster General from the front? 4 p.m.

Mr. REID: If the Postmaster General goes to the front, takes part in the war, and comes back maimed or otherwise and wants that position, I will give it to him or to any other man who does the same thing.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Could the minister be induced to reduce his staff in some of the smaller country towns where he has a great excess of employees? In 1912, a year or two after the present Administration came into power, a return was brought down showing the increase in the number of officials of the Government, and, if I remember rightly, my hon. friend the Minister of Customs was one of the worst offenders. My recollection is that, although there was a decrease in customs receipts, his staff increased to the extent of something like 1,600. My hon. friend has not corrected that, as far as I know, at least in many of these places with which I am acquainted. I find the proof of this in the answer to a question which the Minister of Customs put before the House yesterday. The question was asked by the member for North Cape Breton, and was as follows:

How many persons are employed in the Customs service at the Port of North Sydney?

The answer is "Ten, one of whom is absent on active military service." Then he gives the names, as follows:

Jos. McPherson, J. L. Brennan, David Edwards, J. H. Cameron, F. E. Jackson, John Cogan, J. J. McDonald, H. W. McNeil, Jas. McLeod, Angus Young.

In another part of this answer I find, that the total collections for the year 1916 at the port of North Sydney amounted to $66,460, showing that my hon. friend spends about 14 per cent of the money that he gets from the port of North Sydney in paying his large staff of officers. I give that as an example of the manner in which my hon. friend has enormously increased his staff in many of the ports of Nova Scotia during the time that he has occupied the position of Minister of Customs. If my hon. friend is sincere in what he says about returned soldiers, I have no doubt that he could make room for at least one thousand of them by getting rid of a large number of these unnecessary men that he has in small ports throughout the Dominion and whom he appointed at a time when his department was running wild in the matter of appointments. I should like to know whether my hon. friend will adopt the advice of the hon. gentleman who sits to his right, who has asked us all to practice economy, by getting rid of some of these unnecessary men to whom he is now paying salaries.

Mr. REID: In the port that my hon. friend mentions we have not any greater number of employees than we had at the time I took charge of the department. As my hon. friend mentioned, one of the men is overseas and we have therefore decreased the staff to that extent. In the port of North Sydney, if I remember rightly, a great deal of harbour work is going on, and even though the collections may not be very large, many vessels are clearing and other business requires the attention of a number of officials. Since the war broke out, although the revenue and the work have increased very materially at practically all ports, I have not appointed a man to a vacancy if it has been at all possible to do without him. Only when the inspectors and the collectors have pressed hard for the appointment and have proved to my satisfaction that they could not get along without it have I consented to fill the vacancies, and in filling them I have proceeded as I stated a few minutes ago. Not having the other memorandum in connection with the outside service, I am not able to give the hon. member as full information as if we were considering the outside service.

Mr. SINCLAIR: My hon. friend is quite right in stating that we are discussing the Inside Service, and I will try to avoid taking up the time of the committee in regard to

the Outside Service. My object in mentioning this matter was to give my hon. friend an opportunity of exercising economy. If he would accept my advice we might save a considerable amount of money and possibly make room for a number of returned soldiers.

Another matter in connection with the Civil Service which I think pertains chiefly to the Inside Service is what I regard as an abuse of section 21 of the Civil Service Act. Hon. members who are familiar with that Act will remember that section 21 was inserted for the purpose of enabling the Government to appoint experts in departments where they were found to be necessary. I recollect very well when the Civil Service Act was passed in 1908 that the Minister of Finance of that day explained to the House, in connection with this section, that circumstances would arise where it would not be possible to submit candidates to examination and competition; that occasionally a department might wish to introduce from abroad or even from Canada an eminent man who had made a reputation for himself in some branch and who would not be willing to submit himself to examination by the Civil Service Commission. For example, we might want an engineer who had a great reputation in connection with the railways or public works of the country, who would not be willing to pass any examination, and who would not accept a position unless he was taken on without examination. That was the reason why section 21 was inserted in the Civil Service Act. I find, however, that large additions have been made to the Civil Service by the present Administration under the provisions of section 21 on the pretense that the appointees are experts. Last year I took occasion to ask how many of those appointments had been made, and I find by the answer that was given to the House yesterday that there has been an increase of fifteen of those experts during the past year. I do not know in which department they are; I presume they are in different departments.

Mr. REID: There are none in mine.

Mr. SINCLAIR: At all events we have fifteen additional experts appointed during the current year, and the total number is now 174. Since the present Government came into power they have appointed, under section 21, according to the return given to the House yesterday, 174 experts without examination and without any competition. No one would believe that even twelve of those were genuine experts. I would not like to say that twelve of them were men who were honestly appointed under section 21; but suppose we estimate that twice as many were so appointed, and I think I am far within the limit when I admit that there were 24 of them altogether who were introduced by the present Administration as genuine experts under that section, that would leave 150 bogus ones for whom some excuse has to be made. Every one of those men is appointed by an Order in Council, which contains a statement complying with section 21, which provides that:—

> If the deputy head reports that the knowledge and ability requisite for the position are wholly or in part professional, technical or otherwise peculiar, the Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the head of the department, based on the report in writing of the deputy head, may appoint a person to the position without competitive examination and without reference to the age limit, provided the said person obtains from the Commission a certificate, to be given with or without examination, as is determined by the regulations of the Commission, that he possesses the requisite knowledge and ability and is duly qualified as to health, character and habits.

Every one of those 150 employees who are described as experts has been appointed under a special Order in Council and therefore that Order in Council must have contained an incorrect statement. That is rather a strong assertion to make. It is rather hard for us to believe that fifteen gentlemen sitting around the Council Board conspired to deceive His Excellency by stating that they required such and such a man as an expert whereas as a matter of fact they required him only because he was a supporter of the party. It is hard to believe that the Cabinet would agree to deceive His Excellency by passing a sham Order in Council of that kind for the purpose of getting a position for a supporter of the party. That, however, appears to be the situation. I am quite certain that all these so-called eminent men from abroad or from Canada were not appointed on their merits. At least 150 of them are what I call bogus experts, men who have been introduced into the Civil Service under this section when they should not have been introduced and when there is no good reason for their introduction. Last year we were given by a return the numbers in each department. The Department of Agriculture appointed 29; the Commission of Conservation, 5; External Affairs, 1; Governor General's Secretary, 1; House of Commons, 2; Indian Affairs, 3; Interior, 11; Inland

Revenue, 17; Justice, 12; Labour, 1; Mines, 13; Marine and Fisheries, 4; Militia and Defence, 9; Naval Service, 2; Post Office, 5; Privy Council, 1; Public Works, 28; Printing and Stationery, 1; Railways and Canals, 2; Royal North West Mounted Police, 1; Senate, 1; Secretary of State, 7; Trade and Commerce, 3; making 159, whereas the answer given to the question asked yesterday was that the number had risen to 174 since this return was brought down last year. Will any person believe that fifteen experts were appointed by the Government since last year; I would like to have the names of the men who have been appointed during the year 1916-17, if my hon. friend will give them to me. A large number of those so-called experts are not genuine experts; they are put into the departments under the provisions of section 21 by false representations made to His Excellency when the Orders in Council are passed. If I am incorrect in my statement, the minister can easily put me right by bringing down to the House the names of these 174 men, their former addresses, the nature of their business prior to their appointment and an account of what they are doing at the present time for the salaries they are receiving. The House will then be able to judge whether I am right or wrong in saying that they should not have been appointed.

Mr. REID: The hon. member is giving me quite a contract. So far as the Customs Department is concerned he has not mentioned a single man who has been taken on under that section. I would suggest that each minister give my hon. friend this information when his estimates are up. I will mention it to my colleagues, that they may be prepared to answer my hon. friend. I do not think an unreasonable number of men have been taken on under this section. In the Public Works Department, for instance, twenty-eight men have been appointed under Section 21 in the last six years. That would include architects, engineers, and so forth, and in a large department like the Public Works I should think there would be perhaps four or five changes of that sort in a year. As regards the Inland Revenue Department, some of the men my hon. friend mentioned would no doubt be analysts, who would of course come in under Section 21. As we come to each department I am sure the hon. member will see that we were fully justified in appointing these men.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the minister give us particulars regarding the fifteen men who were appointed last year as experts?

Mr. REID: They were not in my department, but I will see that my hon. friend gets that information from the departments concerned.

Mr. TURRIFF: When the minister called Colonel Spittal to his office and summarily dismissed him, was the Colonel given a chance to explain why he could not comply with the order of the Militia Department to take off his uniform.

Mr. REID: As I remember it, Colonel Spittal came to my office, and I asked him to come back. The Commissioner was present at the time. Colonel Spittal had been paid his salary for six or seven months and had not been doing anything either for the militia or for the Civil Service. He said he would not come back, and that he had a case against the Militia Department, and had engaged a lawyer and was going to fight the Militia Department over his dismissal. He took the ground that the Militia Department or the Government had not the power to dismiss him. While he was fighting his case I wanted him to come back, but he absolutely refused. So I said: "If you refuse to come back I am going to dispense with your service, and we will fill your place with some other man." I was not going to pay him while he was walking around doing nothing, except fighting his case.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend has not answered my question. When the minister had Colonel Spittal on the carpet, did the minister give him an opportunity of explaining why he could not accept his dismissal from the Militia Department?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. TURRIFF: There is another point. Every time the minister refers to the Order in Council regarding returned soldiers, he says. "So far as my own department is concerned." Do I understand that this Order in Council applies only to the Customs Department?

Mr. REID: It applies to all departments of the Government, but of course I can speak for my own department only. I understand the other ministers are carrying out the same policy.

Mr. TURRIFF: Are these men appointed by Order in Council, or are they simply engaged by the ministers?

Mr. REID: When there is a vacancy in the Customs Department, the returned soldier fills in an application form and is examined to see whether he is qualified to fill the position. He has to have sufficient education to do clerical work, but the examination is a very simple affair. After he has been tried out for two or three months, he is appointed by Order in Council if satisfactory.

Mr. TURRIFF: Then it comes down to this: These men, if satisfactory, are appointed by Order in Council after two or three months' probation. The Minister of Customs and the other ministers are therefore jointly responsible for all these appointments of returned soldiers, just as they are responsible for the appointment of men who are not returned soldiers. Each minister must accept responsibility for the Order in Council appointing these men.

Mr. REID: Each minister is responsible for his own department.

Mr. TURRIFF: Yes, but as all the ministers consent to the Order in Council, they are all jointly responsible for all the appointments.

Mr. REID: That is right.

Mr. TURRIFF: Then all the ministers are responsible for appointing these men who have not been to the front.

Mr. SINCLAIR: With further reference to the appointments under section 21, I think it would be satisfactory if the minister would give us the assurance that his colleagues, when their Estimates are up, will give us the names of these experts, together with their age, former and present employment, former and present address, and what salaries they are getting. Will the minister consider this sufficient notice to the other members of the cabinet to have this information ready when their Estimates are up?

Mr. REID: I will bring this matter to the attention of my colleagues, so that they will know what is wanted.

Department of Customs—Salaries, $328,100; contingencies, $25,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There is an increase in contingencies of $5,000.

Mr. REID: Last year there was a supplementary vote of $4,000, so that this really represents an increase of only $1,000.

Department of Public Works—Salaries, $590,250; contingencies, $85,000.

[Mr. Turriff.]

Mr. REID: Hon. members will see that we have the same number of officials as before in every branch of the department—a total of 396. There is an increase in salaries of $10,740, but that is wholly accounted for by the statutory increases. The contingencies are exactly the same as for the previous year.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I see that 28 appointments have been made under section 21 without competition in the Department of Public Works. I desire to be informed as to the dates of appointment, former employments, present duties, and salaries of these officers.

Mr. REID: The deputy minister informs me that these appointments were chiefly of architects. Before other items of the Public Works Department are brought before the committee, a list will be prepared giving the information the hon. gentleman desires.

Mr. KNOWLES: I suppose this is not the item from which the superintendents of telephones in British Columbia are paid?

Mr. REID: No, they are in the Outside Service.

Department of the Interior—Salaries, $1,191,255; contingencies, $115,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There is an increase of $19,600 in salaries.

Mr. ROCHE: Yes. There is the same number of employees, and the increase in salaries is more than accounted for by the statutory increases. There is a reduction of $5,000 in contingencies.

Mr. TURRIFF: Does this vote include the Outside as well as the Inside Service?

Mr. ROCHE: No, only the Inside Service.

Mr. TURRIFF: And the statutory increases make a total of $19,600?

Mr. ROCHE: More than that. Officers who have resigned or died have been replaced by appointees at the minimum salaries of their several classes. These changes represent in the aggregate a considerable decrease. The statutory increases make a net increase in the salaries of $19,600.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I desire to ask for the same information with regard to the Department of the Interior that I have already asked for with regard to Customs and Public Works. According to the list, appearing at page 948 of Hansard of last year, 15

appointments were made by competition and 11 without competition. I would like to get the names, former employments, present duties and salaries of these officers.

Mr. ROCHE: I can have that information ready for Monday. I think that only one was appointed last year under section 21 of the Civil Service Act, Mr. M. S. White, a translator, a gentleman who speaks seven languages.

Mr. TURRIFF: What proportion does the revenue of the department bear to the revenue of a few years ago? Has it increased or decreased?

Mr. ROCHE: Increased.

Mr. TURRIFF: How does the revenue compare with the expenditures of the department?

Mr. ROCHE: There has been considerably more revenue during the past year than expenditure. The revenue for eleven months is $9,000,000.

Mr. TURRIFF: For the last year of the department?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes. It is only fair to explain that in that $9,000,000 are included the collections for seed grain.

Mr. TURRIFF: That does not give any idea as to the regular revenue of the department. What I had reference to was the ordinary revenues of the department from the lands branch, the timber branch and the mines that happen to be under the control of the department. How do those revenues compare with the revenue of three or four years ago and how do these compare with the expenditures?

Mr. ROCHE: The ordinary revenue of the department for the past year is about $2,000,000 in excess of the expenditure.

Mr. KNOWLES: Does the ordinary revenue include school lands?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

Mr. KNOWLES: Of course, the revenue from school lands is only a trust fund?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes, but that is included in the revenues of the department.

Mr. KNOWLES: It is revenue that you cannot expend.

Mr. ROCHE: It is chargeable to expenditure just the same.

Mr. KNOWLES: Would the expenditure in connection with the disposal of school lands come out of this item?

Mr. ROCHE: No, this is entirely contingencies and salaries of the inside service.

Mr. KNOWLES: Col. Bradshaw, while engaged in auctioning off school lands, would not be considered as being in the Inside Service?

Mr. ROCHE: No.

Department of Indian Affairs—Salaries, $126,862.50.

Mr. KNOWLES: Perhaps the minister will tell us about whether he was pleased or not with the commission he recently had in British Columbia and whether he would appoint that commission if he had it to do over again? That is the commission which carried on some kind of work in British Columbia in connection with Indians. Chief Justice Wetmore was the head of it and eventually became so disgusted with it that he threw it up, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. ROCHE: In the first place, the hon. gentleman is giving me credit for something for which I should not have any credit at all, that is the naming of the personnel of the commission, because the commission was named when I was not in the country. However, the report that has been handed in by the commission is an excellent report, and shows that they did good work. The work extended over a period of time greater than either we or they anticipated and involved a great deal of labour and travel in the interior of the province. There was a great deal of hardship in connection with that travel. But, upon the whole, I think that they have done excellent work. I do not know what criticism hon. gentlemen have to make outside of the criticism that they have taken longer with their work than it was anticipated they would. But, they seemed to have thought that was necessary and I have no fault to find with them in that particular.

Mr. KNOWLES: As a matter of fact I have heard that their chief avocation was joy-riding up and down the country and in the most outrageous manner.

Mr. ROCHE: That is all news to me.

Mr. KNOWLES: The minister does not hear all that goes on. Will he tell us why Mr. Justice Wetmore resigned?

Mr. ROCHE: On account of ill-health.

Mr. KNOWLES: He almost immediately afterwards went on a commission in Saskatchewan, farther away from his home

and where the climate is harsher than in British Columbia. Perhaps the pace was not as swift.

Mr. ROCHE: Chief Justice Wetmore stated that he could not stand the onerous travel.

Mr. TURRIFF: Who recommended the appointment of Miss Smith, daughter of the Indian Agent at Kamloops, as stenographer?

Mr. ROCHE: I do not know who made the recommendation but I presume the recommendation came through the usual channel. I am not prepared to say that it did not come from the agent himself but at any rate we have to employ stenographers to do the work. Has the hon. gentleman any particualar complaint to make about Miss Smith?

Mr. TURRIFF: Yes, I understand that there is a great deal of criticism. The Indian agent appointed there, Mr. Smith, is a darkey; he is according to information, unable to write a letter himself and his daughter has been appointed as stenographer. The minister knows as well as I do that there has never been any very great good feeling between our Indians and our coloured people in Canada, and I understand an appointment of this kind has caused a good deal of dissatisfaction among the Indians at that point. I would like to know who recommended the appointment of his daughter as stenographer and what work she has to do.

Mr. KNOWLES: I think you had better inquire of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. ROCHE: I think the hon. gentleman's information is faulty in regard to the capabilities of the Indian agent at Kamloops. I do not know whether he wishes to draw the colour line or not, or to say, that all things being equal, if a man has the ability to discharge his duties, he should not be employed because of his colour. Evidently the Kamloops Board of Trade thought he was all right as he was their secretary and he gave every satisfaction. He was an alderman as well. Surely, it is not necessary that this gentleman, occupying this most prominent position, should employ another to write his letters because he could not do it himself. He has sufficient ability and he is discharging the duties of his position in quite a competent manner. We have very few complaints, and that only on the part of a comparatively few Indians, in regard to the manner in which the agent is discharging his duties. His agency has been well managed and he is up to the average of any white man who has been our agent.

Mr. KYTE: Are there any vacancies on the staff of this department in Nova Scotia?

Mr. ROCHE: I only know of one vacancy and that is in the inspectorate. Inspector Foster, who was under criticism by some Nova Scotia members in sessions gone by, went to the front and paid the supreme sacrifice, his place has not been filled.

Mr. KYTE: Is it the intention of the department to fill that position?

Mr. ROCHE: Not at the present time.

Mr. KYTE: Is the position of teacher at the Indian Reserve at Salmon river, Richmond county, vacant at the present time?

Mr. ROCHE: I am not at all certain about that. Has the hon. gentleman information about it?

Mr. KYTE: I understood that he resigned about the first of April, and I should like to know the circumstances, and to have copies of any reports made to the department by the superintendent of agencies, the inspector of schools or the Indian agent that would throw some light upon the cause of his resignation.

Mr. ROCHE: I will secure that information.

Department of Agriculture—Salaries, $490,675; contingencies, $100,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: There is an increase of $50,000 in the total. Will the minister explain that?

Mr. BURRELL: The increase in the First Division, Subdivision B, is accounted for by the translation of one Outside civil servant into the Inside Service and the promotion of six clerks, three patent examiners and the head of the entomological division at the experimental farm, and two in the live-stock department.

Mr. SINCLAIR: In a return given last year of new appointments under section 21 of the Civil Service Act, it was stated that the Department of Agriculture appointed three by competition and twenty-nine without competition under that section. Would the minister give the names of those appointees, their former employment, and all other details as to their appointment?

Mr. BURRELL: I shall be very glad to get that information.

Mr. KNOWLES: In case a patent is granted and it is subsequently ascertained that it is not really a new invention but that it is covered by a patent already existing, is it the intention to amend or remedy that condition or leave it to the public to take action to upset the patent so improperly given?

Mr. BURRELL: I could not answer that offhand.

Mr. KNOWLES: It is a very important question and one which often arises. Sometimes, with the multitude of patents going through, patents are allowed to slip through that would not be granted if information which may subsequently be secured had been before the patent examiners at the time. Is the patent allowed to stand in such a case?

Mr. BURRELL: I think they have the right to appeal to the Exchequer Court, which is sometimes done.

Mr. KNOWLES: I know. But I would urge on the minister that if he is giving consideration to this matter it should be done more often. I think it would be an improvement to the public service if even at a late date a wrongfully granted patent should be remedied.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—Salaries, $207,950; contingencies, $32,000.

Mr. REID (Acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries): This shows that we have had a reduction in the staff of the inside service in the lower grade of the first division. We promoted some from the first division, subdivision B, to the first division, subdivision A. In the second division, subdivision B, we have dropped a number as well as in the third division, subdivision B.

Mr. SINCLAIR: How many new appointments were made during the year?

Mr. REID: The deputy minister informs me that we have made few appointments. The only appointments that have been made have been to fill vacancies that have occurred, and in each case that has been done through the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Any dismissals?

Mr. REID: No, none.

Mr. TURRIFF: Can the acting minister say if the minister's German private secretary, of whom there was some discussion a year or so ago, is over in the Old Country with the minister?

Mr. REID: No. The private secretary is doing his work here. As I understood from the discussion last year, he had a brother at the front.

Mr. KNOWLES: Which front was he at?

Department of the Secretary of State—Salaries, including P. T. Kirwan, promoted to first division, subdivision B; J. F. Champagne, promoted to second division, subdivision A; M. J. Birdwhistle, promoted to second division, subdivision B, at $1,200—$76,737.50.

Mr. MURPHY: The names of three of the officers are specially mentioned. Is that for the reason that they are being promoted beyond the limit allowed by the Civil Service Act? I recognize the names as those of three deserving officials.

Mr. PATENAUDE: Mr. Champagne came into the department as a junior second class clerk in 1906 at $800, which was increased in the same year by special vote of Parliament to $950. He reached in 1908 the maximum of $1,100 which under the Act of that year was increased to $1,200. In 1913 he passed a special examination and was attached to subdivision B of the second division, making his salary $1,300. In 1914 he received an additional $600 by special vote of Parliament. Mr. Champagne possesses exceptional skill as an illuminator and engrosser. He is now getting $1,450 a year. Promotion would give him an increase of $100.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I notice that in this department eight experts were appointed. Will the minister give us the names and particulars?

Mr. PATENAUDE: Yes, I will bring them down when the regular estimates are under consideration.

Mr. TURRIFF: Has the minister adopted the same rule as that adopted by the Minister of Customs in appointing returned soldiers to positions as they become vacant?

Mr. PATENAUDE: Yes, they have the preference.

Mr. TURRIFF: I understand that my hon. friend has very recently appointed a superintendent of distribution in the Printing Bureau, a man who is not a returned soldier.

Mr. PATENAUDE: That is Mr. Paradis, who was appointed superintendent. He has been there for two or three years and

was previously in the service for thirty years. His assistant is Captain Normandin who is back from the front and wounded.

Mr. TURRIFF: I am referring to the appointment of Mr. J. François Dugas, who has been appointed Superintendent of Distribution in the Printing Bureau at a salary of $2,500. Mr. Dugas was a grocer on Bank street in Ottawa, never was at the front and never was connected with the army in any way.

Mr. PATENAUDE: I do not know about the case of Mr. Dugas. I will inquire about it and bring down the information.

Mr. TURRIFF: Will my hon. friend also look into the case of E. G. Laverdure who, I am informed has been appointed controller of advertising in the Printing Bureau at $1,600 a year. He was a tinsmith and plumber in the city of Ottawa, and not a soldier.

Department of Public Printing and Stationery — Salaries, $65,762.50; contingencies, $10,300.

Mr. KYTE: Has the printing of the electoral lists been commenced? Revision of these has been recently completed in Nova Scotia.

Mr. PATENAUDE: Not yet.

Mr. KNOWLES: In my town a paper called the Moosejaw News is given a substantial patronage from this Government for printing work. What official has charge of sending advertising out to different papers throughout Canada?

Mr. PATENAUDE: It is done through the King's Printer himself and the officers who are under him.

Mr. KNOWLES: Has he an absolutely free hand as to the distribution of this patronage?

Mr. PATENAUDE: It is done through the King's Printer, and, when it
5 p.m. is something particular, after conference with the minister.

Mr. KNOWLES: Are these men the sole judges as to what papers to send to and what papers not to send to?

Mr. PATENAUDE: They are not.

Mr. KNOWLES: Who, then, is the last resort to decide what patronage shall be given to particular papers?

Mr PATENAUDE: The minister himself.

[Mr. Patenaude.]

Mr. KNOWLES: To what extent does the Moosejaw News obtain patronage as a result of the minister's discretion?

Mr. PATENAUDE: I can bring down the information.

Mr. KNOWLES: Will the minister let me know early next week how much the Moosejaw News has received lately?

Mr. PATENAUDE: Yes.

Mr. KYTE: Would it be possible to get from the department of the hon. minister a copy of the electoral lists for any of the divisions of Nova Scotia?

Mr. PATENAUDE: Yes. I have been asked by some of our friends in other counties to do that, and in accordance with their desire I have had typewritten copies made for the members.

Mr. KNOWLES: Does the minister personally remember whether a short time ago the Saskatoon Star and the Regina Post were cut out of the book of life in the way of advertising? I may explain that these two strong Conservative newspapers turned in favour of free wheat about a month ahead of the Government. Will the minister be so kind, when he is getting the information at the same time to get me information as to what patronage was given to the Saskatoon Star and the Regina Post respectively month by month for the last twelve months? The only hope left for him in the province of Saskatchewan is the Moosejaw News.

Mr. REID: The others will see the light before long.

Mr. TURRIFF: They saw the light and they went the other way.

Mr. MURPHY: In connection with the advertising branch of Public Printing and Stationery some names of new appointees were cited a few moments ago by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. The minister may or may not be aware of the circumstances under which the gentleman who had charge of the advertising, Mr. Vincent Braceland, recently left the department. Can he tell me if the position vacated by Mr. Braceland has been filled, and if so, by whom?

Mr. PATENAUDE: The position has been filled by Mr. Laverdure at a salary of of $1,800.

Department of Mines—Salaries and contingencies, $387,485.

Mr. MURPHY: What are the increases in the number of officials?

Mr. PATENAUDE: There is an increase of $13,672. There are three new appointments and the balance of the increase is for statutory increases. The three new appointments comprise two assistant chemists at a salary of $1,600 each. The two assistant chemists are required at our fuel testing laboratories.

Mr. MURPHY: Where are those laboratories?

Mr. PATENAUDE: I cannot say off hand. The appointments have been made owing to numerous requests that have been received by the department during the past year. The third appointment is for a highways engineer. A new laboratory for testing road materials will be completed in the course of the next few months and the tests in connection with this work which have hitherto been carried out in the laboratory of the Columbia University, New York, will be made at the Mines Branch instead.

Mr. MURPHY: Have any of these appointments been made yet?

Mr. PATENAUDE: Not yet.

Mr. KNOWLES: To what extent does the minister keep in touch with the mining industry? I understand that the Institute of Mines hold meetings annually, and it used to be the custom for the Minister of Mines to attend and discuss with the mining engineers matters relating to that industry and to keep in touch with the institute. I understand the Minister of Agriculture some time ago went down to Montreal and gave the members of the institute an address on the connection between agriculture and mining. New ministers have been put in charge of some of the departments almost every few months for quite a while now, and so far as we know that condition of affairs may continue. There is now a new minister in charge of the mines branch. I would like to know to what extent he is endeavouring to obtain that information which, even if it is only a smattering, must be necessary for a real Minister of Mines. Is he attending classes in night schools, taking lessons, or reading books or discussing mining matter with experts?

Mr. PATENAUDE: The minister is not an expert so far as the mining industry is concerned, but he is assisted by a very able deputy minister who is an expert.

Mr. KNOWLES: As the mining industry is a very important one in Canada, I would suggest to the minister that the person in charge of his department should know more about it than the average member of the House. The minister, of course, has been recently appointed, but I think that in the course of a few months he should become partially expert in this matter. Otherwise, he cannot give us any useful information in the House and he will not be of much practical use in the department. He might endeavour to become more informed with regard to these things, so that he will not have to depend altogether on the advice of his deputy.

Mr. PATENAUDE: I assure my hon. friend that I will try to comply with his desire.

Mr. MURPHY: Who is the Deputy Minister of Mines?

Mr. PATENAUDE: R. G. McConnell.

Department of Railways and Canals—Salaries, including assistant to minister at $4,500; F. M. Maclennan at $1,800; R. H. Lang at $1,800, and contingencies, $210,987.50.

Mr. MURPHY: What increases are there?

Mr. COCHRANE: An increase to Mr. Bell, whom I have made assistant to myself, $1,000; an increase to Mr. Yates, who is my secretary, and an increase to the secretary of the department, Mr. Pugsley. There are two other increases in sub-division (a) of the second division. One gentleman who was on the Transcontinental we have brought into the department; the other one, who was on outside work on the Hudson Bay railway, we have put on the permanent staff. We have the same number in the department although we have increased some salaries. The balance of the increase is due to statutory increases.

Mr. TURRIFF: Is this item of $4,500, salary for an assistant to the minister, in connection with the running of the Transcontinental?

Mr. COCHRANE: No, it is in connection with the inside staff of the department.

Mr. TURRIFF: I should like to say a word or two as to the manner in which the Transcontinental from Toronto to Winnipeg is run. It seems to me from the way the

road is being run that the department is deliberately trying to throw the business away to some other line. I will give the minister my experience on a trip over that road. I had come down over that road, which is a good one to travel over, and decided I would go back that way. Two days before I was leaving for the West I went into the Grand Trunk office here and asked them to reserve a lower berth for me from Toronto to Winnipeg. They said they would wire to Toronto, and if I would call the next day they would give me a telegram which would assure me of the reservation. I called the next day, and they said they could not understand why they had not heard from the Toronto office. They wired a second time, and on the following day, the day I was leaving the Central station here at one o'clock, I called again, and was told they had no reply from Toronto to their second message, but that I would be absolutely certain of finding a lower berth reserved for me when I got to Toronto. The train leaves Toronto at 11.30, and I got in some time before that. The city ticket office was closed, and I went up to the Grand Trunk office in the Union Station. They told me they had no record whatever of a berth for me. They had their diagram there, and every berth was marked off. So I saw the conductor of the sleeping car and asked him what I should do. He said that all the berths were taken, as the diagram showed, and all I could do was to wait on the chance of somebody not turning up and claiming their berth. I had to sit up until 12.30 before I found out whether I could get a berth or not, and then I got a lower. I would point out that there were three other lower berths at least that were never occupied all night on that train. I know that for a fact, because I went through the train between one and two o'clock in the morning. But there I was, sitting up till 12.30 to see whether I could get a berth or not. Now, my hon. friend must know that a road will never pay if officials are allowed to do business in that way. If passengers are put to such inconvenience as that they will never travel over the road again.

Mr. COCHRANE: What was the date?

Mr. TURRIFF: I can get it for my hon. friend.

Mr. COCHRANE: I should be very glad to have it.

Mr. TURRIFF: It was in the month of July last. But that was not the end of my troubles. When I got to Cochrane I went into the Transcontinental office and wired to some friends of mine at Minaki, care of the Grand Trunk Hotel at that town. It took the clerk about ten minutes to tell me what the charge was for the message, but eventually he found out and I paid it. The telegram was asking some friends of mine to meet me at the station. I was not sure whether they were at Minaki or Winnipeg, but when I got to Minaki and they did not meet me at the station I concluded they were at Winnipeg and went on there. When I got to Winnipeg I found that they were at Minaki, and I went down and saw them over the week end. They told me they had never received the telegram, and what is more it had not been delivered when they left there a month afterwards. That was my experience on that trip. I am not bringing this matter up so much for the purpose of making complaint, as to let the minister know that some of his officials are either mighty careless, or deliberately trying to throw the business to the other roads. I do not know which it is, but I have given the absolute facts, and I leave it with the minister to take what steps he can to better this state of affairs.

Mr. COCHRANE: With regard to the wire to Toronto for a berth, that is purely a Grand Trunk matter, but I shall be very glad to take it up with them if my hon. friend will give me the date of the telegram. The other matter of the telegram to Minaki from Cochrane is under our control, and I shall be very glad to find out the facts if my hon. friend will give me the date. We will not stand for anything like that, because it is certainly not in the interests of the public or the interests of the road.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is it true that a change has taken place in the policy of the department in regard to the appointment of officials on the eastern division of the Intercolonial. The reason I ask is that a gentleman by the name of Mr. Frank Stanfield, representing the county of Colchester in the Nova Scotia Legislature, resigned some months ago. At least, he sent his resignation to the Conservative Committee in the town of Truro, and it was stated in the public press that he was resigning his seat in the Legislature as a protest against the manner in which the Minister of Railways was making appointments on the eastern division. Some time in February, the Nova Scotia legislature assembled and

has been in session ever since, but Mr. Stanfield did not take his seat until a few days ago, when he appeared in the House and made the statement that the Minister of Railways had changed his policy, that he had in fact capitulated, and that in future, appointments on that division would be made in a manner that would be satisfactory to him and his friends. The inference to be drawn is that he would never have returned to the House unless the minister had made this change in policy. Would the minister be good enough to tell us if he has really changed his policy in that regard, and if we may expect that appointments on the eastern division will be made in a different manner in the future?

Mr. COCHRANE: I have made no change in policy. My policy is to appoint the best man. If it is possible to find him on the road we certainly take him. It has been my policy ever since I took charge of the department to promote men when I knew they were capable of filling the vacant position.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The minister did not promise to make any change—is that what we are to understand?

Mr. COCHRANE: I have said exactly what I mean.

Mr. MICHAUD: Is it the intention of the Department of Railways to make repairs on the Transcontinental line between Levis and Moncton during the present summer? There have been several wrecks which, it is said, have been due to the track not being in proper condition, especially through the presence of faulty ties. This is unfortunate because between Levis and Edmundston enough lumber is made to employ 250 cars a day for three months. If the road were in better condition it would no doubt reap greater benefits from this business.

Mr. COCHRANE: No doubt the road needs ties, all roads do in the spring. This work will be attended to during the spring and summer on the Transcontinental as it is on other roads.

Mr. KNOWLES: I hope the minister will not think I am pressing for an answer he does not want to give if I call his attention again to the question put by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). I wish the minister could tell us more definitely whether the statements made by Mr. Stanfield have any foundation or not. Canadians are now called upon to give attention to the question whether it is or is not advisable for the state to launch into the business of conducting the railways. We shall soon be called upon to consider the report of the Commission appointed to investigate that matter. The experience to guide us in the consideration of the recommendations of that commission can only be the experience of the minister of Railways. As many of us think very highly of the hon. minister as an administrator, we should like very much to know whether he has stood the test of maintaining a business administration of our railways, or whether the remarks of Mr. Stanfield are well-founded. Those of us who have been in the House for any length of time are aware that a man in the position of the Minister of Railways must be almost more than human to bear up against the influence brought against him, no matter which party is in power. The chief reason given by those who oppose Government ownership of railways is that we shall never be able to get heads of departments strong enough to administer the railways. If this be true, it will be better for us not to undertake governmental administration of the railway, but if it is not true a strong argument against that course is removed. Therefore, it is very important that we should know the truth of this matter. This is the first time, so far as I know, when this issue has risen directly between the man with political influence and the head of the Department. I have had something to do with the Minister of Railways. I have come in contact with him in connection with the submission of route maps, when the influence of municipalities was strongly exerted in favour of this or that view; and I can honestly say that I then formed the opinion that he was a man exceptionally fair in his decisions. I confess that it will be a disappointment to me if he cannot assure us that there is no ground for the statements which Mr. Stanfield makes. There is no use quibbling; Mr. Stanfield gave the people in the provincial House to understand that the minister had had to capitulate. He did not use that exact form of words, but that is the effect of what he said. Cannot the minister tell us categorically and unequivocally whether there is or is not any foundation for the statement made by Mr. Stanfield in the provincial House?

Mr. COCHRANE: I have not seen the statement made by Mr. Stanfield, and I will not contradict a statement that I have not seen.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Will the minister tell us what policy he intends to pursue with regard to transportation between Prince Edward Island and the mainland during the comming summer? The minister will remember that a delegation waited upon him some months ago, and the information I have is that he stated that the steamers hitherto employed in the service would be discontinued during the coming summer. That was a great disappointment to the business people of Prince Edward Island. It is stated that another delegation waited upon the minister, and that he gave them some assurance that the facilities at present afforded would be continued during the coming season. What are the real facts in this matter?

Mr. COCHRANE: A deputation came to see me, but I made no promise as to what we will or will not do. We were disappointed in that the terminals were not finished last fall. The contractors say that the weather was so rough that they could not go on dredging for a large part of the time. When the terminals are finished we will lay down a policy.

Mr. HUGHES: And in the meantime what course will the minister pursue?

Mr. COCHRANE: The boats are running.

Mr. HUGHES: And will continue to run as usual until the terminals are completed?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes, unless we change.

Post Office Department—Salaries, $842,820; contingencies, $125,000.

Mr. MURPHY: This is not quite the same as last year.

Mr. PATENAUDE: There have been 37 statutory increases of $100 each, and 435 statutory increases of $50 each.

Mr. TURRIFF: I desire to be informed for what reason Mrs. Mapleton, the postmistress at Middlethorp post office in Saskatchewan, was dismissed. This lady is the oldest settler there. She has been dismissed from the postmastership, my information is, without good cause.

Mr. PATENAUDE: I will get the information for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MICHAUD: I understand that the postmaster of Anderson, in the county of Restigouche, was dismissed lately, and I would like to be informed why.

Mr. PATENAUDE: I will give the facts at a subsequent sitting of the House.

Civil Service Commission—Salaries, $33,075; contingencies, $15,500.

Mr. PATENAUDE: This is made up of statutory increases amounting to $500 and by the provision of $100 for the promotion of one clerk from the maximum of the 3-B subdivision to the minimum of 3-A subdivision.

Mr. MURPHY: By a statute passed a few years ago provision was made for the appointment of a third member of the Civil Service Commission. Has that appointment been made?

Mr. PATENAUDE: No.

Mr. MURPHY: Is it the intention of the minister, or the Government, to apply to that position the same policy which the Minister of Customs enunciated in regard to positions under his control: that it is his intention to appoint returned soldiers?

Mr. PATENAUDE: That is a matter for the Government.

Mr. MURPHY: Which member of the Government?

Mr. PATENAUDE: The whole of the Government, but the appointment has not been considered.

Mr. TURRIFF: Is it the intention to retain the Civil Service Commission now that the Government have practically superseded it by Orders in Council?

Mr. REID: It is being used just the same.

Mr. MURPHY: Used or abused?

Department of Naval Service—Salaries, $188,950.

Mr. MURPHY: What are the increases there?

Mr. REID: Provision is made for the appointment of a draughtsman in the Hydrographic Survey in class 2-B at a salary of $1,300, and the other increases are the regular statutory increases.

Mr. KNOWLES: Could the minister give me any information about a certain ice-breaker that was under the control of the Minister of Naval Affairs and was started in the Vickers-Maxim yard at Montreal at the time war broke out?

Mr. REID: I could not answer that. It is under another vote, and I would ask the hon. member to bring that up when that vote is taken up and when the minister will be here.

Mr. MURPHY: Is there any part of this vote intended for officials outside of the department at Ottawa?

Mr. KNOWLES: I do not know that the minister is quite reasonable in the request which he has made. Possibly decisions such as I refer to are made by the men who are paid out of this vote, and I presume that the disposal of that ice-breaker to Russia was recommended by some person whose salary we are voting.

Mr. REID: There are two branches of the Department of Marine and Fisheries—the Marine Department and the Naval Department. Unfortunately, the hon. member did not bring that up when the Deputy Minister of Marine was here, because the Deputy Minister of the Naval Service tells me that it comes under the Marine and Fisheries branch of the department. I would not have had any objection to giving my hon. friend all the information I could if he had brought it up when the Deputy Minister of Marine was here. Before we bring up the Marine and Fisheries estimates again the Minister will be here and give the explanation himself.

Mr. KNOWLES: The explanation, of course, is very reasonable if the minister says it is under a different division of the department. Will the minister get me the information without my making a motion for a return in regard to the progress made on that boat, how much was rebated by the Vickers-Maxim firm, how much Russia paid for the boat and how much Canada would have paid if the boat had been completed here?

Mr. REID: We may not be able to get part of that information in the department, but all the information that is in the department I will get for the hon. member.

Mr. TURRIFF: If I understand correctly, we are paying $188,000 in salaries in Ottawa for the running of the Naval Department?

Mr. REID: That is the position and the details are all set out. This vote is for the officials employed in the Inside Service in Ottawa.

Mr. TURRIFF: Of the Naval Department?

Mr. REID: Of the Naval Department; that is the branch under the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. TURRIFF: And we have two boats now, I understand, one laid up and one in commission.

Mr. REID: Of course, the hon. member knows that the Fisheries branch comes under the Naval Department, so that this includes salaries of the Fisheries branch as well as the other naval services.

Mr. TURRIFF: Do the Fisheries come under the Naval branch instead of the Marine branch?

Mr. REID: The department was divided under two heads and the Fisheries branch comes under the Deputy Minister of Naval Service.

Mr. TURRIFF: It seems rather peculiar that fisheries should come under the Naval branch instead of the Marine and Fisheries branch.

Mr. MURPHY: It is the other way round, is it not?

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. MURPHY: The vote preceding the one we are discussing is headed "Department of Marine and Fisheries."

Mr. SINCLAIR: I think it would be convenient if the minister would make a statement as to what branches of the Marine and Fisheries Department are under the Naval Service and what branches under the Marine and Fisheries. It is confusing to a great many people. I do not think that the division has been plainly stated in the House. If the minister has the information at hand I think it would be good policy to put it on record.

Mr. REID: Under the Naval branch of the department we have the hydrographic survey, the tidal survey, the wireless, fisheries and fishery protection service. The division is shown in the annual report.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Life-saving?

Mr. REID: The life-saving stations are under the Naval branch.

Mr. KNOWLES: What is the weather report service under?

Mr. REID: That is under the Marine and Fisheries Department.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I understand from a statement in the press that the superintendent of the life-saving stations, Mr.

Nickerson, was dismissed. Will the minister tell us if that is true, and, if so, why he was dismissed?

Mr. REID: He was dismissed. His services were not further required and the work done by him is now done by officers of the fisheries protection service. His salary was saved.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Who performs the duties of the late officer?

Mr. REID: The captains in the fisheries protection service now do the work.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Of course the branch is a very important one. Last year a very serious accident took place in my own constituency owing to the fact that the lifeboat was not in repair, and the lifeboat crew were therefore unable to give any assistance to the wrecked sailors of the dredge Cape Breton, that was driven by a storm on that coast. That fact, together with the dismissal of the superintendent, led me to inquire why he was dismissed and also why the lifeboat at the Whitehead station was not in commission at the time of the wreck of the Cape Breton, which involved the lives of a number of men.

Mr. REID: The dispensing with the services of Mr. Nickerson meant a reorganization of the service and the placing of the responsibility on the captains. The department thought that it would secure better satisfaction and better service by placing the responsibility on the captains.

Mr. SINCLAIR: How many captains are there?

Mr. REID: There are five or six boats along that coast.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Would it not seem that if no one man were responsible for the inspection it would be less efficiently done than if some man were placed in charge of it?

Mr. REID: As I understand, each boat is on a particular service, taking a portion of the coast line, and the captain while on duty is supposed to perform the work that Mr. Nickerson formerly did. Thus you have the services of five men instead of one, and each is charged with responsibility.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Do I understand that the five captains are cruising along the same territory in the Maritime Provinces or is the territory divided up?

Mr. REID: Each vessel has a section of territory of its own.

[Mr. Sinclair.]

Mr. SINCLAIR: What captains were responsible for the condition of affairs at the Whitehead and Canso stations during the past year?

Mr. REID: I could not give that information now, but will do so on the other Estimates.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It would be interesting to know just what territory each captain has, so we would know to whom we should go when anything of that kind happens.

Mr. KYTE: Mr. Nickerson, the late superintendent furnished an annual report as to the work done in life saving every year, the conditions of the life boats and other matters pertaining to the duties that devolved on him. Is any similar report furnished by the captains?

Mr. REID: Mr. Nickerson, as I understand, did not furnish such a report. The captains do furnish a report on each route on which they work, and the department has these reports.

Mr. TURRIFF: Newspaper items have appeared about some naval construction that is being undertaken by the Naval Department. Would the minister give us some information as to the intention of the Government? Are they starting in on a programme of naval construction or what?

Mr. REID: As I understand the construction to which the hon. gentleman refers is for the Imperial Government. It would not be proper to announce everything that has been done, but I have no doubt that on the other Estimates the minister will give as much information as possible. It is all for the Imperial Government, and the Naval Department is merely acting for them.

Mr. TURRIFF: The Imperial Government is paying for it?

Mr. REID: Yes, and the Naval Department are only agents in respect of the matters to which the hon. member refers.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I understand that the commandeering of ships for war purposes comes under the jurisdiction of the Naval Department. I have seen in the newspapers that the Government have taken some new position in regard to this important matter. If so it would be very interesting to the people of Canada to know just what their policy is. Very shortly after the declaration of war, I undertook to

draw to the attention of the Government the fact that Canadian ships were being commandeered by the Imperial Government and I then thought and said that the proper policy to adopt would be for our own Government to requisition such ships belonging to Canadians as might be required for the war, and to hand them over to the Imperial Government. We should have kept control of our own shipping. The Government did not act on that suggestion, and, as we all know, during the two and one-half years of war, Canadian ships have been requisitioned by the Imperial authorities. It has been said in the newspapers recently that the Government has taken some action in this matter and that some agreement has been reached between the Government of Canada and the Imperial authorities by which the requisitioning of Canadian ships will be done by the Canadian Government. Will the minister say if that is the case, and what the policy of the Government is in regard to this question?

Mr. REID: It strikes me that at the commencement of the war or shortly after that a few vessels of Canadian registry were requisitioned by the British Government; but afterwards it was arranged and understood that if vessels of Canadian registry were to be requisitioned, the British Government would apply to the Canadian Government and ask if they would requisition the ships.

The Canadian Government themselves make the requisition and then hand the vessel over to the British authorities. If the British Government wish to have the services of any Canadian registered vessel they ask us to requisition it in the interests of the war, and as a rule we do so.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is this procedure founded on an Order in Council?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the minister produce it?

Mr. REID: Yes. The Order in Council gives the Minister of Marine and Fisheries power to requisition vessels, but it is all done through the Canadian Government. This course has been followed for some time.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Reid, the House adjourned at 6 p.m.

Monday, April 23, 1917.

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

THE ROSS RIFLE FACTORY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. G. W. KYTE: Would the Minister of Militia and Defence kindly inform the House when the papers relative to the taking over of the Ross rifle factory will be brought down, and whether a statement will shortly be made by the Government with reference to the manufacture of rifles in Canada?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The Order in Council providing for the taking over of the Ross rifle factory will be brought down to-morrow.

Mr. KYTE: Will the Government be in a position to make a statement with regard to the manufacture of rifles in this country at an early date?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Appraisers are now taking an inventory of the Ross rifle factory. The Government is using the greatest possible dispatch in having the necessary specifications and patterns prepared for the making of a new rifle.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is the factory at present closed?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: A certain number of men are employed in the taking of the inventory, but there is no manufacturing going on at the present time.

THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GRAHAM: May I ask the leader of the House when the Public Accounts Committee will be called again?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I will inform my hon. friend to-morrow.

ENLISTED CIVIL SERVANTS.

PAY AND SEPARATION ALLOWANCE.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Would the Minister of Militia and Defence kindly inform us what the policy of the Government is with regard to the salaries of inside civil servants who have enlisted? It will be remembered that when these civil servants were invited to offer themselves for overseas service they were given the assurance that their salaries would not be lower than what they were receiving in the service, and I understand that the military pay has been supplemented

in certain cases in accordance with that assurance. Those civil servants who enlisted two years ago would now be getting, if they had remained in the service, their regular statutory increase, and I wish to know whether allowance is made for that when they are given their military pay.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The question which my hon. friend raises was brought to my attention this morning. My own view is that these civil servants should get the regular statutory increase, and the matter is being looked into with a view to ascertaining the exact position.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I should like to ask a question with regard to separation allowances in the case of civil servants who have enlisted. A return was laid upon the Table the other day giving the names of a number of members of this House who had been appointed to different positions in the Militia, some of them occupying the position of colonel, and who were receiving their sessional indemnity, the salary attached to their military position, and separation allowance as well. I am told that in the case of at least some civil servants who have enlisted the separation allowance has been refused. I would ask whether that is the case, and if so, why a distinction is made to the prejudice of the members of the Civil Service.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I have not heard that there has been any discrimination against either members of Parliament or civil servants in respect of enlistment in the overseas forces.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There is a case within my own personal knowledge of the wife of a civil servant who was refused a separation allowance. She was informed by the Department of Militia and Defence that no separation allowance was granted in the case of a civil servant. We also know from the return that was laid on the Table the other day that separation allowances have been granted to the wives of members of Parliament, who were receiving both military pay and their sessional indemnities.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I should be glad if my hon. friend would give me the name of the person he has in mind, so that we may look into the case, and I shall then be able to answer intelligently the question which my hon. friend raises. Personally I do not see why any civil servant in the overseas forces should not be entitled to a separation allowance for his wife.

[Mr. Sinclair.]

Mr. PUGSLEY: It might be a little objectionable to give the name, because sometimes when a civil servant complains he does not possibly receive the treatment from the officials which he otherwise would receive. But if my hon. friend will make inquiry in the department he will find the statement which I have made to be correct, and if he does not find it to be correct, I shall gladly furnish him with the name.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I will make inquiry, but I can assure my hon. friend that no soldier will be discriminated against for advancing his claim.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—PURCHASE OF COAL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): I should like to direct the attention of the Minister of Railways to the following despatch from Stellarton, which appears in the Halifax Herald:

> Stellarton, April 20.—There is much excitement in this town as to future work in the Acadia Coal company's mines. This seems a peculiar statement when anything black is saleable as fuel. The company have now about 20,000 tons in bank. Cars are not obtainable, it is claimed, to ship this to customers. It is rumored that there is serious trouble between the company and the management of the Intercolonial.
>
> This company, being on the line to Sydney, supplies the larger share of the tonnage on the eastern division. Report says that the Canadian Pacific pays over $5 a ton to this company and to the Greenwood company, and that they guarantee cars to take their tonnage. The Canadian government import coal at a cost of $7 per ton at least. The company says its wages to the men are dependent on the price it gets from the I. C. R., who take one-third of its product.
>
> Further rumour says that Scotia is having a price 50 cents in excess of that offered and that they have limited the quantity that it will require from that company. All the miners want is no discrimination against this company and the going price, so that thereby they can secure the going wage.

I am advised that the Minister of Railways has offered this company $4.25 a ton for coal, while the Canadian Pacific Railway is paying this and other companies $5.25 a ton, and I am also informed that the minister paid $9.25 for coal purchased in the United States and delivered at Halifax. What is the position of my hon. friend with regard to this matter?

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways): We have made no contract yet with this company, but we have offered them the same price at which we are buying

from other companies. I have not heard anything with reference to a shortage of cars, but I will take the matter up, and if the coal is shipped there will certainly be cars to ship it in.

Mr. MACDONALD: I was not referring to the non-shipment of coal, although it is well known in Nova Scotia that there are 20,000 tons of coal banked up at the Acadia mines through the failure of the Intercolonial to supply cars. What I wanted to know is why the Minister of Railways was haggling with this company and offering them $4.25 a ton for coal when the Canadian Pacific Railway was paying for the same quality $5.25 a ton, and when my hon. friend had paid $9.25 a ton for American coal delivered at Halifax.

Mr. COCHRANE: We never paid $9.25 a ton for coal delivered at Halifax.

Mr. MACDONALD: It was so stated by my hon. friend himself in this House in February last.

Mr. COCHRANE: But we offered this company and other companies more money than their contract called for, and they did not fill their contract.

Mr. MACDONALD: What are you going to do about it?

Mr. COCHRANE: That is a matter for us to settle, not you.

Mr. MACDONALD: It is not altogether a matter for my hon. friend to settle, but for the people of this country. The Minister of Railways does not own the country yet as he will find out.

FARM LABOURERS FROM THE UNITED STATES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: I should like to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to a statement in the Montreal Gazette, to the effect that some of his officials in the United States, in their advertisements for farm labourers for Western Canada, had stated that there would be no conscription here, and that the men would be exempt from all military service. The Gazette states, also, that these advertisements have been withdrawn. Will the hon. gentleman bring down the advertisements in question, together with any instructions that have been issued in the matter?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

COAL PRICES AND SHIPBUILDING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (St. John City and County): As the subject of coal has been mentioned, I desire to call the attention of the Government to the fact that during the past winter, and even up to the present time, in the city of St. John where a great deal of anthracite coal is burned which can only be obtained from the United States, people have been obliged to pay an enormous price for that article, as much, I am informed, as $13.75 a ton. We are told that the reason for these high prices is that coal has to be brought to St. John by vessel and that there is a great scarcity in tonnage, and therefore freights are very high. I do not dispute that; my object in rising is to call the attention of the Government to the fact, which I have brought before this House on many occasions, that there is a great scarcity of tonnage for carrying the water-borne freight of Canada. The matter is a very serious one indeed for those who have to use American coal transported by water. I would ask the Government if any steps have been taken by them to encourage the building of ships, more especially wooden ships, not merely to engage in ocean transportation but for coast transportation, which is vital to the people of our country. I was glad to notice the other day that the authority in the United States charged with these matters had decided to give an order for one thousand wooden vessels.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would remind my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) that he is not in order in entering upon a discussion at this stage. And, may I say, there is a growing tendency, I fear, to rather enlarge upon the privilege afforded private members on the Orders of the Day of asking questions upon matters of importance. This, if allowed to grow, will result in inconvenience. Of course, a certain latitude for the asking of questions upon the Orders of the Day has always been granted, but I hope that hon. members will guard themselves against the tendency to dilate upon questions which may involve the necessity of lengthy replies by members of the Government.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I agree, Mr. Speaker, that it is necessary to avoid as far as possible such discussion. But the conditions of the moment are unusual. These are times that are trying the souls of our people. In the city from which I come the cost of living—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would remind the hon. member that there is no subject before the Chair. I wish he would submit his question.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Having made my preliminary observations. I desire to ask if any steps have been taken by the Government for the building of vessels in Canada.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Orders have been placed by the Imperial Government with Canadian shipyards for some twenty-two vessels. I understand that further orders for eight vessels are under consideration. This will involve a tonnage of 175,000 tons. The effect is that all the shipbuilding plants of Canada have sufficient orders to carry them well into the middle of 1918. We have given attention to the question of shipbuilding, because, as the hon. gentleman says, it is vital at this time. The more ships we can build, the more the existing shipping of the world will be available for the transportation to our Allies of commodities of all kinds. Some time ago I took up this question with the Imperial Munitions Board acting for the Imperial Government here, as to what is to be done towards building wooden ships for the purpose of transporting the products of Canada to Great Britain in order to assist in the situation which has become so acute by reason of the submarine menace. The representative of the Minister of Shipping, Mr. Perry, has been looking into the question, both on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of Canada. Recently I offered, on behalf of the Government, to find money on this side of the ocean, to the amount of $10,000,000, to place the Imperial Government in funds for the construction and purchase of wooden ships in Canada. The matter is now under consideration, and I am of the opinion that orders for a considerable tonnage of wooden ships will be placed in Canada through the Imperial Munitions Board. These, of course, will be of service to transport our products to the United Kingdom, and will also ease the general shipping situation to which the hon. gentleman has referred.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): Perhaps I should add a word in answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) on the subject of coal. He will be aware that an order in Council was passed last November, concerning the prices of fuel, clothing, and food. Under that order we have sent out questionaires to all the known coal dealers in Canada, and to these we have received answers under oath. I have not the figures before me, but, speaking from memory, I think there is no return showing any such price as my hon. friend has stated. Speaking further from memory, I think the order contains a provision compelling dealers to sell any of the products referred to at a reasonable and just price; so that, if any one in the city of St. John feels aggrieved at the price charged for coal, with the consent of the Attorney General of the province he can prosecute the dealer for demanding a higher price than is reasonable and just.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I disclaim having suggested that the coal dealers of St. John were asking more than a fair price. What I said was that the excessive freight which they were compelled to pay for water transportation is alleged to be the cause of the very high price. I am sorry to learn from the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) that the Government itself has taken no steps to build ships in Canada but is relying upon the Imperial Government.

CANADIAN PRISONERS OF WAR.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): I wish to ask the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Edward Kemp) a question in regard to the position of Canadian Prisoners of War in Germany. I have a letter from one of these prisoners who states that after these men were detained there was some difficulty about their pay being made available through governmental sources for the purpose of enabling them to get food, and that as a consequence the parents and friends of the prisoners contributed, as we all know they did, to send food to them. It was stated in the press not long ago that some restriction was imposed on the rights of the relatives and friends of prisoners to send them clothing or food and the matter upon which I want information is: What is the Government doing now? Is it possible for the Government to utilize the pay of these men, which is running on, I presume, although they are prisoners, for the purpose of enabling them to get food through governmental sources, or what provision is being made now for them in view of the fact that private parties are prevented from sending them sustenance?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The question which my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) raises, I think, has reference to the Red

Cross Society's shipments to Great Britain. I am not prepared to make a statement at the moment but I shall endeavour to do so to-morrow and in the meantime I shall make further inquiry.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—COAL CONTRACTS.

Mr. MACDONALD: On Thursday last the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) promised to bring down a statement in regard to coal contracts which I asked the minister about a short time ago and he has not done so.

Mr. REID: I promised to draw the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals to the hon. gentleman's request. I mentioned it to my hon. friend, and he is here now.

Mr. COCHRANE: The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) was not in his seat on Friday or he would have got that information. We have made the following contracts:

	Tons.
Dominion Coal Company	260,000
Intercolonial Company	90,000
Bras d'Or Coal Company	10,000
Milford Coal Company	5,000
Maritime Coal Company	100,000
Minudie Coal Company	5,000
Jones and McKinnon	8,000
M. F. Keith	7,000

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 26, respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill No. 27, to amend an Act to incorporate the Canadian General Council of the Boy Scouts Association.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill No. 28 respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—Mr. Rainville.

Bill No. 29, to amend the Act incorporating the Canadian Surety Company.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 30, respecting the Canadian Western Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill No. 32, to incorporate the Cascade Scenic Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

Bill No. 34, respecting the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Northrup.

Bill No. 35, respecting the Kaslo and Slocan Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 36, respecting La Compagnie du Chemin de Fer de Colonization du Nord.—Mr. Northrup.

Bill No. 38, respecting certain patents of George C. Breidert and Burton W. Mudge.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 39, respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—Mr. T. J. Stewart.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC BRANCH LINES COMPANY.

On motion for the second reading of Bill No. 33 respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—Mr. Currie.

Mr. MORPHY moved that the Bill be withdrawn.

Mr. GRAHAM: Why? The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Currie) is not here.

Mr. MORPHY: I understand the intention is to introduce a new Bill in place of this.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS.

On the motion of Mr. Rainville for the second reading of Bill No. 37, respecting the Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Company Limited.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would the mover explain the object of the present Bill? I understand there was an inauguration of the tunnel yesterday, and that a train ran through. Is the purpose of this Bill to extend the time for completion?

Mr. RAINVILLE: I think it is, but I am not sure.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Carried.

Mr. GRAHAM: The explanation is satisfactory.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterick.

NATIONAL SERVICE CARDS.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. How many National Service Cards were sent out to each province.
2. How many of such cards were filled in and returned from each province.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: 1. No exact record of the distribution of blank national service form by provinces is available.

1. Work not yet completed. So far the record for each province is as follows: Nova Scotia, 92,767; New Brunswick, 70,927; Prince Edward Island, 21,479; Quebec,

290,866; Ontario, 627,152; Manitoba, 131,265; Saskatchewan, 149,649; Alberta, 88,278; British Columbia, 76,977.

MAIL REGISTRATION.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the Post Office Department authorized any private company to guarantee the safe delivery of parcel post or of any mail matter registered or unregistered?
2. If so, what is the name of said company or companies?
3. Under what arrangement has said privilege been granted by the Post Office Department?
4. Have any annual statements been made to the department as regards the volume of business done by said company or companies?

Mr. PATENAUDE:

1. The Post Office Department has not authorized any private company to guarantee the safe delivery of parcel post or of any mail registered or unregistered.
2. Answered by No. 1. 3. Answered by No. 1. 4. Answered by No. 1.

ASHCROFT FORT GEORGE MAILS.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. Has contract been let to J. C. Shields and others or to the Inland Express Company for carrying mail from Ashcroft to Fort George, B.C.?
2. If so, when was the contract let?
3. Were tenders called for this contract?
4. Was a lower tender than one accepted put in by Charles Miller of Toronto?
5. What price is the department paying for carrying this mail at the present time?

Mr. PATENAUDE:

1. Yes, to J. C. Shields.
2. 24th June, 1916.
3. No.
4. A lower offer was received from the B. C. Express Company on the 27th June, 1916, but arrangements with Mr. Shields had already been completed.
5. $90,000 per annum.

THREE RIVERS PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. BUREAU:

1. Have any payments been made to McLeod, Ferron & Co., for the construction of the public building at Three Rivers?
2. If so, what amounts have been paid on account of the contract and for extras, respectively?
3. Have any payments been made to Charles Lafond in relation to the construction of said building? If so, how much?
4. Has work on said building been interrupted? If so, for what reason and for how long?
5. What was the date and amount of the last payment made to the contractors?
6. What was the date and amount of the last payment made to the architect, Mr. Lafond?

[Sir Thomas White.]

Mr. REID:

1 and 2. Yes, on contract, $96,462.05; on extras, $13,501; $109,963.05.

3. Yes, $3,057.67, including disbursements of $77.25.

4. On May 7, 1914, work of construction was stopped on order of Mr. C. A. Lafond, Supervising Architect, owing to some question being raised by the corporation of Three Rivers regarding a portion of the site. Work was resumed some time in September, 1914, and was continued until September, 1915, when the contractors expressed a wish to give up the work. Practically no work has been done since that time until March, 1917, when a new contract to complete the building was made with Mr. J. Bourque, and work has been resumed.

5. March 30, 1917, $2,663.05.

6. September 10, 1915, $325.63.

RENTALS AT CALGARY.

Mr. TURRIFF:

How much rent was paid to Dr. Blow for the offices of the Irrigation Branch and the Dominion Lands Office in Calgary for the years ending March 31, 1916, and March 31, 1917, respectively?

Mr. ROCHE: 1915-16. Irrigation Branch, $5,872.20; Dominion Lands Office, nil. 1916-17, Irrigation Branch, $5,769.05; Dominion Lands Office, $4,924.77.

QUEBEC & SAGUENAY RAILWAY.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How much has been expended by the Department of Railways and Canals during the year 1916 on the railway known as the Quebec and Saguenay Railway?
2. What expenditure will it require to complete this railway?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No money was paid by the Department of Railways and Canals in connection with the Quebec and Saguenay Railway during the year 1916, but work to the value of about $180,000 was performed on this line.
2. About $1,000,000.

THE DREDGE CAPE BRETON.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has an investigation been made as to the cause of the wreck of the dredge, Cape Breton? If so, by whom?
2 (a). Has any report been submitted in this matter? (b) If so, when will it be available for Members of the House?
3. Has any allowance been made by the Government to compensate the families of the men that were lost in that disaster?

Mr. REID:

1. Yes, by Messrs. F. N. Malcolm, Wreck Commissioner, with J. F. Chapman and W. C. Smith, Nautical Assessors.

2. (a) Yes; (b) Report can be laid on the Table at any time.

3. The granting of gratuities is under consideration.

RAILWAY DEPARTMENT STEAMERS.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. What steamers have been lately purchased by the Railway Department?
2. From whom were these vessels purchased?
3. What price was paid for them?
4. For what purposes are they to be used?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Authority has been granted by Order in Council, dated April 17, 1917, for the purchase of two vessels, viz., the A. J. McKee and the T. J. Drummond.

2. The A. J. McKee was purchased from the Algonquin Central Railway, and the T. J. Drummond from the Great Lakes Transportation Company, Limited, of Midland, Ont.

3. The purchase price of the A. J. McKee is $500,000, and the T. J. Drummond $515,000.

4. For the purpose of carrying coal from Sydney to River St. Lawrence ports.

POSTMASTER AT STELLARTON.

Mr. MACDONALD:

Who is the present postmaster at Stallerton Pictou County?

Mr. PATENAUDE: Mr. W. G. Miller.

INVITATION TO ANGLO-FRENCH DELEGATES.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

Is it the intention of the Government to officially invite the Anglo-French delegates, to the Washington Conference, to visit Canada?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It has been arranged that the Acting Prime Minister (Sir George Foster) will extend an official invitation to the Anglo-French delegation to the Washington Conference to visit Canada.

FRANCO-CANADIAN TREATY.

Mr. GRAHAM:

Has the Government received intimation of France's intention to denounce the Franco-Canadian Treaty?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Government has received no such information.

QUEBEC AND SAGUENAY RAILWAY BONDHOLDERS.

*Mr. GRAHAM:

Who are the Canadian bondholders on the Quebec and Saguenay Railway, and what amount does each hold?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Government has no information as to who are the Canadian bondholders of the railway in question.

DR. BRUCE'S REPLY TO BAPTIE REPORT.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Has the Department or Minister of Militia received a reply or report from Doctor Bruce to or upon the Baptie Report?

2. If so, will the minister bring down copies of said reply or report?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: On the 14th instant, Dr. Bruce informed me that he had forwarded a copy of his reply to the Baptie report to the department, but the report has not yet been received. I shall bring down a copy of the reply when it is received.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What were the names, former post office addresses, occupations and salaries paid to the censors and decoders in the employ of the Government at Hazel Hill and Canso during the year 1916?

2. How much has been expended in connection with this service at Canso and Hazel Hill since the first of August, 1914, up to the present date?

3. How much has been expended in connection with the said service in embracing all the stations in the province of Nova Scotia from August 1, 1914, up to the present date?

1. How many permanent civil servants or officials were in the employ of the Post Office Department on the 10th day of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?

2. How many temporary civil servants and employees of all kinds were in the employ of said department on the 10th day of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?

3. How many permanent civil servants or officials were appointed by said department since the 1st of August, 1914?

4. How many temporary civil servants and employees were employed by said department since August 1, 1914?

5. What was the gross amount paid by said department for salaries and expenses to both permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1911?

6. What was the gross amount paid by said department for salaries and expenses of all permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1917?

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. How many permanent civil servants or officials were in the employ of the Department

of Militia and Defence on the 10th day of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?

2. How many temporary civil servants and employees of all kinds were in the employ of the said department on the 10th day of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?

3. How many permanent civil servants or officials were appointed by said department since the 1st of August, 1914?

4. How many temporary civil servants and employees were employed by said department since August 1, 1914?

5. What was the gross amount paid by said department for salaries and expenses to both permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1914?

6. What was the gross amount paid by said department for salaries and expenses of all permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1917?

7. How many civil servants were appointed by said department since October 10, 1911, under the provision of section 21 of the Civil Service Act?

Mr. PARDEE:

1. How many permanent civil servants or officials were in the employ of the Public Works Department on the 10th day of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?

2. How many temporary civil servants and employees of all kinds were in the employ of the said department on the 10th day of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?

3. How many permanent civil servants or officials were appointed by said department since the 1st of August, 1914?

4. How many temporary civil servants and employees were employed by said department since August 1, 1914?

5. What was the gross amount paid by said department for salaries and expenses to both permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1914?

6. What was the gross amount paid by said department for salaries and expenses of all permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1917?

7. How many civil servants were appointed by said department since October 10, 1911, under the provisions of section 21 of the Civil Service Act?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

1. How many permanent civil servants or officials were in the employ of the Department of Agriculture on the 10th day of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?

2. How many temporary civil servants and employees of all kinds were in the employ of the said department on the 10th day of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?

3. How many permanent civil servants or officials were appointed by said department since the 1st of August, 1914?

4. How many temporary civil servants and employees were employed by said department since August 1, 1914?

5. What was the gross amount paid by said department for salaries and expenses to both permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1914?

[Mr. Macdonald.]

6. What was the gross amount paid by said department for salaries and expenses of all permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1917?

7. How many civil servants were appointed by said department since October 10, 1911, under the provisions of section 21 of the Civil Service Act?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

For a copy of all petitions, Orders in Council, letters, telegrams, etc., in connection with the last appointment of a postmaster at Wentworth Centre, Cumberland County, N.S.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

For a copy of all correspondence, memoranda, Orders in Council, etc., in reference to the dismissal of Moses H. Nickerson, as Inspector of Life Saving Stations in Nova Scotia.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

For a copy of all proceedings in the Exchequer Court of Canada, and judgment of Mr. Justice Cassells concerning the reference of the Quebec and Saguenay Railway, the Quebec and Montmorency Railway and the Lotbinière and Megantic Railway.

Mr. NORTHRUP:

For a copy of all contracts and agreements between Sir Charles Ross, his successors or assigns and His Majesty the King represented by the Minister of Militia and Defence since and including the agreement between them dated the 27th day of March, A.D., 1902.

Mr. CARVELL:

For a copy of all papers, documents, petitions, memoranda, correspondence, etc., with reference to the Government of the Dominion of Canada building competing telephone lines in British Columbia paralleling lines already in operation of the Okanagan Telephone Company, Limited.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

For a copy of all papers, documents, petitions, memoranda, correspondence, etc., in connection with the building of a wharf during the last five years at White Rock, B.C., and any extensions of said wharf, giving the name of the contractor and the name of the Superintendent of Works.

Mr. MACKENZIE:

For a copy of all papers, documents, petitions, memoranda, correspondence, etc., with the Government of British Columbia or any member thereof with the Fishery Officers of the Marine and Fisheries Department resident in said Province, and with any company, person or persons relating to prohibition of the export of British Columbia salmon since January 20, 1913.

Mr. MACDONALD:

For a copy of all papers, documents, petitions, memoranda, correspondence, etc., in connection with the letting of the contract to construct Section No. 2 of the Jetty over Hayseed Channel, South Arm of Fraser River, Contract No. 10710, with a copy of the plans and specifications, prices or schedule of rates and any and all extensions of said contract or any new contracts.

Mr. BOIVIN:

For a copy of all papers, documents, petitions, memoranda, correspondence, etc., with reference to the leasing of Poplar Island Indian Reserve, City of New Westminster, North Arm of Fraser River, showing terms and conditions upon which said lease was granted.

Mr. KYTE:

For a copy of the contract for dredging in False Creek in the City of Vancouver, entered into either by the Government or the Board of Harbour Commissioners with the Pacific Coast Dredging Company, showing the quantity of material removed, the amount paid each month respectively to the said company for said dredging since the beginning of the work, showing any changes in or supplementary contracts in regard to dredging at Vancouver made by the Government or Harbour Commissioners with the said company, and the total amount expended at False Creek since the inception of the work.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

For a copy of all statements, reports, evidence, letters and other papers and documents in the possession of the Department of Railways and Canals relating to a claim for a horse belonging to one Dan McFarlane, injured at Brinley Brook, N.S., by the Canadian Government Railway.

Mr. BURNHAM:

For a copy of all papers, documents, instruments, letters of the Minister of Militia and all correspondence, etc., relating to the purchase or arrangements for purchase of the property of Albert Carpenter, for the purposes of the Peterborough Rifle Range.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions and other papers concerning the substitution of the name of Luceville given to the post office of Sainte Luce, County of Rimouski, Quebec.

Mr. TURRIFF:

For a copy of the Order in Council and all other papers in connection with the awarding of the contract to J. C. Shields and others or to the Inland Express Company for carrying the mails from Ashcroft to Fort George, B.C.

THE DUTY ON SEED BEANS.

Mr. A. B. McCOIG (West Kent) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, on account of the great shortage in the bean crop in Canada during 1916, and the urgent need in this country for this article, in the interest of the consumer and producer, beans for seed purposes should be allowed to come into Canada duty free.

He said: Mr. Speaker, my chief reason for moving this resolution is the great shortage in the bean crop in the south-western part of Ontario. We have been unfortunate in our attempts to get seed for the different crops which the farmers are desirous of putting in. This is particularly true of the bean crop, which last season was a complete failure in the counties of Essex, Kent and Lambton, and in parts of Elgin county. We have had to get the seed from the United States. The seed which was brought in last year from the United States matured about two weeks earlier than the home-grown seed, and the farmers who were fortunate enough to get seed from the United States had a great advantage over those who used home-grown seed. They are anxious, therefore, to get as much of the seed this year from the state of Michigan as they possibly can. A request to this effect has been made in a petition which, I understand, has been forwarded to the Government, and the demand has been voiced also by farmers' associations in the county of Kent. In view of the high price of seed at the present time, a greatly increased production during this year will result if the Government can see its way clear to allow the farmers to have their bean seed brought in free of duty and free of war tax. The Prime Minister and the other members of the Government, as well as the citizens of Canada, are particularly anxious that every farmer shall produce as much as he possibly can, and if satisfactory results in this respect are to be obtained, it will be absolutely necessary to get the seed to which I have referred. If this House is in sympathy with the proposals to this effect which have been advanced from time to time by different boards of trade and by different municipal councils throughout the country, I feel satisfied that the request will be granted and this motion allowed to go into effect.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The matter of production is, of course, a very important one, and within the next few days I shall be glad to look into the subject of my hon. friend's motion and see what, if anything, can be done. I spoke to my hon. friend the other day, and I understood that it was not his intention to bring this resolution up until after the Budget. I do not understand that he is pressing the motion to-day, and if he is content to withdraw it, having brought it to the attention of the Government, I shall be very glad to look into the matter.

Mr. McCOIG: I have no desire to press the matter against the wishes of the Minister of Finance, but if it is some time before the Budget is brought down and the people do not know what course the Government purposes adopting, the result may be detrimental to the best interests of this year's crop. It will be satisfactory, however, if the farmers have the seed before May 24 or June 1. Undoubtedly they are anxious to know whether the Government will grant

this request, for if the duty be removed many farmers will put in seed who otherwise would, perhaps, be unable to secure the necessary seed or who would not be anxious to pay the price which they have to pay under existing circumstances.

Mr. PUGSLEY: As I should like to say a few words on this resolution, I would move that the debate be now adjourned.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I agree to that.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

On the motion of Mr. Pugsley:

That, whereas, in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, the provincial franchise has been granted to women, by legislative enactment, and in British Columbia the electors have voted in favour of similar legislation;

Whereas it is proposed in the Dominion Elections Act that persons entitled to vote for members of a Provincial Legislature shall also be entitled to vote for members of Parliament, but in respect to Alberta and Saskatchewan—alone of all the provinces of Canada—it is provided that only males shall be entitled to vote for members of the Federal Parliament, thus creating an anomalous situation as between the provinces, which should be removed;

Whereas during the present Empire struggle the women of Canada have shown a most intelligent and patriotic interest in, and an unselfish devotion to, the welfare of the state;

And, whereas it seems but just and right that they should be given a voice in the direction of its affairs:

In the opinion of this House it is desirable that provision be made either to grant to women who are qualified to vote for members of a Provincial Legislature, the right also to vote for members of the Dominion Parliament, or to grant to women throughout the Dominion the right to vote for members of Parliament, subject to such provisions and limitations as may seem reasonable to Parliament.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I had intended to press this resolution to a vote this afternoon; but some arrangements were made by other gentlemen in regard to motions further down the list, and for reasons which have been presented to me by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), and which seem to be very well founded, I would ask that this motion stand.

Motion stands.

VICTORIA BRIDGE TOLL RATES.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville) moved for:

A copy of the Order in Council increasing the toll rates on Victoria Bridge, Montreal, and also a copy of all petitions, telegrams, letters and other documents referring to said increase.

[Mr. McCoig.]

He said: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak at any length. I wish only to draw the attention of the Government to the very serious state of affairs which exists in connection with the toll rates on Victoria bridge, Montreal, which is the only connecting link across the river St. Lawrence between the great commercial metropolis of Canada and the south shore. A few weeks ago the people were startled to learn that the toll rates were increased. I do not know the reason for the change, but I wish to inform my hon. friend, the Minister of Railways and Canals, that some relief should certainly be afforded to the farmers of the counties on the south shore. I have not the present tariff before me, but I know the rates are simply prohibitive for the farmers of the counties of Laprairie, Rouville, Chambly and Verchères, not to mention others, and I sincerely hope that the representatives of the province of Quebec in the Government will do something to remove that disability which is fastened upon the farmers of the south shore. The increase, I am sure, has passed unnoticed when my hon. friends were absent from Council, but it seems to me that to call their attention to this real grievance will be sufficient to effect a cure.

I think the time has come when the Grand Trunk Railway Company should give us free ingress and free egress across the Victoria bridge. This bridge has been very heavily subsidized, first for the original construction and later on for its reconstruction, so that it seems to me that the people in that section of the country should receive ample justice on the part of that company. I quite understand that, like all other transportation companies, the Grand Trunk Railway has passed through hard times; but when one considers that such a large population has to make use of that connecting link between the two shores of the St. Lawrence river, one feels that the Government should make it a point, if not to make the bridge free for the farmers and the community at large, at least to have the old toll rates restored. I make a special appeal to the hon. Secretary of State, (Mr. Patenaude), who represents one of the large constituencies of the city of Montreal, and also to the Deputy Speaker of the House (Mr. Rainville) who represents the counties of Chambly and Verchères.

Mr. PATENAUDE: My hon. friend must be mistaken, because there has been no change in the rates so far as the farmers are concerned; the change is only as re-

gards motor trucks, and I presume the Minister of Railways will have an explanation for that.

Mr. REID: Perhaps I should reply to the hon. member, as this matter was brought before me when I was acting for the Minister of Railways in his absence. The matter is one of routine. After having heard the case as represented by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, I went into it thoroughly with the deputy minister and other officials, and found that the tolls had not been revised for many years. The deputy minister, after investigating the matter very carefully, recommended that the changes were fair and just, and I therefore recommended the changes to Council and they were approved. The changes, however, were not so drastic as the hon. member has stated. At the time care was taken to protect the farmers and the increase was more in regard to motor trucks. After the Order in Council was passed, I noticed that there were some complaints, but I understand they were taken up with the officials of the Grand Trunk Railway Company and that the grievances complained of were removed. At all events I gave notice to the effect that if there were any grievances, these toll rates could be revised from time to time, and I was willing at any time to hear complaints which, if well founded, would result in a revision of the rates. From that day, however, to the time that I ceased administering the department, no complaint was registered. I have not asked the minister if any complaints have been received since then, but I have been advised by the Grand Trunk officials themselves and others that there are no grievances now, or that if there are any, they are so small that no one cares to take any further interest in them. As my hon. friend knows, the matter can be brought before the Minister of Railways at any time, and I am quite satisfied that he will do his best to remedy any grievance that is shown to exist. The rates are not permanent; they can be revised at any time.

4 p.m.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am very glad to hear that the rates can be revised when a grievance is shown to exist. In the present case the grievance is certainly felt by the farmers, and also by the business men of Montreal. My hon. friend (Mr. Patenaude) stated that the farmers were not hit by this new regulation. Well, I can say this: I represent the constituency of Rouville, which, as my hon. friend knows, is a farming community, and when I was there ten or twelve days ago I met several farmers both of St. Hyacinthe and Rouville, and the whole talk was of the rates on the Victoria Bridge. My hon. friend must not forget that motor trucks are used very extensively in that very progressive district, in the Counties of Laprarie, Rouville, and Chambly-Verchères. I need not say that it is the most progressive district in my province. I have also heard some very bitter complaints from the merchants of Montreal. I am sure my hon. friend will bear me out when I say that there is a large local trade between Montreal and the south shore. The wholesale grocers of Montreal send motor trucks over the Victoria Bridge, simply loaded with merchandise to be delivered at Laprairie, St. Lambert, Chambly, Longueuil, Marieville, and other smaller towns and villages. I have heard some members of the Montreal Board of Trade complain very bitterly about these high rates, and I might mention many who do an extensive business on the south shore. They stated that the rates were almost prohibitive. I am glad to have had this opportunity of bringing the matter before the House, and to have the promise of the acting minister that a remedy will be found for this evil.

Motion agreed to.

LUCEVILLE, RIMOUSKI COUNTY.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville) moved for:

A copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions and all other papers concerning the substitution of the name of Luceville given to the Intercolonial Railway station of Sainte Luce, County of Rimouski, Quebec.

He said: This motion will be more interesting to those members of the House who are familiar with the French language. Sainte Luce, the old name of the village is a much better name than Luceville. It was an old French name and was euphonious. Sombody, possibly a busybody in the village, undertook to get the name of the post office and station changed, and against the will of the parish priest and of the community generally, and in spite of shoals of protesting letters and telegrams, the name was changed to Luceville. This is really a grievance for that constituency, not only to those who appreciate euphony and like to stick to old names with a romance about them, but from a business point of view as well. I sincerely hope that my hon. friend the Secretary of State, who attends to our

affairs in the province of Quebec, will see to it that the old name of Sainte Luce is restored. Some people in the Province of Quebec have a very officious way of getting old names with a flavour of romance about them changed for new names which have no meaning at all. What meaning has Luceville? It is ugly, it is not euphonious, and there is no romance about it; whereas the old name of Sainte Luce has a pleasant ring about it. I sincerely trust that my hon. friend will see that the name of the station and of the post office is restored.

Hon. E. L. PATENAUDE (Secretary of State): I shall be glad to bring down the documents in connection with this matter and if there is anything that can be done in the premises, I shall do it with pleasure.

Motion agreed to.

THE DUTY ON TRACTOR ENGINES.

Mr. A. B. McCOIG (West Kent) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, on account of the urgent need of greater production of foodstuffs and the admitted shortage of farm labour, tractor engines suitable for all kinds of farm work, which will be of great assistance to producers, should be admitted into Canada free of duty.

He said: I feel satisfied that every member of the House will agree with me that it is of supreme importance that this resolution should be passed. We have it on the highest authority that there is great food shortage at this time. The Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) have urged our farmers to produce as much as possible. But, with the great shortage of labour, especially in the province of Ontario, it is out of the question for our farmers, under present conditions, to get in the crops that our people are anxious they should get in. I was talking to Mr. Foulds, manager of the Thames Valley Land Company, which has large holdings in the township of Tilbury, in the county of Kent, and he informed me that fields aggregating no less than four hundred acres in the most fertile portion of their lands would be left uncultivated this year owing to the shortage of labour and the lateness of the season. I asked him whether, if he had a light tractor engine, he would be able to handle the entire farm, and his answer was that he believed he could. He said he had been communicating with the provincial authorities with a view to getting one of the ten tractors purchased by the Government of the province. But it is likely he would be unsuccessful because of the great demand that has arisen for these tractors. It goes to show how urgently the tractors are needed when the provincial Government purchases ten of them and brings them from the other side of the line, where they are manufactured. We learn, also, that the enterprising members of the Board of Trade of Toronto are drawing upon their private bank accounts to purchase five tractors with a view to distributing them where they can do the best work. With such evidences of an urgent demand for these machines on the part of our own people, it would seem only fair that this Parliament should take action at least to the extent of allowing these tractors to be brought in without an additional fine. I believe that if the duty were removed many farmers would be able to purchase these tractors privately, and if the duty were removed the cost to the purchasers would be greatly reduced. The tariff formerly was 20 per cent and now there is an additional 7½ per cent. That is to say, if this duty were taken off we should be able to purchase five tractors for the present cost of four. I believe I am within the mark when I say that at present one thousand of these tractors could be used in Ontario. If the duty were removed these machines would be of some assistance in getting in the spring crop, and our farmers would be in a much better position to put in an additional wheat crop this fall, and in the meantime there would be the summer fallowing and preparation for that crop. I understand from newspaper reports that other countries have placed orders for no fewer than 50,000 farm tractors. This is an indication of how widely useful these machines can be made in assisting greater agricultural production, and makes all the stronger the case in favour of this resolution. Should the Government object to allowing the free entry of the larger tractors, I would be prepared to amend this resolution by confining it to tractors of 8-16 horse-power, or possibly 10-20 horse-power. That, I understand to mean, a tractor that will pull 8 or 10 horse-power and will develop power on the belt of 16 or 20 horse-power. These tractors will be sufficiently large for our immediate purposes, and their importation will not interfere with any manufacture in Canada. I believe that the Massey-Harris Company are getting out a small tractor, but it is practically still in the experimental stage. We see by the press this morning that in all churches throughout the Dominion preachers have been urging greater production. And we

are warned by those who are in a better position to judge than most of the members of this House can possibly be that there is danger in the Old World, and even here, of actual famine. This being so, it is clearly the duty of Parliament to give farmers every possible assistance. With the use of these tractors our farmers will be able to produce more, and thus Canada, besides sending her men to the front, will be able to give assistance in providing supplies for the troops and the people generally without which we cannot succeed in winning the war.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance): I am not clear as to what item in the Tariff the hon. member refers to. The resolution speaks of "tractor engines suitable for all kinds of farm work." These engines to-day are manufactured in Canada, by one or more concerns. Some time ago we placed ditching machines on the free list, but that was partly on the ground that they were not manufactured in Canada. As I have pointed out in the House before, one item in the Tariff depends upon another. If we take away the duty on tractor engines, then, as tractor engines are manufactured in Canada, we should have to take away the duties on the raw materials which enter into their manufacture, on the coal used in their production, and even on the building material used in the construction of the buildings in which they are produced.

Mr. TURRIFF: Will the minister please say where these tractor engines are manufactured in Canada?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Assuming that I understand the article to which he refers, I am informed that they are manufactured in Hamilton, Brantford, and possibly some other places.

Mr. McCOIG: I may inform the minister that the 8-10, and 10-20 tractors are not manufactured in Canada, though I understand that the Massey-Harris people are experimenting with them.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The hon. gentleman's resolution refers to "tractor engines suitable for all kinds of farm work." The description is about as wide as he can make it. The questions we must consider are, first, are these manufactured in Canada? and second, can they be manufactured in Canada? If they are manufactured in Canada, our farmers can buy them; if they are not now manufactured here but can be, then it is important that Canadians should make them.

Mr. McCOIG: But the nation will starve in the meantime.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not agree that these machines cannot be made in Canada. My information is that they are actually manufactured here and can be bought. It is the policy of the Government to encourage the manufacture of all articles that can be produced in Canada. It is in the national interest now more than ever that if an article can be bought in Canada it should be bought here rather than abroad, for it is necessary above all in time of war that we should conserve our resources. Speaking also from the standpoint of revenue, there never was a time when this Dominion needed revenue more than it does at present.

Mr. TURRIFF: Import the goods.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There never was a time when this Dominion needed revenue more than it does at present. Our war expenditures are at the rate of $1,000,000 a day.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Some time ago I saw in the newspapers that the British Government had bought, for the use of its farmers, 2,000 of these tractor ploughs. I suppose that is what my hon. friend (Mr. McCoig) means. Were any of these purchased in Canada or were they not all purchased in the United States?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have no information as to that point, but I am perfectly satisfied that if the Dominion Government desired to buy 2,000 ploughs it would be very much better that they should place the order for them in the Dominion of Canada than in the United States.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If you could get them.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: But the point is that while we might get these tractors in the United States, they are manufactured, or can be manufactured, in Canada and in ordinary times it is desirable that our Canadian manufacturers should build them.

Mr. PARDEE: Does the hon. gentleman say they can be bought in Canada? I understand the Ontario Government are bringing them in from the United States. Why are they doing that if they can buy them here?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am not able to say whether the Ontario Government are buying them in the United States or not, but I am referring to traction engines. Traction engines are manufactured in Canada.

Mr. TURRIFF: I think it will clear matters up a little bit if we get an idea of the kind of engine that is meant. You can get a traction engine to run a threshing machine in Canada; they are made at half a dozen or a dozen places. But, the tractor engines that are now being used by the western farmers for drawing a double mould board, or a two or four furrow plough, are not made in Canada except experimentally. We cannot get them in quantity; we have to buy them in the United States.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend will observe the wording of the resolution. It refers to "tractor engines suitable for all kinds of farm work."

Mr. McCOIG: I suggested when I was making my remarks that I would be willing to so amend my resolution as to confine it to the 8-16 and 10-20 tractors which are suitable for farm purposes. The large tractors, the 20-30 and 20-40, are too heavy for farm work and are almost impracticable because they pack the ground too much.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is not possible for me to agree to the amendment of this motion unless my hon. friend desires to give notice of it. I can only speak of the resolution as it stands on the Order Paper, and as it stands on the Order Paper it should be voted down for the reason which I have given; that is, that the tractor engines can be manufactured in Canada, and it is against the national interest that they should be imported from the United States. I was developing my argument as to the need that Canada has for additional revenue. Then, beyond the desirability of manufacturing these goods in Canada, if there ever was a time in the history of the Dominion when we need revenue it is the present. We have an expenditure in connection with this war at the rate of $1,000,000 a day. In so far as I know, all classes in the community are doing well. I do not think that the farmers have ever done as well in the history of the Dominion as they are doing at the present time. I do not believe that as high prices have ever been obtained for farm produce as are being obtained at present. I do not believe that general business in the Dominion was ever better or as good as it is at the present time. That being so, there would seem to be no reason why the duty should be taken off these articles any more than off a further range of articles that my hon. friend might mention. The present is not a time to reduce or remove duties which give us our revenue. So that, on two grounds, first, on the ground of revenue, second, on the ground that these articles are being, or can be, manufactured in Canada, I think my hon. gentleman's motion should be negatived. If he desires to withdraw this motion and substitute a motion which covers a certain line of traction engines which he mentioned, but which I cannot identify and about which I have no information at the present time, I would be willing that that should be done, but, as it stands, the resolution should be negatived.

Mr. WILCOX: Mr. Speaker, I want, in the first place, to associate myself with those who are in favour of any measure that will benefit the agricultural classes of this country at this time. I am rather inclined to the view, however, that the suggestion which has been made by my hon. friend from West Kent (Mr. McCoig) this afternoon, if carried into effect, would not be the benefit to the farmers that he anticipates, but would, on the other hand, work a great injury. We have in the little town of Essex, six miles from where I live, a splendid industry which is branching out into the manufacture of farm tractors. They are putting up at the present time, I understand, seven of these tractors for the express purpose of assisting in all light farm work. If my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) were to act upon the suggestion of my hon. friend from West Kent, I think it would have the effect of wiping out of existence that infant industry, which, I do believe, is contrary to the policy of both political parties. As I understand the principle upon which both political parties stand in regard to this matter, it is that the infant industry shall have a reasonable protection until such time as it is enabled to compete against the industries of the outside world. My hon. friend (Mr. McCoig) says that is false. There may be some question about that point, but I know that up our way in the splendid city of Windsor, where we are hoping to build up a great industrial centre, the Liberals have very little to say about free trade.

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. gentleman did not say what you intimated at all.

Mr. McCOIG: I did not address any remarks to the hon. gentleman whatever.

I did not refer in any way whatever to anything that the hon. gentleman said. That is all imaginary on the part of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WILCOX: I heard a breath floating from the other side that sounded like that. I may be pardoned for referring to the question of traction ditchers which has been dealt with. I think the Minister of Finance will agree when I state that I was the first member of this House who suggested to him that, as this machine was not manufactured in Canada and was only manufactured in the United States, it might be placed on the free list. I have watched this very closely because the question of tile draining in the county of Essex and in western Ontario, where it is a flat, level, but very rich and fertile country, is a live issue and we have dozens of these machines in our neighborhood. There is one working on my own farm, or on my father's farm, and we know, what we had to pay when these machines had a duty imposed upon them. We had to pay twenty-five cents a rod for the digging of the trench and the placing of the tile. The duty was taken off. A few more machines were brought in and the men who brought the machines in joined together and raised the cost of laying the tile to twenty-eight cents a rod. That is what we are paying to-day. So that the elimination of the duty on the tile ditching machines did not reduce the price to the farmer of the laying of the tile, but, in my opinion, it did have the effect for all time to come, while the tariff remains as it is, of preventing all possibility of any tile ditching machines being constructed in the Dominion of Canada. So it seems to me that when our policy is based upon that principle of a reasonable protection for an infant industry, when we are commencing to build up that industry, I believe, as the farmers of this country have been loyal and patriotic in their adherence to that principle in our national policy in the past, they will stand by it in the future in the same way. I also believe that the benefit which my hon. friend anticipates would flow from the reduction of duty would not be secured. Therefore, I think the tariff should remain as it is.

Mr. NESBITT: What firm in Essex are making these machines?

Mr. WILCOX: The firm there is making a farm tractor with a capacity of drawing two or three plows. They have purchased a machine shop and commenced operations about two months ago. I am quite confident that if my hon. friend will send a telegram this afternoon, that company will be able to fill right away all the orders that he can take in the county of Kent.

Mr. McCOIG: Last fall—I did not want to bring any personal matter into this debate—I waited on Mr. McGregor, head of the Ford factory in Ford, and asked when I could get a tractor for my own farm, as at the request of this Government I wanted one to get in all the wheat possible. Mr. McGregor told me that he could not guarantee me a tractor within two years; and the whole nation would starve before these tractors would be ready to cultivate land to produce wheat.

Mr. LALOR: If the hon. member will wire to the Canadian Engine Company at Dunnville, Ontario, he can get a tractor because we manufacture them.

Mr. McCOIG: What horse-power?

Mr. LALOR: I do not know exactly the horse-power, but large enough to do ploughing.

Mr. NESBITT: That is the trouble, they are too large.

Mr. McCOIG: These are kerosene burning engines and they afford a great saving in cost over the gasolene engines to which my hon. friend (Mr. Lalor) referred.

Mr. NESBITT: Are the McGregor people at Ford the same as the firm at Essex?

Mr. WILCOX: No, they are not the same people. The Ford people have not commenced to construct tractors. I understand they have not commenced even in Detroit, and I know they have not in Walkerville. The firm I have reference to is starting a factory in the town of Essex.

Mr. NESBITT: What is the name of the firm?

Mr. WILCOX: I think it is The Essex County Tractor Company, but I would not be positive as to the name.

Mr. NESBITT: Have they produced these tractors yet?

Mr. WILCOX: I shall send a telegram this afternoon and get that information. I am sure they are now manufacturing tractors and putting them on the market. They had one on exhibition at the fall fair last year.

Mr. NESBITT: The reason I ask these questions is that I wish to be absolutely

fair in these things. So far as the Ford people are concerned, I know that what the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McCoig) says is correct, because I wrote them myself and they are not in a position to produce any tractors yet. As to the factory in Essex, I never heard of it before. That of course, does not say, that it does not exist. I wish them success. But in the meantime I want to impress on the Minister of Finance that this year in Ontario we are suffering very materially from the lack of farm labour. There is a great deal in the newspapers about the city people sending students into the country and going themselves, and all that sort of thing; but as a matter of fact the ordinary farmer does not pay much attention to that because he knows as well as I do that a man cannot come from the city, unaccustomed to heavy manual labour, and be much use on the farm.

Mr. WILCOX: Men from the city have proved to be good fighters and I do not know why they should not be good farmers if they apply themselves.

Mr. NESBITT: They would undoubtedly become good farmers if they had the time and experience, as good as anybody else. But at the same time no man can successfully do a kind of work to which he is not accustomed until he has had training and experience. The tractors of which the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McCoig) speaks were exhibited last year at all the ploughing matches in the country. They were all of American manufacture. The tariff at the present time as against American machines is 20 per cent and 7½ per cent, or 27½ per cent. The machines that were exhibited and were put into use last fall, these American machines, were very light and capable, with engines able to draw two or three ploughs. I saw them working in two or three instances and know that they did excellent work and could be used on the ordinary farm at least in central and western Ontario. I think it would be a material advantage to the people of Ontario, and, perhaps, to other parts of the country if this change in the tariff were made. I leave my hon. friends to speak for the West, but it would certainly be of material advantage to us if the duty were taken off. A duty of 27½ per cent is very high; it is altogether unnecessarily high. I do not know of any manufacture that requires a duty of 27½ per cent to do business in this country. The minister is quite right in saying that if an article is manufactured in Canada and the duty is taken off the finished article the duty should also be removed from the raw material entering into its production. But for the benefit of the farmer and of the community at large, it would be wise for the minister to remove the duty from light tractors used for ploughing purposes, and I hope he will give this matter serious consideration. I am sure that the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McCoig) will be willing to amend his resolution to conform to that suggestion.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia): It seems to me that when so much has been said by the Government in connection with greater production, this matter deserves serious consideration. A campaign is being carried on all over Canada to-day, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, calling on the farmers to produce more foodstuffs, and there is absolutely no question that the world's supply of food is now at a lower ebb than it has been for many, many years. It was stated last week by an authority engaged in compiling figures relating to this matter that during the present year the amount of wheat produced will be 310,000,000 bushels less than the different countries that use wheat as a food have been in the habit of importing yearly. In view of this shortage and of the necessity for all the production possible, it would seem to be a matter of common sense on the part of the Finance Minister and of the Government to help along production by granting the request made by the member for Kent. There is no use preaching production to a farmer if the conditions are not such that he can produce with advantage to himself. If you want to secure the greatest possible amount of production, the proper course is to make the way easy for the man who produces.

I am quite sure that the tractors that the member for Kent wishes to have put on the free list are quite different from the ones that the Minister of Finance spoke about. The traction engines that we have seen in the West by the hundreds are engines that can be used for a number of purposes, chiefly for running separators; they move from field to field by their own power and draw the separator and a wagon or two along with them. That is not the sort of engine that the member for Kent wants to have put on the free list. The engine to which he refers takes the place of six or eight horses. Hundreds of them are being used in the provinces of Mani-

toba, Saskatchewan and Alberta; they will do as much breaking as eight or nine horses. I know one firm in Winnipeg which has made a contract with a Minneapolis manufacturer for the purchase of several hundred of these tractors; they are being bought throughout the whole country. They retail at a rather high price, something like $1,650; but in the West they find that a tractor of that kind, notwithstanding the high cost of fuel oil, does the work cheaper and more quickly than it can be done by using horses, especially in breaking up the land. A number of these tractors, all from the United States, were exhibited at exhibitions last summer. I think I can reasonably assure the Finance Minister that the tractor engine referred to by the member for Kent is not manufactured for practical puposes in Canada. I believe, however that the manufacturers are taking the matter up, and it is probable that in a year or two they will have an engine on the market that will be all right. If these tractors were being manufactured in Canada, I feel certain that the Government of Ontario would have purchased them from Canadian manufacturers instead of going to the United States for them. The fact that they bought them in the United States is conclusive proof that they could not secure them in the province of Ontario.

If the duty upon these tractors were removed, one result would be a very much increased crop during the year 1918. I do not know that the removal of the duty would make much difference so far as the present year's crop is concerned. In another month the sowing season will be over, and those who have not obtained tractors would hardly be able to secure them in time to use them advantageously between now and the end of the seeding. We have no certainty that the war will be over a year from now, but we do know that food is becoming very much scarcer in Britain. I see that the British Government have arranged with Mr. Henry Ford, the maker of the Ford automobile, to send specifications of his tractor engine to Britain. The British Government will then have these tractors manufactured in Great Britain and used to plough up the parks and vacant lots throughout the British Isles in order to secure the cultivation of a largely increased acreage. If it is necessary for the British Government to take such drastic steps as these in order to increase their own food supply, it seems to me that it would be wise for this Parliament to do everything in its power to increase the supply of wheat, not only this year, but during next year as well. From all the information I have been able to get in the West, I understand that the acreage in wheat this year will be less than last year, on account of last fall being a bad season. Only a small amount of land was got ready for this spring, and while the total acreage in crop this year will not be less than last year, the acreage in wheat will be considerably less, that of flax, barley and oats being, perhaps, somewhat larger. We have to take it for granted that there will be a big demand for food next year, and it is not wise to wait until next year to prepare for the sowing of the 1918 crop. We have to begin to prepare now, and we can do no better than adopt the resolution of the member for Kent and have these tractors put on the free list. The wording of the resolution is, perhaps a little wide; it might be better to narrow it down and state more definitely just what kind of tractor is meant. If my hon. friend the member for Kent and the Minister of Finance get together, they can very soon arrange that.

I say again that if the Government wish to carry out the policy of more production they ought to adopt the suggestion made by the member for Kent and put these tractors on the free list. It would be a big help to the farmers not only of Ontario, but of the three prairie provinces as well, and the result would be a largely increased acreage during the season of 1918.

Mr. BLAIN: Will the member for Kent state the selling price of the tractor to which he refers?

Mr. McCOIG: Four of these tractors were brought into Chatham the other day, and the price of each, in round figures, was $1,150. That includes a plough which will turn three furrows.

Mr. BLAIN: Where is it manufactured?

Mr. McCOIG: In Chicago, by the International Harvester Company. It burns kerosene instead of gasolene.

Mr. LALOR: Is that laid down price including duty?

Mr. McCOIG: Yes, that includes the duty and the freight.

Mr. LALOR: What is the horse-power?

Mr. McCOIG: For that size, eight and sixteen: that is, eight on the draw and six-

teen on the belt. It is a tractor that is used for ploughing, discing and cultivating, and the farmers also use it for grinding, or filling the silos in other seasons of the year.

Mr. F. F. PARDEE (West Lambton): The figures that have just been given to us in answer to the questions asked by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) prove that it might be well for the Government to consider whether or not $1,140 is a very large expenditure for any farmer to incur for a tractor engine of the kind that the hon. member for West Kent has reference to, for farm purposes. The cry has been made here several times today and it has been repeated throughout the country that production is the one essential thing at the present time; that production is needed as a war measure. If production is needed as a war measure, I maintain that the lessening of the duty on those tractor engines should be entered into by the Government as a war measure. If the duty cannot be lessened, why can not some sort of a rebate be made? Why cannot the Government do something of its own accord to carry out its own policy of increased production? Why preach production and not help production? Why say: Produce for the sake of the mother country on account of the shortage in food which is becoming extreme, while at the same time the Government does not do everything possible to carry out the policy of production which it has enunciated. The Minister of Finance in one breath says: We never before needed revenue so much as we need it now; and in the next: Buy at home. If you reduce the duty, people will buy more of these engines and the minister will get more revenue than by putting an extreme duty on this article, and production will be increased. If the Government is honest in its professions for greater production, then it cannot better exemplify its honesty to the people of Canada and of the mother country than by giving every possible help it can, even as a war measure, to this very thing that it desires, viz., production. These things have to be taken into consideration in times which are as extreme as those we are living in. Perhaps home manufacture may be a little hurt, but surely everyone is willing to undergo some sacrifice for the sake of the one great cause which we are all trying to accomplish. If the revenue is going to be injured by the passing of the motion of the hon. member for West Kent, I would suggest to the Government and to the Minister of Finance in particular that a tax on excess war profits in the manufacture of munitions might make up some of the depreciation in the revenue. There are many ways in which we might increase the production, and if the Government is really anxious for production, the best thing it can do is to make it easy for the people to produce.

Mr. T. J. STEWART (West Hamilton): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I was not in the House when the mover of the resolution was speaking as I should like to have heard the arguments in favour of the duty being taken off tractor engines. I have had the privilege of handling tractor engines for a number of years, and I know what they cost in this country and in the United States very approximately. If the duty is taken off those tractor engines, the manufacturers in this country will not be able to exist, because the manufacturers in the United States, having a larger field in which to sell their goods, manufacture these engines in large numbers and consequently can produce them more cheaply than can manufacturers in this country. In the East not more than one or two farmers in a thousand use those tractors as the farms are too small. I have been through the West and tractors are used in the West a good deal; but I have not heard any complaint as to the duty on tractor engines, and I am quite convinced that if the duty is taken off the manufacturers in this country will not be able to compete. I know the Sawyer-Massey Company and the Waterhouse Company, but I am not aware that they have made a great deal of money during the years those duties have been in existence.

Mr. PARDEE: How many tractors do those companies produce in a year?

Mr. STEWART: I do not think the Sawyer-Massey would produce more than 32 or 35 altogether in a year. The market in this country is very limited for those engines; perhaps fifty or sixty are sold in the United States for one here.

Mr. PARDEE: Why does the Ontario Government go to the States?

Mr. STEWART: Nobody knows that. I know from the cost of the tractor engines manufactured in the United States that no Canadian firm is able to manufacture in competition with the United States manufacturers considering the large markets the latter have and the larger production com-

pared with the production in Canada. If the duty is taken off, those Canadian manufacturers who have been in business for so many years, and who are able to produce sufficient to cope with the demand, will be crippled, so that I think the Government would be very foolish to take off the duty for the benefit of a few farmers when it would ruin the manufacturers who have built up a good trade.

Mr. McCOIG: My impression is that the hon. member for West Hamilton does not understand the situation. This is a clear case of many men standing up in Parliament and on public platforms who do not understand the real wants of the farmers. The tractors to which the hon. member refers are threshing machine tractors, which cost in the neighbourhood of four or five thousand dollars. The tractors to which I refer cost about $1,150. Let me cite the name of Mr. John Johnston, of the county of Kent, who purchased one last year. He had read the arguments put forth by different speakers on public platforms throughout the country in favour of greater production. He had one thousand dollars on hand and he said: "I am going out to comply with the request of the Government and buy a tractor engine; I am going to start ploughing to-morrow, and until it is too late to put in wheat I am going to sow every acre of my farm I can in wheat, to carry out the wish of the people of this country." He has two hundred or two hundred and fifty acres of land, and at the price of wheat to-day he will make enough to pay him back the price paid for the tractor. His brother, A. Johnston, took a tractor off the train at the city of Chatham last Monday, paying all the expenses amounting to $1,150, and he is going to try to produce all that is possible. Mr. Wm. McNeilage took one home last Monday also and paid $1,150 for it, and he is going to use it for the very purpose that the member on that side and on this side of the House are asking the farmers to do; that the preachers in every pulpit in the country are asking for; that is, for increased production. At the present time you cannot get the man-power or the horses to do the work that one of these tractor engines will do in the same time. The hon. member is not aware of the kind of tractor these are. There is no manufacturer in this country making this engine. The Minister of Agriculture, who has no doubt interested himself in this great question, possibly was at the Whitby Exposition last fall and must have seen a number of American tractor engines which were there and which all did the work to the entire satisfaction of the farmers. When we can get one of those tractors that will plough six acres in a day, that will disc and cultivate and fix ready for seeding ten acres a day; when it will take three men with two three-horse teams and one two-horse team to do the same amount of work. If these men know nothing about farm work they know that if they persist in their attitude they will kill the very thing we want in this country, namely, greater production. Let us get these implements in free now, that we may produce the food that is wanted so urgently, and then you can put as high a tariff on after the war as you like, and I will not object. Let the people who are anxious to do the work—not the arm-chair fellows who come around in vacation time and get in the way,—get the implements, and then we will have greater production. The hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Wilcox) is the last man who should throw cold water on this scheme. He said the resolution introduced and carried through this House by the Minister of Finance to remove the tariff on tile draining machinery had been a detriment, rather than otherwise.

5 p.m.

Mr. WILCOX: I did not say that. I said that the farmers were paying a greater price for their tile draining now than before the duty was taken off.

Mr. McCOIG: The hon. gentleman said that on account of the duty being removed the farmers were now paying, 28 cents a rod instead of 25 cents. The hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Truax) in his bye election for this House when the campaign literature was being circulated, remembers very well that one of the things for which the Government claimed credit was the removal of the duty on ditchers. Surely the hon. member for North Essex is not going to repudiate the statement that was made in his party campaign literature circulated in the agricultural constituencies. This is not a personal matter with me, for I have already purchased a machine. I got one last fall, and there was such a demand for these machines at that time, that another man bought it from me for exactly what I paid for it. I got another one the other day. so that personally. I have nothing to gain, but it is of the men who are going to buy in the future that I am thinking. Many

and many an acre of land will go into fall wheat this year if the Government will grant this request, and the machines will come in in greater numbers than carloads of four. Many of our farmers would buy the machines and do not only their own work, but their neighbours' as well, the neighbours possibly threshing for the man who is operating the tractor. If the Government will give the farmers this assistance our crop of wheat next fall will be doubled, instead of falling off 180,000,000 bushels, as it did in 1916. That is what we are all out for. We are not here for political capital all the time, and certainly not on this question. We ask the Government to grant this request because we believe it will assist in carrying out the demand that this Government is making upon our farmers from time to time. There are many other arguments which I could advance, but I will content myself with this quotation:—

> Allies require food above all from America. The Allies' greatest problem—and the one which you can best aid our allied cause by helping to solve—is that of food, which involves that of shipping.
>
> Please remember that there is no British food problem, no French food problem, nor Italian, nor Russian food problem. It is all one great question. At a recent allied conference the Allied Governments agreed to pool their food supplies.
>
> While England is not short of food, and probably could get along if she had only herself to consider, all is not well with France and Italy. Their food shortage is acute. It is growing more so.

Those are the words of the Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour. Surely when he comes from the old land with a message like that we should not hesitate a moment to pass this resolution, so that we may get the tractors in time for the spring seeding. If we delay for two or three weeks longer the machines will be of no use this season. I am pleased to amend the resolution at the request of the Finance Minister so that all tractors over 8, 16, 10, 20 horsepower be excluded.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The resolution as it stands includes tractor engines suitable for all kinds of farm work. If my hon. friend desires to narrow his resolution I should like him to give notice, so that I may look into it.

Mr. T. J. STEWART: Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand that the hon. member rises to discuss the question before the House?

Mr. T. J. STEWART: I wish to answer a statement made by the hon. member in reference to myself.

[Mr. McCoig.]

Mr. SPEAKER: Unless the hon. member rises to a point of order it is not proper for him to discuss the motion at this stage, because the debate has been closed by the member who moved the resolution.

Mr. STEWART: I do not know whether you call it a point of order or not, but he made a statement about myself that is not correct, and I wish to contradict him.

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister wants a day or two to consider this resolution, I understand.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no doubt in my mind that it is not competent for the hon. member to amend his resolution except by the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. GRAHAM: We understand that. I just wanted the leader of the Government and myself to understand each other.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The resolution as it stands on the order paper is wider than is now proposed, and it would be negatived as far as the Government is concerned. If my hon. friend desires to put another resolution on the order paper covering his amended motion, it is open to him to do so.

Mr. GRAHAM: I see the point raised by the leader of the House. I have not consulted my hon. friend, but would the leader of the House assure us that within a reasonable time we shall have an opportunity to discuss the amended resolution?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend can discuss this and any other cognate question upon the Budget; the place where these questions should be discussed.

The House divided on the motion of Mr. McCoig.

YEAS.

Messieurs:

Bourassa,	McCoig,
Bureau,	McCraney,
Cash,	McKenzie,
Clark (Red Deer),	Marcile (Bagot),
Douglas,	Michaud,
Fortier,	Nesbitt,
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),	Oliver,
Gauvreau,	Papineau,
Graham,	Pardee,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),	Proulx,
Kyte,	Ross,
Lapointe, (Kamouraska),	Sinclair,
Lemieux,	Truax,
	Turgeon,
	Turriff.—28.

NAYS.

Messieurs:

Armstrong (Lambton),	McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Armstrong (York, O.),	Marshall,
Ball,	Meighen,
Barnard,	Morphy,
Bennett (Simcoe),	Morris,
Blain,	Nicholson,
Boulay,	Northrup,
Boys,	Paquet,
Bradbury,	Patenaude,
Burnham,	Rainville,
Burrell,	Reid,
Clark (Bruce),	Roche,
Cochrane,	Schaffner,
Crothers,	Sexsmith,
Donaldson,	Shepherd,
Elliot,	Steele,
Fisher,	Stevens,
Fripp,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Green,	Stewart (Lunenburg),
Hanna,	Wallace,
Henderson,	White (Sir Thomas),
Lalor,	Wilcox,
Lewis,	Wright.—48.
Macdonell,	
Maclean (York, O.),	

Pairs

Messieurs:

Kemp (Sir Edward),	Robb,
Wilson (Wentworth),	Wilson (Laval),
Stanfield,	Macdonald.

Motion negatived.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am paired with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) Had I voted, I would have voted in favour of the motion.

Mr. MARCIL: I am paired with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty). Had I voted, I should have voted in favour of the motion.

Mr. CROMWELL: I am paired with the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Tobin). Had I voted, I should have voted against the motion.

Mr. GRAHAM: As the matter might otherwise be overlooked, may I be allowed at this stage to notify the Government that, the proposal to amend Mr. McCoig's motion having been declined, on some future occasion when motion is made for the House to go into Committee of Supply, a motion covering the ground which would have been covered by Mr. McCoig's motion as proposed to be amended will probably be brought forward.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

FREE TRANSPORTATION FOR PROVINCIAL LEGISLATORS.

Mr. G. E. McCRANEY (Saskatoon) moved the second reading of Bill No. 18, to amend the Railway Act.

He said: As the Railway Act is under revision by a Special Committee of the House, this appears an opportune time to bring to the consideration of the House and of this committee the amendment proposed by this Bill. The purpose is to give to the members of the local Legislatures similar pass privileges to those enjoyed by members of this Parliament. It is not proposed to add any new burden to the railway companies, for it is the practice of railway companies to give passes to the members of the provincial legislatures. It may be of interest to the House to know under what circumstances section 343 of the Railway Act, which it is here proposed to amend, was passed. I am informed that in 1903 the late Senator Davis of Prince Albert, being then a member of this House, made some criticism of one of the railway companies, from which company he held a pass. The criticism was objectionable to the company, and they promptly withdrew the pass and so notified Mr. Davis. He spoke to the late Mr. Blair, who was then Minister of Railways, telling him of the circumstance. As the Railway Act was then under the consideration of Parliament, this section was put in so as to avoid the recurrence of such instances and to place members of Parliament on an independent footing with reference to the railways. This subject of passes has been and is a matter of discussion on public platforms. The fact that a member of the legislature holds a pass from a railway company becomes the subject of remark. To my mind, members of provincial legislatures are entitled to the same protection for their personal honour that members of this House are entitled to. The legislature of Nova Scotia has endeavoured to deal with the matter. In the Statutes of Nova Scotia, 1906, Chapter 25, section 3, the following is enacted:

> 234a. Every railway company shall furnish free transportation upon any of its trains for members of the Legislative Council and House of Assembly of Nova Scotia, with their baggage, and also for such officers and servants as may be employed by the Governor in Council in business or work connected with the railways of the province, or any of them, with their baggage or equipment, and shall also when required haul free of charge any car provided for the Governor-in-Council.

Whether the legislature of the province of Nova Scotia has the power to pass such an Act affecting railways under the control of this Parliament is a matter I am not going to discuss. But I understand that the practice of the railways is to conform to

this section and to issue passes to members of the legislature. The legislature has done all it could, at any rate, to put its members in a right light before the country. I am informed by leaders of the Opposition in two of the provinces that the passes which are issued to them by the railway companies cover transportation, not only within the province in which they reside, but also over the whole of their system. Perhaps when the matter is under consideration, it may be desirable to give them the same privileges which it is proposed by this Bill to give to members of Provincial Cabinets. The Bill, as it is presented, limits the passes of members of the legislature to transportation within the province in which they reside, while providing for passes to be given to members of Provincial Cabinets good throughout the whole of Canada.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways): I cannot altogether agree with this Bill, and I would suggest that it be referred to the Committee on Railways without giving it the second reading. I think it is going rather further than we should go to compel railways to give transportation to all members of provincial legislatures. I understood the hon. member (Mr. McCraney) to say that the railways gave to members of the Nova Scotia legislature passes that are good over their entire systems. That is not the case so far as the Government railways are concerned. I think that on company railways also such passes are confined to the limits of the province except in the case of the ministers of the Crown.

Mr. McCRANEY: The minister is correct—members of the legislature are given transportation within the province in which they reside, but ministers of the Crown have passes good throughout the whole system. That is what this Bill provides.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It has been found by the railway companies and also by the Minister of Railways in relation to government roads, that it is a reasonable courtesy to extend to the members of provincial legislatures practically the same privileges that by law are extended to members of Parliament.

It ought to be borne in mind that there is scarcely a railway system in Canada but owns roads as parts of its system which were very largely subsidized by the different provinces. The same remark would apply to the Intercolonial railway itself. The most valuable section of that road, the portion from St. John to the boundary line of Nova Scotia, was built at the expense of the province of New Brunswick, and it was handed over as an asset to the Government of Canada without the province of New Brunswick receiving one single dollar of the cost of that road. So it is with the Canadian Pacific. That road consists of a line from McAdam Junction to St. Andrews, from McAdam Junction to Woodstock, from St. John to McAdam Junction, and of the New Brunswick railway, built from a point opposite Fredericton up the St. John river to Edmunston in the county of Madawaska. These railways now form the entire Canadian Pacific Railway system in the province of New Brunswick and were constructed, or largely constructed at the expense of New Brunswick. To all these different lines the Dominion Government contributed very little compared with what was contributed by the province. I presume the same remark would apply to railways in all other sections of Canada. I doubt if you could pick out a single railway, or part of a railway system, in the Dominion of Canada which has not been constructed very largely through the assistance of the various provinces.

Why, on principle, should the public men in the different provinces be placed in any different position, as far the railway companies are concerned, from that which is occupied by the members of this Parliament? The reasons why, by law, railway companies are compelled to give passes to the different members is that there may be no favouritism, that in the discharge of his public duties no member of this Parliament shall feel that he is under any obligation to the railway companies which come here from time to time for the purpose of securing legislation. It is very desirable in the public interest that that should be so. It is very desirable that when a railway company comes to this Parliament no member should feel that he is enjoying any favour from that particular company; that the right and privilege of transportation that he has is a right and privilege conferred upon him by law, that he should be free and independent to discharge his duties to the public entirely without reference to the railway companies.

The same rule should be applied to the members of the provincial governments and legislatures. It is extremely desirable that they should be in the same free and independent position as members of this Parliament. But, it may be asked: Why should not that privilege be conferred upon

them by legislation of the provincial legislatures? It could be done in their respective provinces if it were not for the fact that this Parliament for years has been—whether in the public interest or otherwise it is not necessary now to say—infringing upon the rights of the provinces. Time after time, session after session, it has been declared by this Parliament that certain railways should be brought under the exclusive legislation of the Dominion Parliament. It is provided that if any of these railways which have been incorporated, subsidized and largely built by the provinces, connects with the Intercolonial railway or the Canadian Pacific railway or any other line of railway which receives authority from the Dominion Parliament, ipso facto that railway comes under the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament and the right of the provincial legislatures to impose any obligation upon it is thereby taken away because, by the legislation of this Parliament, it is taken entirely out of the control and placed beyond the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures. That being so, I think there is every reason for placing members of the provincial legislatures in the same independent position as that in which members of this House have, by law, been placed.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Solicitor General): I was endeavouring to get the full import of the views expressed by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley). I think I succeeded to the extent of learning the principle upon which he understands the present enactment was inserted in the Railway Act, namely, that it being in the public interest that members of this House should be enabled to ascertain to the very best advantage the conditions in all parts of Canada, it was well that they should be free at all times to travel in the different parts of the country and that they should be free to do so under such legislation as would make it their right and not make it an obligation on their part to the railway companies. I do not purpose to argue it now. It might be that the logical extension of that principle would be to enable members of the provincial legislatures to travel within the borders of their provinces. But I cannot for the life of me understand how, by any extension of the principle we adopted in this House some years ago, it could be argued that that right should be extended to members of provincial legislatures to travel throughout the length and breadth of Canada. Whether, if this Act go no further than to enable members of the provincial legislatures to travel within the borders of their own province, it would then be acceptable, I would not care to say.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is as far as it does go.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It appears to me that as a general principle the shorter our steps, and the less distance we go in that direction the better. Every one knows the abuses to which these rights, or alleged rights, are always put. But, at all events, the proposal, in its present form, does not appear to be one which should be adopted in principle, if the passage of the second reading would mean adoption in principle, because it goes further in my judgment than we can justify ourselves in going.

Mr. PUGSLEY: As I read the Bill it is limited to the provinces. It says:

> and to members of the Executive Councils of the provinces of Canada, and within the provinces in which they reside, to members of the Legislative Councils and Legislative Assemblies of the provinces of Canada.

Except as to members of the Government, it is limited to the province; as to members of the Government it is broader.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not see the significance of the conjunction in that event or even that it meets the objection that could be raised to the principle. At all events, I should not care to concede or extend the right further without the fullest consideration. I would suggest that, without adopting the principle of the Bill, it be referred to the committee to which all railway amendments are now referred.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That means, as I understand, the second reading without affirming the principle?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and referred to the Committee on Railways.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I rather thought the Solicitor General meant—and I think that is what the Minister of Railways would do—to refer this to the special committee.

Mr. COCHRANE: No, to the Railway Committee of the House.

Mr. McCRANEY: I understand from the Solicitor General that it was a special com-

mittee to which he thought this Bill should be referred and not to the general Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines. I moved the motion on the understanding that all amendments are being considered now by this special committee on railway matters, and I see by the public press that the Minister of Railways is inviting suggestions by letter and otherwise. That is the committee which should consider this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion was submitted by me in plain terms to the House and announced carried, and it is therefore too late to discuss it.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT BOARD.

On the motion of Hon. W. J. Roche, that the House do tomorrow resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed Resolution:—

Resolved,—That it is expedient to establish a board, to be called "The Soldier Settlement Board," consisting of three commissioners, and to provide for salaries and expenses in connection therewith, and to empower the Minister of the Interior, at the request of the board, to reserve such Dominion lands as may be required, and upon the recommendation of the board, to grant a free entry for not more than one hundred and sixty acres of such reserved lands to any person who has served in the naval or military expeditionary forces of the United Kingdom or of any of the self-governing British Dominions or Colonies, and who has left the forces with an honourable record or who has been honourably discharged, and the widow of any such person who died on active service, subject to such conditions as in the opinion of the Governor in Council are necessary to secure the use of the land for the purposes for which it is granted; and further to provide that the board may loan, upon such terms and conditions as may be prescribed, to any such settler an amount not exceeding two thousand dollars for acquiring land for agricultural purposes, payment of encumbrances on lands used for agricultural purposes, improvement of agricultural lands, erection of farm buildings and purchase of stock, machinery and equipment, the money to be expended under the supervision of the board, and all expenditure made under the terms of this resolution to be paid out of such moneys as Parliament may appropriate for the purpose.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is distribution of the land to returned soldiers to be limited to those of Canadian origin?

Mr. ROCHE: Oh no.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It will include those from all parts of the Empire?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is unlimited?

[Mr. McCraney.]

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

Motion agreed to.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY.

The House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Rainville in the Chair

Civil Government—Department of Labour, salaries, etc., $54,137.50.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Are there any new officers in the department?

Mr. CROTHERS: There appears to be one more. The number last year was 39; this year it is 40. There are 5 instead of 4 officials in subdivision A of the third division this year. I understand that one of these positions is vacant. The amount of this vote last year was $54,012; this year it is $54,137.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Have any returned soldiers been taken into the department?

Mr. CROTHERS: One at least.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Have all employees been appointed under the Civil Service Act?

Mr. CROTHERS: I think not; we have some temporary employees.

Mr. VERVILLE: It was reported in the press some time ago that Mr. Brown, Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour had been suspended or dismissed from the department. I should like to ask the minister whether he is still in the employ of the department, and why he was suspended?

Mr. CROTHERS: The office of Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour has been abolished.

Mr. TURRIFF: On what date?

Mr. CROTHERS: Just a day or two ago.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is since Mr. Brown was abolished.

Mr. CROTHERS: Since he was suspended.

Mr. VERVILLLE: It is quite a while since I saw that report in the press.

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister took him from the office, not the office from him.

Mr. CROTHERS: The office was abolished and his services are to be discontinued from June 1.

Mr. GRAHAM: Do I understand that his services are to be discontinued from the 1st of June and that the office was abolished a couple of days ago?

Mr. CROTHERS: It is all in the same Order in Council.

Mr. GRAHAM: Will the minister tell us why this was done?

Mr. CROTHERS: I have no objection to telling you why, but in the absence of the person who is directly interested, I am reluctant to say anything concerning this matter. I do not like to speak disparagingly of one who has no opportunity of saying anything by way of explanation, or defence, or mitigation. I suppose it is so in all cases where the person concerned is not a member of this House; whatever you have to say touching a matter of this kind has to be said in his absence, and he, therefore, has no opportunity of saying anything by way of explanation. Speaking sincerely, I would prefer not to say anything about it; but my hon. friends are, of course, entitled to ask the reason and to get it.

Mr. VERVILLE: I would like to know why.

Mr. CROTHERS: The immediate cause of his suspension arose in this way: on a Saturday evening in the latter part of February he applied to the deputy minister for leave of absence for a few days. As the matter of his absence had been up at least on one occasion before, the deputy referred him to me. Mr. Brown telephoned me to say his wife was leaving the city on Monday and that he would like to have three or four days off. I said, "all right; take three or four days." Well, he took all that week and three days of the next week, and when he returned he did not say anything about it, make any explanation, apology, or anything else. I, therefore, gave him notice of suspension. The facts are that for a long time he had not been satisfactorily discharging the duties of his office. He appeared to be obsessed with a grossly exaggerated conception of the importance of a civil servant in the first division. He used to do things without saying anything about them, a thing which I think a man in his position should not have done. He used to do things that he was distinctly told not to do, and he would criticise the way in which the Department of Labour was administered.

Some hon. MEMBERS: He was justified in that.

Mr. CROTHERS: The department may not be managed properly; it may be very inefficiently administered; but it appeared to me it was no part of the duty of an assistant deputy minister to criticise the way in which the department was administered. I do not think he was competent to discharge the duties of his office; I think he was incompetent; I think he was insubordinate, and he was disloyal.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In what sense was he disloyal?

Mr. CROTHERS: In the sense that he was not loyal to the head of the department.

Mr. VERVILLE: I suppose the same thing will apply in any of the other departments, that if an employee asks leave of absence for a certain length of time, and stays away three or four or five times longer than he is permitted, he will be suspended?

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not know what action the other ministers would take in a case of that kind.

Mr. VERVILLE: I am not asking the minister to tell me whether that course of action will apply or not; but I say for the benefit of the other ministers that there are men employed in the other departments who have asked for leave of absence for a very short space of time who have travelled all through the West for four or five months.

Mr. CROTHERS: I have not had very much experience in any other department; but I have acted in a few of the other departments in the absence of the ministers, and I remember distinctly deputies coming in and apologizing for being away half a day, and giving reasons for their absence; such as sickness in the family or something of that sort, and, of course, nothing more was said about the matter. In this case, however, no effort at all was made to explain or apologize.

Mr. VERVILLE: It was not a question of apology; it was a question of whether or not he was competent to fill the position.

Mr. CROTHERS: I gave incompetency as one reason; there are several others.

Mr. TURRIFF: Apparently the reason given is that this official took two or three days longer leave of absence than he had asked for, and because on his return he did not come to the minister and apologize, the minister first suspended him and then fired him, and now the minister brings in

a further excuse that the official was not competent anyway. If the assistant deputy minister was not competent, it has taken the minister five years to find that out. He was not suspended or dismissed for incompetency; but simply because he did not apologize to the minister for being two or three days over his leave he was fired.

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not know whether my hon. friend knows better than I why he was fired. I have told the committee why his services were dispensed with. My hon. friend is probably right, that his services should have been dispensed with five years ago; I know that I spoke about it several years ago. I may add that he has not received any statutory increase of salary for three or four years because he had not, in my judgment, efficiently discharged the duties of his office.

Mr. VERVILLE: Will the minister give us a little explanation about this item of $15,000 for sundries? I am not saying it should not be inserted in the Estimates, but I would like some explanation.

Mr. CROTHERS: This item comprises three items: extra clerical and other assistance, $1,000; printing and stationery, $7,000; sundries, $7,000. This includes stationery and printing other than the Labour Gazette, travelling expenses for officers resident at Ottawa, postage, clerical assistance, clerical help, etc.

Mr. MACDONALD: Has the minister given all the reasons that prompted him to dispense with the services of Mr. Brown?

Mr. CROTHERS: I think those I gave would cover them. I have not gone into all the details.

Mr. MACDONALD: Either they do cover them, or they do not.

Mr. CROTHERS: I think they cover them.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister should tell us in what respect Mr. Brown was incompetent and also in what particular respect he was disloyal. I know nothing about Mr. Brown except that he was always regarded by the public as an efficient officer; but if a man is said by a minister of the Crown to be incompetent and disloyal, those general words ought to be particularized, and definite instances given in which the incompetency has arisen and the disloyalty become apparent. It is very easy to use those words in a general sense and they carry meanings which are very broad. Mr. Brown is a journalist; I remember when he was in the press gallery here, and while he was in the department, as far as competency is concerned, his intelligence and capacity ought to have made him competent for the office. Therefore, if the minister says he is incompetent, I ask: Wherein is he incompetent? The same applies to the question of his disloyalty. It is only fair that we should know these things.

Mr. CROTHERS: As my hon. friend from Pictou has said, when Mr. Brown was appointed to a position in the Department of Labour, he had been a newspaper reporter of some experience, but no distinction. He was appointed to the position without any examination whatever, under the provisions of section 21 of the Civil Service Amendment Act, the Civil Service Commission after profound deliberation for three months gravely certified that the duties of this office called for qualifications of a professional and technical character. As hon. gentlemen will remember, under section 21 of the Civil Service Amendment Act, a man may be appointed without any examination whatever when it is certified by the Civil Service Commission that the duties of the office call for qualifications of a professional, technical or otherwise peculiar character, and in this case such a certificate was given. If a university graduate were to apply for a position carrying a salary of $500 a year, he or she would have to pass an examination; but under this certificate, issued by the Civil Service Commission in this case, this man was appointed at a salary of $2,800 a year to advance to $4,000 by annual increments of $100. That is a little device that is sometimes adopted to foist into the service one who cannot get in by the regular route.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think the present Government knows more about that than anybody else.

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not think you will find any men of that kind in the Labour Department.

Mr. GRAHAM: I guess the other ministers are pretty bad, then.

Mr. CROTHERS: In answer to my hon. friend from Pictou, I would say that I have had many complaints both from employers and employees of the manner in which Mr. Brown discharged the duties of his office. I remember on one occasion he went down

to New York at the public expense without saying a word to me that he was going, and he did not even condescend to make any report when he came back as to the reason for his visit. I could also give instances where he has criticised the management of the department behind my back. There have been occasions when I have told him that we did not require certain things, and months afterwards I have found out that he had got them. I have on other occasions distinctly told him to do certain things which he did not do. I have no desire to go into these details, but hon. gentlemen have a right to ask for them, and I have a right to give them. It is not a pleasant thing to dismiss a man from office if he is discharging his duties fairly and efficiently, but, as I said before, Mr. Brown seemed to be obsessed by a grossly exaggerated conception of the responsibilities and importance of a civil servant in the first division.

Mr. VERVILLE: I should have thought that the Minister of Labour would have acquired a sufficient amount of knowledge in the last five years to know the kind of man he needs in the department. The minister has been speaking of technical men. I think in a department like his it would be better if there was less technicality and more common sense. I am not referring to this Government particularly, for that is what I have always said. Until you get practical men in the Department of Labour you will never make it a success.

Mr. CROTHERS: We have them there now.

Mr. VERVILLE: In inferior positions, carrying parcels and such like. That is the only kind of practical men you have in the department. The minister might say that the fair wages officers are practical men. Why, it is only two years ago that he appointed one in Winnipeg who did not know who was the head of the labour movement there; he was not a practical man. The only men who should be appointed as fair wage officers are men of practical experience who have come in contact with the different labour elements throughout the country. Surely there are men in this country with common sense enough and practical experience to fill the position that has been made vacant by Mr. Brown's dismissal. I am sorry to hear the minister say that he is going to abolish this position. With all due respect for the minister and the deputy minister, I say there is a practical side to the department that nobody seems to know anything about.

Mr. CROTHERS: Which side is that?

Mr. GRAHAM: The inside.

Mr. VERVILLE: Everything pertaining to the department. It would not be fair to expect the minister or his deputy to have all the practical knowledge that is necessary. A professional man cannot have that knowledge. But my point is that if practical labour men were appointed to high positions in the department, they would be able to render a great service to the minister and the country.

Mr. CROTHERS: When I took charge of the Labour Department, the two fair wage officers were Mr. McNiven and Mr. Dubreuil. Mr. McNiven was transferred within a few months to Vancouver. He is a man with a great deal of experience and strong common sense, and has discharged the duties of his office for the past five years with perfect satisfaction to me. Speaking from memory, I do not think I have ever had a complaint against him or his work. He has settled scores of disputes which would have ripened into serious trouble but for his presence on the ground at Vancouver. I have unbounded confidence in him. Not long after I was placed in charge of the department, I recommended that he be given an increase in salary, because I thought he was worth more than he was getting. Mr. Dubreuil was also a first class man, who looked after the Province of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces. He spoke both English and French fluently and did his work well and I increased his salary because I did not think I could get another man to do the work as well as he, and we were likely to lose him if he did not get an increase. I was very sorry, indeed, when he was taken away. The gentleman at Winnipeg that my hon. friend has referred to served us faithfully there for about three years, and did a great deal of extra work in connection with the Hudson Bay Railway, over which he went two or three times to see that the men constructing the road were being treated properly. He looked after his territory to the satisfaction of every one, and I never had a complaint against him. Unfortunately, his health failed him about a year ago, and he was obliged to resign his position. I have two or three other men who have not had as much experience as Mr. McNiven or Mr. Dubreuil, but who are discharging their duties efficiently. The only complaint I remember in connection with a fair wage officer was that a man whom I had appointed myself had

not fixed the wage schedule fairly on some public work. I sent another man to the works and he came to the conclusion that the first man had not put the wages as high as they should have been, and the schedule was changed accordingly. That is the only complaint I can remember that has been made against any fair wage officer in the last five years. My hon. friend wants us to have practical men. I think we already have practical men in the department.

Mr. VERVILLE: In the inside service?

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes.

Mr. VERVILLE: Name them.

Mr. CROTHERS: I have now in the department one of the officers who was there when I took charge.

Mr. VERVILLE: There were two.

Mr. CROTHERS: None have been dismissed. Not a single Liberal has been dismissed from my department since I was placed in charge of it. And when I took charge there was only one Liberal-Conservative in the department, and he had been appointed prior to 1896 and has since been superannuated.

An hon. MEMBER: That applies to the Inside Service?

Mr. CROTHERS: Inside Service and Outside Service. I know the matter to which the hon. gentleman refers—the correspondents of the Labour Gazette. I have explained that to the House before, but perhaps it will bear repeating. When I was placed in charge of the department I asked for a list of all employees with particulars in each case showing name, age, salary, when appointed, the duties assigned, and how those duties were being discharged. This list was made up by one of the officers of the department, one who had always been a Liberal. Out of the seventy or so correspondents of the Labour Gazette throughout the whole country from Vancouver to Halifax, there were about five or six who were reported as not discharging their duties even fairly well. I gave word to have them dismissed. I did not know whether they were Liberals or Conservatives, and I don't know yet; nor do I care. Others were appointed in their places.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The minister will pardon me, I hope, if I return to the case of Mr. Brown. I hold no brief for Mr. Brown, but I think I was responsible for his appointment when Minister of Labour, and at that time I felt, and the Government felt, that a good appointment had been made. Mr. Brown had been for several years a journalist in Ottawa, the representative in the Press Gallery of the Montreal Witness, and he had taken a very promment position with relation to the Salvation Army in Ottawa. By all the people of Ottawa he was considered a very upright gentleman and quite capable of filling any position in the Civil Service. Now, the word "disloyal" which the minister has used carries with it an imputation of meanness which I cannot believe to be attachable to Mr. Brown; he is the very opposite of a disloyal officer, in my judgment. The minister says that Mr. Brown had, perhaps, too high a conception of his position and his duties. That is quite a human failing, and perhaps Mr. Brown may have it. He may have throught that at times things were not done according to the ethics of the department. But let the minister put himself in Mr. Brown's position. If he were assistant deputy minister of the department and should differ with his minister on some matters of official duty, would he consider that a sufficient reason for the minister to dismiss him? Unless he can show that Mr. Brown was disloyal in having divulged the affairs of the department in a mean way, or in not fulfilling the duties of his office, surely he will not say that Mr. Brown should be put on the street. Mr. Brown occupied what I consider a very responsible position and was a respected member of the Civil Service. Surely, though he may have differed in opinion with the minister, or with the deputy minister, that is not a good reason for such action as the minister has taken. We are passing through a crisis which affects civil servants perhaps more than any other members of the community, and yet for petty reasons the hon. minister dismisses such a member of the Civil Service as Mr. Brown. I can assure the minister that Mr. Brown enjoys a very high reputation, and his dismissal will create in the minds of the people the belief that the minister had other reasons for this dismissal than those which he has stated this evening. I have had experience as a member of the Government, and I know that an officer may be fussy, capricious, or annoying to his fellow employees. But the man who holds the position of minister must be human and must be Christian. Surely, the fact that an officer differs with his superiors on unimportant questions is no reason for throwing that officer on the

street. I appeal to the better instincts of the hon. minister and would ask him to reconsider his decision.

Mr. CROTHERS: My hon. friend does not attach the same meaning to the word "disloyalty" that I do. In using the word I did not refer to differences of opinion on questions of the policy or action of the department. Disloyalty includes such an act as going to others with criticisms of the department, or finding fault with the minister behind his back. It was such things I had in mind when I used the word. A difference of opinion is all right. My deputy may have a suggestion to make, and we talk it over. Perhaps his suggestion is adopted, or perhaps my view is adopted, but in making such a suggestion, the deputy minister is not only not disloyal, but he is performing his duty.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I fail to understand in what this alleged disloyalty consists. Can my hon friend establish that Mr. Brown gave away the secrets of the department, or struck his minister from behind, or wrote to the press against his minister? Such things, of course, I agree would be disloyal. But even to criticise the minister in his presence——

Mr. CROTHERS: No, not in my presence.

Mr. LEMIEUX: or with his fellow officers of the department as to a certain line of policy—

Mr. CROTHERS: No, outside of the department.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The duty of a minister of the Crown is not to accept only the advice of those who are always ready to abide by his decision, but to listen also to adverse criticisms. I remember that when I was appointed Postmaster General, I warned the deputy minister to speak boldly if he should differ with me on an appointment or on the policy of the department. The minister is not omniscient; he must take the advice, and believe in the common sense and loyalty, of those who surround him; and the best protection he has is sometimes the adverse criticism he receives from his officers. When I was in the Post Office Department there were scores of employees who had been there since Confederation and who consequently were not in sympathy with the head of the department. They were the very best of officers and I never had, during the six years I was there, occasion to dismiss one of these men. I would not have dismissed one of them for differing with me. I would be only too glad to accept their criticism in good spirit and to listen to their views whether I was prepared to accept their decision or not. Really, I do not think my hon. friend is doing justice to Mr. Brown. Mr. Brown enjoys a higher reputation than that given to him this evening by my hon. friend.

Mr. CROTHERS: My hon. friend will persist in talking about a set of circumstances that do not exist. He is too clear-headed a man to misunderstand what I said. When I speak of disloyalty,—and the sense in which I use the word is the proper sense in which to use it—he gets up and proceeds to lecture me as if I had refused to discuss matters with this officer and had therefore dismissed him because he disagreed with me. That is not the question at all and I think my hon. friend knows that it is not the question. He followed me when I spoke about criticising the department behind my back and outside of the department. That is what I call disloyalty and that is one of the things for which this officer was dismissed. Yet, my hon. friend presumes to discuss the matter as if I had dismissed him because he did not agree with me on everything. That is not the point at all and I think my hon. friend knows it is not the point.

Mr. BURNHAM: If, as a man in a way representing the taxpayers of this country, I may be allowed to make an observation, it is that the criticism of the hon. member from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) would certainly be justified if one of the major officers of the department could go off to New York at the public expense, stay there as long as he pleased and come back without reporting. If that is the way the taxpayers' money of this country is to be expended, the Department of Labour had better be abolished. I cannot see any justification for such conduct.

Mr. KYTE: May I ask the Minister of Labour when he first made up his mind to abolish the office? He has intimated that he has abolished the office. I would like to know when he abolished that office.

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not believe I could tell my hon. friend the exact day or week. I do not think an assistant deputy minister is necessary or desirable in that department. There never was an assistant deputy minister until this man was appointed.

Mr. KYTE: Will the minister say it is not his intention to appoint another officer to do the work done by Mr. Brown?

Mr. CROTHERS: No, I do not say that. I may recommend some one else but he will not be under the name or style of Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour.

Mr. KYTE: So that the minister is abolishing the office for the purpose of making it easier to abolish Mr. Brown?

Mr. CROTHERS: Oh, no.

Mr. KYTE: Changing the name only. He admits that another appointment is to be made but he says that the officer will not be known as assistant deputy minister.

Mr. CROTHERS: I did not say that it would be made; I say it might be made.

Mr. KYTE: Will this new man who may be appointed have the same salary that Mr. Brown enjoyed?

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not know.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was there any investigation before the dismissal of Mr. Brown? I ask this because I happen to know Mr. Brown; he was in a very high position and surely this cannot pass unnoticed. Was there an investigation as to the facts which gave rise to his dismissal?

Mr. CROTHERS: Does my hon. friend mean an investigation by any outside party or outside source?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes.

Mr. CROTHERS: No, it was not necessary; I knew the facts myself.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: The minister talks about the facts; I would like to know what the facts are.

Mr. MACDONALD: This is war time, and economy is necessary; at all events the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) told us this afternoon that the Cabinet needed money, and as, according to the minister, an assistant deputy minister is not necessary, I suppose the minister will move to reduce the vote by the amount intended for that officer and dispense with the services of anybody for that purpose this year?

Mr. VERVILLE: I do not quite agree with the suggestion of my hon. friend. This department has not any too much money to its credit so far. If the minister is going to appoint anybody else to do some of the work in the Labour Department. I would not ask the minister to drop the provision for that man this year, but I would ask him to pick out of the 7,000,000 people in the nine provinces, and God knows how many cities, a good, competent, practical labour man, and I do not care what his politics are. Politics makes no difference at all. Let that man try to help him in carrying on the work of his department.

Mr. GRAHAM: The vote is for the assistant deputy minister. The minister may not use it for anything else; so that he might as well drop it. If it is a vote for something else he had better put it under that designation. He cannot take a vote for one officer and give it to another.

Mr. CROTHERS: We do not put it under the name of the assistant deputy minister.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not the vote before me.

Mr. CROTHERS: There is a practice that obtains in the department, and has for many years—I do not know whether it will strike hon. members as being a reasonable one or not—but it is this: If a man is promoted from one position to another, the sum of money that he received in the lower position is voted next year and may be voted for ten years one after another although the position is not filled. The vote is taken every year and if it is thought wise at any time to appoint a man to the vacancy he is appointed and the money is there to pay him. Take the $3,000 item there, for instance; that was voted for Mr. Coats, who was then editor of the Labour Gazette. He was transferred to the Department of Trade and Commerce about two and a half years ago. The vote appeared there every year. It was there last year and was there this year, but it was not used. It may be thought necessary this year to appoint a man to the position covered by this vote, to do certain work in the Department. There are several vacancies, as I have explained. If a man is promoted or dies, the vote for his former position is carried on and there is a vacancy which may not be filled for two or three years. I do not know whether it is a good practice, but I found it and it has been continued, not only in my Department but in other departments.

Mr. MACDONALD: You are not economizing at all.

Mr. CROTHERS: It does not follow that this will be expended

Mr. MACDONALD: Why put the vote in if you are not going to expend it?

Mr. CROTHERS: We may want it.

Mr. TURRIFF: The minister has explained that in his judgment the position of assistant deputy minister in the Labour Department is not necessary. Therefore it seems to me reasonable to say that the work that the assistant deputy minister is accomplishing could have been done in the department without having an assistant deputy.

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not think that follows at all.

Mr. TURRIFF: Now my hon. friend dismisses the assistant deputy and says that the position does not need to be filled and is abolished, that it is not necessary or advisable; and he proposes to put somebody in the assistant deputy minister's place, perhaps not under the same title but under another title. I suppose the assistant deputy minister was not appointed as assistant deputy, at least his name does not appear under that title, but simply as a clerk in the First Division.

Mr. CROTHERS: He was appointed as assistant deputy.

Mr. TURRIFF: Therefore my hon. friend intends to replace Mr. Brown, though not calling the new official by the same name. He dismisses Mr. Brown, he abolishes the office; then, as he says, he proposes to appoint somebody else to the position.

Mr. CROTHERS: I did not say that.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend says practically that.

Mr. CROTHERS: I said I might.

Mr. TURRIFF: We know what that means under this Government, which is not noted for its economy. We know that when my hon. friend gets that vote through and says he may appoint some one to take that position, there will be enough hangers-on looking for jobs, and especially jobs at that salary, to make it certain that before very long my hon. friend will fill that position. Is it his intention to give Mr. Brown employment in any other capacity?

Mr. CROTHERS: It is not my intention at present.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend has criticised the late Government for the appointment of Mr. Brown under section 21 of the Civil Service Act.

9 p.m.

It would take all night to discuss appointments under section 21 in the last three or four years. If he appoints another gentleman to do Mr. Brown's work, will it be under section 21 or through the Civil Service Commission direct by examination?

Mr. CROTHERS: I am not able to tell my hon. friend that. When the time comes and it is thought necessary to put an additional man in the office, I will consider all these questions. We are not in a position now to say what we will do.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend admits that he will do just what he criticises the other Government for doing, and he will not commit himself to doing anything else.

Mr. CROTHERS: My hon. friend did not catch the point of my criticism. My point was that a certificate was given to the effect that the duties of this office required professional and technical knowledge. It is perfectly right, if you want a skilled engineer, to appoint him under section 21 as a technical officer, without examination.

Mr. GRAHAM: They never would allow me to do it in the Railway Department.

Mr. CROTHERS: But why it should be said that the duties of this particular office require qualifications of a professional or technical character is beyond my comprehension.

Mr. GRAHAM: Then we may take it for granted that the minister's conclusion is that he would not appoint a new man under section 21, because, according to his interpretation of the Act, the qualifications for this office, as outlined by him, are not such as would make the person to be appointed eligible under section 21. Then it will be under the ordinary Civil Service system. I might say to the minister that he is wrong about engineers. Under the former Administration, when the Railway Department wanted an engineer I was not allowed to select a man, no matter what his technical knowledge was. We had to accept the man given to us by the Civil Service Commission after passing his examination, and the commission gave us good men; I am not objecting at all to the appointments. But the minister is wrong in thinking that the other departments by which he is surrounded—unless the Civil Service Commission has changed—are allowed to take even these technical men, unless under some very exceptional circumstances, without the ordinary Civil Service examination.

Mr. CROTHERS: My hon. friend is not familiar with section 21.

Mr. GRAHAM: Oh, yes he is, but he has not used it as much as the Minister of Labour has.

Mr. CROTHERS: I have not used it at all.

Mr. GRAHAM: I mean the Government.

Mr. CROTHERS: You cannot make an appointment under section 21 without a certificate from the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. GRAHAM: Surely; I know that.

Mr. CROTHERS: The deputy head of a department, with the approval of the head, may notify the commission that they require a civil servant with certain qualifications, and such an appointment may be made without any examination, because the section so provides. The Civil Service Commission determine whether or not the candidate has the qualifications. For instance, you ask for a graduate in a certain line, perhaps economics. The Civil Service Commission ascertain whether the applicant is a graduate of a recognized university. Then the candidate does not have to pass any examination. The matter has to go through the hands of the Civil Service Commission to that extent, but it is up to the commission to say whether the duties of the position call for qualifications of a professional and technical character.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I think I could make a fair proposition to the minister. If he can promise this committee that he will keep the place and the salary attached to it for a good returned soldier from the trenches, I think the committee will vote heartily the amount.

Mr. CROTHERS: I might say, for the information of my hon. friend, that an Order in Council was passed some time ago providing that all these positions should be filled by returned soldiers, if suitable men could be got; and I know I have followed that myself and I think all other departments are following it as closely as possible. Sometimes you cannot find a returned soldier to fill a certain position. But I have refused this last two weeks dozens of applicants for positions by telling them that an Order in Council requires that positions be filled by returned soldiers and that if we cannot find one now for any position we must leave the position open until we do find one. That is the policy of the Government under that order.

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister has read, I suppose, of a gentleman in Toronto who claims that, althought a returned soldier, he was sent to the patronage committee of the Conservative party in Toronto to get their recommendation.

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not live in Toronto.

Mr. GRAHAM: That occurred, all the same.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is it the custom of the department to fill all positions of this kind by promotion in the department? That would be a sound policy and one which the minister would find to produce efficiency in his department. Even if a returned soldier should be available, it might be that he would perhaps fit in lower down, and that promotions might be made within the department to fill positions requiring considerable training. I would think that if positions of that kind could be filled by promotion from among the men in this own department it would tend to efficiency and be an encouragement to better work within the department.

One of the criticisms of this Government has been that in several of the departments employees have not been promoted as rapidly as they should. As to the Department of Railways, almost disastrous results occurred in the province of Nova Scotia by reason of the fact that promotions were not made within the ranks of the officials of the department. I hope that the Minister of Labour will take a hint from the fact that the Minister of Railways was chastised and brought to his milk, as the saying goes, by some of the criticisms which were made in the province of Nova Scotia, and, if he has suitable men in his own department made the necessary promotion from among them.

Mr. CROTHERS: For the benefit of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, I may tell him that by several years we have anticipated his contention. In our department we have been doing the very things that he says we ought to do, that is, promoting men to higher positions as vacancies occur. Take the case of Mr. Coats, who was mentioned a moment ago. When he has transferred to the Department of Trade and Commerce, another young man in the service was put in his place to do the work he had been doing, but at a very much smaller salary.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What was the name of the officer?

Mr. CROTHERS: Mr. Stewart. Weekly or monthly we are promoting men from the

lower positions to higher ones as vacancies occur. We always do that in our department.

Mr. MORPHY: In one respect I am forced to disagree with both the minister and the hon. member for North Cape Breton. When we are thinking about the returned soldier we ought to think along lines that will be conducive to his wellfare. If a man standing next for promotion in the Civil Service was within military age, physically fit and did not go to the front for his country, it would be monstrous to promote him, no matter what the length of his service might be, and thereby refrain from giving the position to a returned soldier who had done his bit and who was fit for the job.

Mr. GRAHAM: How many correspondents are there?

Mr. CROTHERS: About 70.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is not easy to get good ones, is it?

Mr. CROTHERS: No, we do not pay enough.

Conciliation and Labour Act, including publication, printing, binding and distribution of the Labour Gazette, and allowance to correspondents, and for clerical assistance in preparing tables of statistics, $35,000.

Mr. MACDONALD: What practical steps has the minister taken to deal with the problem of the high cost of living in Canada? I am aware that an Order in Council was passed in regard to the matter, and that Mr. O'Connor has been employed in that connection, but so far I have been unable to observe that in any part of Canada the Government have taken hold of this problem with any strength or vigour or in such way as to produce results. In Australia, where they have a War Measures Act similar to ours, the Government have taken vast powers and have regulated the cost of staple products which enter into the daily life of the citizens of the country. We have had nothing of that kind here, and I think the minister ought to tell us what he has tried to do, even though he has not succeeded in doing very much, to meet the paramount necessity which exists all over Canada, particularly among the labouring people, of dealing with the exorbitant cost of all the necessaries of life.

Mr. CROTHERS: I have a report in process of preparation, which will be ready in a few days, and which will go into particulars concerning the matter to which my hon. friend directs attention. However, I do not mind telling him, in a general way, what we have done. The Order in Council, a copy of which I have not at hand, is aimed at preventing restriction of trade, exorbitant prices, combines, and so on. For instance, it makes it obligatory for one who is in possession of articles of food, clothing or fuel—the Order in Council is confined to these three classes of goods—in amounts more than ordinarily necessary for his own use or for carrying on his business, to sell these goods at a fair and reasonable price. We took up the question of coal. We sent to every known coal dealer in Canada a number of questions which were very full and very searching. He was required to say where he bought the coal in the first place, what he paid for it at point of shipment, what the freight cost him, the cost of unloading and selling, and the amount of his overhead expenses. Satisfactory sworn returns were obtained from nearly all the coal dealers in Canada. It was necessary in some cases to communicate with the firms more than once, but in the end I think we got answers to all the questions which were asked. With one or two exceptions we were satisfied that no unreasonable profits were made by the retail dealers in coal. We got statements of prices, and so on, not only from them, but from other sources as well, and were enabled to compare the two, and with the exception of one place, I do not remember that any complaints were made that the people were being overcharged for their coal. Then we took up the price of sugar. We found that an agreement existed between the manufacturers and wholesale and retail men with regard to prices.

After some correspondence, some of these men came to see us, and in many cases, if not in all of them, the practice which we thought objectionable was discontinued. I know one refinery, for instance, that controlled the sale of sugar in two provinces, and only fifty-two men in the two provinces could buy sugar from that refinery, no one being able to purchase sugar from it unless he belonged to the association or complied with the conditions necessary to become a member of the association. We took the matter up; the attorneys general of the provinces consented that a prosecution should be taken against those men, the result being that they came down from their perch and discontinued this objectionable practice. We have investigated the cold

storage business throughout the country; we have examined into the way in which collieries are conducted as to prices and all that sort of thing, and in a few days I will have ready a full report which I expect to placed upon the Table and which will set forth the details of what we have done in these various lines. Of course, the great majority of the people of this country understand the main factors in the rise of prices, although they are confidently told by those who have an object in view that there are other causes. It is probably safe to say that thirty million men, if not a good many more, have been withdrawn from productive work to engage in destructive work. It is said that those men consume at least fifty per cent more than they would if they were civilians. That gives us the equivalent of 45,000,000 men consuming foodstuffs and producing nothing, withdrawn from productive labour and engaged in destructive labour. Before the war broke out, there was just about enough food grown to cover the world's consumption; we had not to throw any surplus food into the ocean. Take 45,000,000 men from producing; set them to destroy life and property; take that, in connection with the fact that last year, with slight exceptions in certain places, crops were short the world over, and with all this destruction and waste going on lessening production, and you have the main factors causing the advance in prices. Some people tell us that the rise in prices is due to cold storage and combinations. I admit that in some cases those things have had a slight influence on prices, but the main factors are those I have stated. We are endeavouring under that Order in Council to offset so far as we can those influences that, to a slight extent, may affect prices, but on the whole the others are the main factors.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend has in the course of his few remarks admitted that, although a condition has existed, he has done nothing to remedy it.

Mr. CROTHERS: He has not admitted anything of the kind.

Mr. MACDONALD: Will my hon. friend kindly restate what he has done?

Mr. CROTHERS: I thought I made myself perfectly clear. My hon. friend was not in the House at the time, I am told.

Mr PUGSLEY: The minister appointed some committees.

Mr. MACDONALD: I was in the House.

[Mr. Crothers.]

Mr. CROTHERS: I did not think my hon. friend was here all the time.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend made an argument that because he made certain inquiries he had performed his duty.

Mr. CROTHERS: I said, if my hon. friend was here or if he was out of the House, that we had sent questionaires to all the coal dealers in Canada and that from reports which we had received under oath and from other information, we were satisfied that the coal dealers were not making any undue profits and that there were no combinations as to coal except in one or two places.

Mr. MACDONALD: I heard all that.

Mr. CROTHERS: Then why does my hon friend say that I have done nothing? We have done the same thing in regard to sugar, cold storage, etc.

Mr. MACDONALD: What my hon. friend has said means that he considers there is no duty thrown upon him or upon the Government to deal with the whole question of the food supply of this country in some drastic and imperative manner. Why did my hon. friend proceed under the War Measures Act and have an Order in Council passed giving him plenary powers, if the powers he was going to take simply consisted in the power to investigate matters by asking certain people certain questions? Does my hon. friend mean to say that this Government could not have taken, under the War Measures Act, powers of such a nature that they would be enabled to deal with problems of this kind and fix the cost of staple articles at figures within the reach of the ordinary individual? In this country we produce approximately 200,000,000 bushels of grain, whereas Canada consumes only 50,000,000 at the most. Does my hon. friend mean to say that there are no means that he or his associates in the Government could have devised by which the people of this country could have received the bread they require at some figure within reason, considering that we produce in this country four times what we consume and that we have such a huge surplus for export abroad?

Mr. BURNHAM: Free wheat will have that effect.

Mr. MACDONALD: I do not intend to pay any attention to my hon. friend who dreams about things. The situation shows that in regard to this matter the minister apparently thought his duty was ended

when he asked certain questions of certain people. He asked one sugar man as to whether he had a combination with any other brother sugar man in regard to the prices they were to charge, and he found there was a combination, but he said that it faded away. Then he said that the retail coal dealers were not asking exorbitant prices for their coal. Did it never occur to my hon. friend that it was his duty and that of his colleagues in the Government much earlier in this war to allocate to their respective duties in this country those people who were engaged in performing definite services for the country? So far as coal is concerned, my hon. friend and his colleagues permitted recruiting sergeants to proceed into all of the coal mining districts of this country and take away from those coal mines the expert operators and the men who were able to produce that necessary and essential article which enters into the household life of every one in this northern country. They allowed recruiting to go on without paying any attention to the proper distribution of labour or the necessity of utilizing for the defence of the country those people who should go to the front. My hon. friend was a member of the Government which allowed 50,000 men to go to England who ought never to have gone there because they were medically unfit to fight. whereas had the Government paid any attention to looking after the national duty that each citizen of this country should have discharged, those men could have remained in peaceful occupation and assisted in the production of those articles that are essential to the well-being of the people. When my hon. friend tells the people that he has performed his duty by asking certain questions of certain people, and stopping there, his answer is not an efficient one and will not be so regarded. My hon. friend thinks his task is all performed; that there is nothing left for him to do. That is my hon. friend's position in regard to the matter. My hon. friend had an Order in Council passed. Occasionally we see these Orders in Council that are passed; there is a regular bureau of a political nature run by this Government under which announcements are made to the country through the Conservative press, but the last institution that this Government seems to think it necessary to consult respecting the interest of this country is this Parliament. We come down here after Parliament has sat for two or three months and have to request the Government to bring down and place upon the Table important Orders in Council which they ought to bring down of their own volition. My hon. friend has thrown upon the municipalities the task of enforcing this Order in Council, which they have passed under the War Measures Act, an Act which gave the Government wider powers than have been taken by any other Government engaged in the war. Suppose my hon. friend saw fit to pass an Order in Council dealing with the question of recruiting, would not the whole country stand aghast if he left its enforcement to the municipal authorities? And yet that is what he did in regard to this question of the high cost of living, which, next to the task of winning the war, is daily becoming the most vital problem we have to solve. But my hon. friend thinks that he and his Government have performed their full duty when they have asked certain questions, and put up to a municipal body the responsibility of enforcing these provisions. I had expected that my hon. friend would tell the House that he had at least attempted to grapple with this question, but all he tells us is that he has satisfied himself that the retail coal dealers are not asking too much for coal; that the sugar combine faded away when he peered into it, and that he talked to some tannery about the cost of making leather. If my hon. friend thinks that that is doing his full duty to the people of this country under war conditions, I must tell him that he occupies a very ridiculous position before the people.

Mr. CROTHERS: I am afraid my hon. friend has never read the Order in Council. I will send him a copy of it to-morrow. My hon. friend is confusing matters. He started by accusing the Labour Department of not having done anything under this Order in Council, and he wound up by blaming the department for some recruiting that was done at the mines.

Mr. MACDONALD: I blame the whole Government for that. This question is too serious to quibble over. I pointed out that the whole trouble arose from the fact that the Government had not systematically allocated to the citizens of this country the various duties they should perform with a view to the winning of the war, that whilst it was desirable men should be recruited it was also necessary that work like coal mining should be carried on, that the Government had had no plan at all, and that hundreds of men had been allowed to go to the front who ought never to have left this country. In England, coal miners are

exempt from military service; in fact, thousands were brought back from the front to work in the mines in England. Through the lack of system on the part of this Government the price of coal has gone up, owing to the scarcity of labour to work the mines. My hon. friend and this Government should have done what the Government of England did; told the men who were supplying the fuel of the people that they were performing a national service. The Government ought to have known that when they permitted recruiting officers to go amongst these hardy and adventurous men, inducing them to enlist, they were creating a situation under which the price of coal was bound to go up and contribute to the high cost of living in this country.

Mr. CROTHERS: The remarks of my hon. friend show that he does not know what was done with regard to recruiting, either. He is talking without knowledge.

Mr. MACDONALD: That statement is absolutely untrue.

Mr. CROTHERS: It just shows that my hon. friend does not know what he is talking about. Let us confine ourselves for a moment to this Order in Council; we will come to the other matter later. My hon. friend says that we have left the enforcement of this law to the various municipalities. There is no truth in that so far as I know. I don't think he has read the Order in Council, and I will send him a copy tomorrow. When he reads it, he will see that the matter is not left to the municipalities altogether.

Mr. MACDONALD: What is left to them?

Mr. CROTHERS: It is left to them to ask such questions as the Minister of Labour might ask touching matters within their own municipality, and if they find out that anything is being done in their municipality in contravention of the law they can proceed to prosecute.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is not that leaving it to them?

Mr. CROTHERS: Would you have this Government inquiring into the cost of milk in Nanaimo, for instance, or on Vancouver Island?

Mr. KYTE: They do it in Australia.

Mr. CROTHERS: They do many things in Australia that we do not do here.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Mr. PUGSLEY: They do many things there that we ought to do here—build ships for instance.

Mr. CROTHERS: My hon. friend talks a great deal about shipbuilding and Australia is often mentioned. I do not want to say anything derogatory of Australia, but just take this point. It is said that Australia manages labour unions and strikes a great deal better than we do in Canada. Well last year, with their population of 5,000,000 they had 300 strikes, and with our population of 8,000,000 we had only 75, so Australia has got ahead of us in that regard. The government thought it right to empower the municipalities to inquire into conditions in their own municipality, and if the questions asked are not answered according to the Order in Council the municipal authorities may proceed against a delinquent, with the consent of the attorney general of the province. My hon. friend must remember that the Labour Department has to do not only with conditions in one municipality but with matters that effect the country as a whole.

Mr. MACDONALD: What have you done?

Mr. CROTHERS: Does my hon. friend want me to tell him three or four times?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think the Minister could more easily tell us what he has not done.

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes, because it is so little. What have we done in regard to sugar and coal? We have sent out questionaires to all the coal dealers in Canada and have received replies under oath, and have checked them up to see whether they were correct.

Mr. KYTE: Has that reduced the cost of these commodities?

Mr. CROTHERS: I am told that it has, in some places. The prices are not so high here as elsewhere. We have also sent out questionaires to the sugar dealers all over the country, and have received replies under oath. Some of them were not satisfactory, and we repeated our questions. We have also investigated the question of bread.

Mr. MACDONALD: You did not say that before.

Mr. CROTHERS: I mention it now, as bread is very important. As I was saying, the Order in Council provides that no prosecution shall be held without the consent of the attorney general of the province.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why do you put that in?

Mr. CROTHERS: For the same reason that you put it in the Lord's Day Act.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What was the reason?

Mr. CROTHERS: When you were passing the Lord's Day Act you left it to the discretion of the attorney general of the province whether there should be any prosecution. We thought that principle a very good one, and applied it in this case.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In order to prevent prosecutions.

Mr. CROTHERS: If the replies to the questions indicate that there has been a contravention of the law, we send the evidence to the attorney general of the province, pointing out that we think there has been a contravention of the Order in Council, and it is then up to him to prosecute if he thinks fit.

Mr. MACDONALD: Does my hon. friend think that in passing an Order in Council under the War Measures Act, one of the most plenary Acts ever put on the Statute Book, the Government has fulfilled its duty when it turns over the responsibility of enforcing the law to the provincial and municipal authorities?

Mr. CROTHERS: My hon. friend is wandering again. If my hon. friend thinks that anything wrong has been done under this Order in Council, it is his privilege and right to criticise it in this House, but it is not proper for him to say to me, in discussing this Order in Council, that I should have seen that no recruiting was allowed at a certain mine. That has nothing to do with this Order in Council. But I may tell my hon. friend for his information—for he does not appear to know it—that long, long ago instructions were given to the recruiting officers not to recruit men in these mines, on the ground that these men were needed for carrying on mining. And the recruiting ceased. So, it will be seen, we have anticipated some of these things.

Mr. KYTE: How long ago?

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not remember.

Mr. MACDONALD: Now that my hon. friend has delivered himself of his wonderful knowledge, I desire to pay a tribute of admiration to the gigantic brain that has been working so ponderously on this question of the cost of living. The hon. gentleman said I was incorrect in saying that he had cast the responsibility of this matter upon the municipalities, and then he went on to prove very completely that what I had said was true. He told us the powers given to the municipalities, and declared his opinion that the Government had fulfilled its duty by declaring that the responsibility of carrying out this order under the War Measures Act should rest upon the Attorneys General of the provinces. If that is the way this Government has taken of exercising the powers given it by this Parliament under the War Measures Act at the inception of the war, it is time this Parliament reviewed the War Measures Act and the provisions made under it. As to the constitutional point involved in this reference to the municipalities, there is not a man sitting behind the hon. minister who is acquainted with legal or constitutional matters who will say that this Government is justified under the provisions of the War Measures Act in getting rid of its responsibility for the enforcement of any part of this law by attempting to throw that responsibility upon some other body. As to this question of recruiting coal miners, the hon. minister's knowledge is singularly limited. He has told us that in November last orders were given that there should be no more recruiting in the coal mines. That is to say, two years and three months after the war began, for the first time the Government interfered—

Mr. CROTHERS: No, long before that.

Mr. MACDONALD: Let me tell the hon. gentleman for his information—and I come from a coal-mining country and know whereof I speak—that the recruiting officers of this Government have been active right along, and are active at this moment, in the coal mines of Nova Scotia, recruiting men for the war. Shall we say that they are ignoring the instructions that were given them? That is only another way of saying that the Government have never dealt practically with the question of arranging to have proper National Service, for the organizing of bodies of men to work as well as bodies of men to fight. The responsibility for the increased cost of living, which is already severely felt by the people of this country, will be placed upon the shoulders of the hon. minister and his associates because of their absolute failure to deal with the question.

Mr. BURNHAM: One statement was made by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), which, as it appears in cold type, will look very badly and will give a

wrong impression. He said that fifty thousand men had been sent overseas who were returned and should never have been sent.

Mr. MACDONALD: I said that according to the evidence submitted to members of this House, fifty thousand men, medically unfit, had been recruited and sent across.

Mr. BURNHAM: That gives a wrong impression. The hon. gentleman must know that the Army Act and the K.R. & O. allow men to misstate their ages. A man, on his attestation, may make a solemn declaration that he is forty-four years of age, when in fact he is fifty-four, without incurring any penalty. A great many men, in mistaken zeal, thought they could get away with that, and stated that they were forty-four, and so came within the required age, and so got across. But when they were pressed for an accurate statement, they had to admit that they were of a greater age, and so they had to be returned to this country. This accounts for a large number of the fifty thousand. And they were admitted by reason of a flaw in the Army Act, and no power in the world, no minister of any nation could possibly have prevented it, because it is in all of the Army Acts. And why it is there, I do not know. Now, a word as to another point suggested by the hon. member. The Minister of Labour has been reproached with having allowed food prices to go up without taking proper steps to prevent it. The hon. gentleman is one of those who have been pressing for free wheat on the ground that this change would send up the prices. At one moment the hon. gentleman is for limiting the prices that have gone up, and at another he is for taking steps to cause prices to go up. Which is it to be? We do not wish to go to the people with two horns of the dilemma—one is surely bad enough. Let us know which it is to be.

Mr. KYTE: I am sure that those who read the statements of the Minister of Labour here to-night will be disappointed to find that, when he was requested to give full explanation of the results of the operations of his department with regard to the cost of living, no results were forthcoming. He did state that questions were sent out as to the cost of certain commodities, but he was unable to point out that his activity resulted in reducing the cost of living by one iota. We had a complaint in Montreal a few months ago because potatoes were selling in that city at $3.50 a bag. The Minister of Labour made some inquiry and ascertained that, whereas the dealers in Montreal alleged that there was a great shortage of potatoes in Canada and that this was the reason why prices had gone up, the fact was that, over and above all the requirements for consumption and for seed for the forthcoming season, there was a surplus of two million bushels of potatoes in the Dominion. But the hon. minister did nothing, and potatoes are selling at $3.50 a bag, if not $4.00, in Montreal at this time. As to the price of flour, the hon. gentleman stated that the result of his inquiry was to show that no undue profits were being charged by those engaged in the production of this article.

Mr. CROTHERS: I did not say that.

Mr. KYTE: The hon. gentleman was speaking generally of articles of consumption, and stated that there was no evidence of undue profits being paid.

Mr. CROTHERS: No.

Mr. KYTE: Does the hon. gentleman think that when milling companies which were content to earn six or seven per cent before the war are now dividing profits among their shareholders at the rate of twenty-four per cent, that is not an undue profit for war times? The minister stated also that the high cost of these articles of food was due to the large number of men who were taken from the ranks of the producers and became consumers. But how is that to be reconciled with the statement made in the press the other day, that, as to the wheat in this country, over and above all that was needed for consumption and as seed for the coming season, there was not less than 116,000,000 bushels in the Dominion at this time? Besides that, the wheat now held by the millers, and for the flour produced from which they are charging enormous prices, was purchased by them from the farmers at from $1.20 to $1.40 a bushel? The farmers received no benefit, the speculators got it all, and they have been dividing enormous profits at the very time when the minister tells us that no undue prices were being charged. Read the trade journals from day to day and you will find that companies engaged in the manufacture of food products are dividing among their shareholders much larger profits than those they made before the war. Companies that were content with five, six, or seven per cent before the war,

are almost invariably paying dividends of from fifteen to thirty per cent. Yet the Minister of Labour says there is no undue profit enjoyed by those engaged in the production of these particular commodities. How is the consumer affected? To-day flour is quoted at $12.70 by the car load. The hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) had something to say about putting wheat on the free list. At the time that the agitation for putting wheat on the free list was most acute the farmer might very well have looked for increased prices for the wheat which he had raised and it was a time when the consumer could afford to pay a little more for his supply. But they dawdled along for five years, until the price of flour got beyond the reach of the average consumer in Canada, and then they took the duty off to enable the speculator to create a panic and put $1.20 on the price of flour. That is the result of the hon. gentleman's activity on behalf of the consumer. There is not a commodity that enters into general consumption that has not been enhanced beyond all proportion to the exigencies of the times unless you take into account the greed of those engaged in the manufacture of these products. The minister had an opportunity to-night to state wherein his activities had resulted in reducing the cost of living with regard to one commodity to the consumers of this country, but he has failed to do so. He has said that these commodities are dearer elsewhere than here. It is quite true that in Germany, and in Berlin they are, but with that exception food prices in Canada are dearer than they are in any part of the civilized world.

Mr. CROTHERS: The prices in Canada have gone up less rapidly than in any other belligerent country in the world, with the single exception of New Zealand.

Mr. KYTE: Australia?

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes, Australia. They are about the same in New Zealand as in Canada. Prices have gone up less rapidly than in any other belligerent country, New Zealand only excepted, and they are about the same as in Canada. My hon. friend has grown very eloquent over prices and found fault with my department for not keeping down the prices of everything. I remember him making a very eloquent speech not very long ago, but when he got down to facts there did not seem to be very much in it. We have endeavoured to carry out our part in enforcing that Order in Council. The right was given to the municipalities to investigate within their own limits and to enforce the Order in Council. We thought it better to leave it to the attorney generals of the different provinces rather than to undertake to prosecute ourselves, just as hon. gentlemen did when they were in power in regard to the Lord's Day Act. Another instance was when they passed the Alien Labour Act. They started in by attempting to enforce it from Ottawa. They had not gone very far before they got tired of it, and they amended the Act so that they would not have to enforce it. They never attempted to enforce it afterwards, and I can fairly say that we never attempted to do so either. We left it to those who felt that they were aggrieved, just as in this instance we leave it to those municipalities who feel that they are aggrieved.

Mr. VERVILLE: Who asked for the change in the Alien Labour Act?

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not know; I was not in the House at the time. As a matter of fact, it was changed and no attempt was made by the late Government to enforce it. I am not blaming them for that but I am giving that as another illustration of why this Government had kept away from enforcing a statute passed by this Parliament. It is the duty of the province to enforce the criminal law, or quasi criminal law, and this Government does not undertake to enforce any Act, of this character, speaking generally although there are one or two exceptions. That is what we have done with regard to that Order in Council. No prosecution may be had under it without the consent of the attorney general of the province in which it is said the offence is committed. We believe that the attorney general of the province is in the best position to say whether a prosecution should be instituted or not. If the facts do not warrant a prosecution he does not order one. But, we have carried out the law. We have sent out these questions and wherever doubt arose we have sent out a man to examine witnesses under oath and have compelled people to show us their books; we have investigated cold storage and all that sort of thing. We are preparing a full and detailed statement of what we have done and the results and these reports respecting coal, sugar, bread, and cold storage——

An hon. MEMBER: Anthracite coal?

Mr. CROTHERS: The report as to anthracite coal will be laid on the table a few days and every hon. member will

have an opportunity of reading the reports in detail.

Mr. KYTE: How very consoling it will be to the consumers to know that the Minister of Labour is preparing a report as to the inquiries he had made. It will satisfy them, no doubt, for the increased cost of leaving. The Minister of Labour stated that the cost of food products is less in Canada than in any other belligerent country with the exception of New Zealand.

Mr. CROTHERS: No, I said the price had gone up less rapidly in Canada than in any other country.

Mr. KYTE: I take issue with the minister. I cite the case of Australia, while in January flour was selling at $5.80 in Australia, it was $9.50 in Montreal; butter was selling on the 15th of January in Australia at 28 cents a pound and in the city of Montreal at 40 cents and the same applies to eggs, bacon and all other commodities that enter into the daily consumption of the home. I would suggest to the Minister of Labour to inform himself a little more on these particular subjects before he undertakes to discuss them here.

Mr. CROTHERS: I would like to say to the hon. gentleman that his giving to us the prices of these things in Australia does not prove or disprove what I said. That is not the question; the question is the advance since the war. If the hon. gentleman takes prices at the commencement of the war and compares them with what they are now he will see how rapidly they have gone up. I did not say that prices here were as low as in any other country. What I said was that prices had not gone up as rapidly in Canada as in any other belligerent country with the exception of New Zealand.

Mr. KYTE: Which shows that the minister does not face the question but is quibbling in order to get around it. We are discussing the question of the cost of these commodities. Compare the cost of commodities in this country with prices in England. I suppose the Minister of Labour gets some consolation from the circumstance that the cost of these commodities is greater in England than in Canada. But we overlook the fact that England is an importing country whereas Canada is an exporting country and the cost of these commodities imported into England depends entirely on the uncertainty of transportation conditions.

[Mr. Crothers.]

Mr. CROTHERS: What about prices in the United States? My hon. friend and others are claiming the right to send stuff over there because prices there are higher than here, and they have not had any war there.

Mr. KYTE: The United States up to a few weeks ago was not a belligerent country. The United States was making more money out of the war than any other country. They did not know what to do with the money they were making, therefore they were not as much concerned about the cost of living as about the money they were making. The Government of that country were under no patriotic duty at that particular time to see that the cost of living was not unduly enhanced. But the moment war was declared by the United States they took the matter up and they have done more after three weeks to prevent the rise of the price of food products in the United States than this Government has done in three years.

Mr. CROTHERS: What has been the result?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I wish to say a word on this subject of ships. The Minister of Labour is rather disposed to ridicule any suggestion with regard to this Government improving the means of transportation. Some gentlemen rather intimate that the reason for the farmers of the West desiring to secure a market for wheat in the United States is that they wish to be able to get increased prices. I do not think that that at all follows as the reason. If a farmer has a larger and wider market, a market to which he can continually send all that he produces, he may well be content to receive the same price which he has been receiving for the smaller product at home. If the farmer can find a market for ten thousand bushels of grain he may make more money at the same price than he would make if he was selling only some five thousand bushels. This larger market will induce the farmers of the West, and indeed of the East as well, to increase their production, because they know that they will always have a steady market for what they produce. I know that if we in New Brunswick had free access to the American market for our potatoes, which this Government can secure at once by placing on the statute-book a law admitting potatoes

from the United States into Canada free of duty, the result would be that farmers would double and treble and quadruple their production in the province of New Brunswick because when potatoes are worth $3 or $4 per barrel in the United States the price in New Brunswick is less than that by the amount of the American duty.

Mr. CROTHERS: How much a barrel were they this winter?

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend knows they are getting a high price.

Mr. CROTHERS: How much? $8.50 a barrel.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But that has not always been so. Two years ago the farmers were glad to sell potatoes in New Brunswick at 40 cents a bushel. But if they had a larger market they would be in the same position as the producer of wheat with a larger market. It would encourage increased production and add enormously to the prosperity of the farmers, even although the price of the product should not be materially increased.

With regard to ships, I say that this Government, so far as the question of transportation is concerned, have absolutely fallen down in the discharge of their duty. This war has been in progress since August, 1914, well on to three years. Surely this Government ought to have recognized that the result of the great European war would be a greater demand for vessels. They ought to have realized that there would be the submarine warfare, that the shipping of Great Britain and her Allies would be imperilled and that there would so be a greater demand for new shipping. In Canada we have magnificent opportunities for shipbuilding. I remember, when I was a comparatively young man, when in the province of New Brunswick there were dozens of shipyards turning out magnificent wooden ships which sailed upon every sea and carried the fame and reputation of our province to all parts of the world. There are splendid opportunities for shipbuilding. But this Government took no steps to encourage the building of ships. Over and over again I and other members of this House have appealed to the Government to do something, to give bonuses, or to themselves engage in shipbuilding, for the people of this country.

10 p.m.

Mr. LALOR: Did your Government do anything for shipbuilding along these lines?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Fortunately our Government did not hold the reins of power during a great European war. The conditions have changed materally, and I say that any men managing the affairs of this country with reasonable foresight must have known that there would happen the very thing that has happened to-day, when the British Government is begging for ships. Has my hon. friend read the report of the interview with Mr. Balfour only a few days ago in which he implored the Government of the United States to send all the ships they could, wooden vessels, cruisers, destroyers, even tug boats, to put them in the service of the Empire and their Allies in order to try and overcome the German submarine menace? What did the United States do? Within a week after the declaration of war the United States gave an order for one thousand wooden vessels, appropriating $50,000,000 for the purpose of providing one thousand wooden ships to be built upon both the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts for the service of the Allies in this war. In the face of this splendid work on the part of the United States, this Government stands in a deplorable condition. Canada has done absolutely nothing. Was it because this Government in 1913 was informed by Mr. Winston Churchill that to build ships of any size you must have a firm foundation on which to lay the keels, and that it would be a very difficult task for Canada to engage in the building of large ships? Or was it because in 1911 the Nationalist allies of this Government in the province of Quebec declared that they would oppose to the last the building of a Canadian navy? Was that the reason of it? Is that the reason why this Government has taken from that time to this no step of any kind or description for the establishment of ship yards in Canada and the building of ships? We want ships to carry the products of Canada across the ocean to serve the Allies in this hour of tremendous need, because the products on this side of the ocean are required perhaps more than anything else. It is the danger of starvation which is facing Italy and France, and to a certain extent England, which is awakening the strongest feeling of apprehension on the part of the Allied Governments. And that is why they rejoice so greatly that the United States has come into this war, because she will be able to furnish ships, she will be able to give increased means of transportation, and in that way to do enormous service to the Allies. This

Government, as I have said, has done nothing. We implored them even to place engines, these Diesel oil engines, which would be useful for auxiliary power in the case of wooden vessels, upon the free list. Session after session members on this side of the House have appealed to the Government to do this. The Government waited upwards of two and a half years before doing it. At last they did it and gave some little measure of encouragement to shipbuilding in that respect. But that is all they have done. It is true that they point with some degree of pride to the fact that ships are being built in Canada for the British and other Governments. Where are they being built? Some of them at the Vickers-Maxim Works in Montreal. Is this Government entitled to any credit for the establishment of these works? No, Sir, none whatever. They were established under the Liberal Government in the year 1908. Is the Government entitled to any credit for the ships that are being built at the yards of the Port Arthur Dry Dock and Shipbuilding Company on the northwestern coast of lake Superior near Port Arthur? Not at all; these works were established before the present Government came into power. So with the shipbuilding works at Toronto; so with the Collingwood Shipbuilding plant and with most of the plants which are in operation to-day in Canada. This Government has, I say to its discredit, done absolutely nothing for the purpose of building up a shipbuilding industry in this country.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Was it not prior to 1896 that the Act was passed which granted subsidies to dry docks and under which the Collingwood dock was placed on a footing to do business?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think not.

Mr. BENNETT: That Act was in force prior to 1896; anybody could have taken advantage of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But the Act was amended. Under the Act as originally passed no dry docks at all—at all events, not more than one two—were built. When the Liberal Government came into power they amended the Dry Dock Act, and I think that if my hon. friend will look into the statutes and look up the date when the dry dock at Collingwood was built, he will find that it was under the amended Act which was passed after the Liberal Government came into power. I want to call attention to the fact that this Government, so far from doing anything to encourage shipbuilding and Canadian transportation, actually permitted the British Government to commandeer a number of large vessels which were engaged in the transport of coal between the mines in Nova Scotia and the city of Montreal. This greatly hampered the business of the coal companies, and allowed a very important step to be taken towards increasing the cost of coal in the city of Montreal. With regard to our coast trade, our shipping has decreased most materially. It is an extraordinary fact that the cost of bringing coal by water from the coal mines of Pennsylvania is to-day 100 per cent greater than the cost of bringing coal by rail from Pennsylvania to the cities of Montreal and Ottawa. This surprising fact resulted, as I have said, from the great scarcity of shipping. At the very commencement of this war the Government ought to have anticipated the coming scarcity of shipping and to have taken steps to encourage shipbuilding in Canada. We had hoped that a great shipbuilding yard would have been established in the Maritime Provinces, because when the late Government went out of office there was in the Department of Marine and Fisheries a tender from one of the greatest shipbuilding firms in the world for the building of cruisers and destroyers. If that tender had been accepted, long before this the contract would have been completed and the company engaged in building commercial vessels, probably employing 5,000 or 6,000 men. When this Government came into office, however, they cancelled that contract and returned the amount of deposit, and from that day to this nothing whatever has been done in the way of establishing a shipbuilding plant. Go to the ports upon the Atlantic coast; go to the ports upon the St. Lawrence; go to the Great Lakes or west to British Columbia, and you will be able to find hardly anything of a practical character that has been done by this Government to encourage shipbuilding. The Minister of Finance made the statement to-day that the Imperial Munitions Board are thinking of engaging in the manufacture of wooden ships in Canada and that he, on behalf of the Government has made an offer to lend to the Imperial Munitions Board the sum of $10,000,000. I assume that that amount will carry interest, and that the rate will be at least as high as the rate the United States is going to charge the Allies, 3½ per cent. But, Sir, that does not fill the Bill. These ships will be under the control of the British Government; they will be used for transportation in the in-

terests of the British Government. That will not at all improve the conditions affecting the inland coastal transportation of Canada, water transportation between one part of Canada and another the point of production and the point of consumption. It will not in any way relieve the difficult situation in which we find ourselves to-day. I agree with what the member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) has said, that the Minister of Labour has given no satisfactory explanation as to the high cost of living. It is not enough for this Government simply to say they have appointed commissions. It is true that some three years ago they appointed a commission which investigated the high cost of living, which commission found, I believe, that if the people of Canada would eat more fish and potatoes and less meat and flour, they would be able to get along more cheaply—a most valuable report, I suppose, in the opinion of the Minister of Labour. Afterwards it was announced by the newspapers that a committee of the Government, of which the hon. Robert Rogers was the head, had been appointed to take up this question immediately and arrive at a solution. A deputation waited upon him and he gave them the greatest possible encouragement as to what this active sub-committee was to do with a view to reducing the cost of living. Well, we have had no report as to what they have accomplished but we know what they said they could accomplish. It remains for the Minister of Labour to say to-night that he has sent out hundreds of questions to the people engaged in the coal business and in the sugar business, and that if he finds that the answers which he has received show an unsatisfactory state of affairs, he will forward them to the municipal authorities and expect them to take action.

Mr. CROTHERS: No, to the Attorney-General of the province.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend has taken a splendid means of shirking the responsibility which rests upon this Government.

Mr. CROTHERS: Just as you did on the Sunday question.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is a terrible confession for my hon. friend to make. He implies that the late Government, in regard to the Sunday question, referred the matter to the Attorney General of each of the provinces, and he says that this Government did the same thing in the case of the high cost of living and for the same reason. In other words, he wants us to understand that it was done in order to shirk responsibility.

Mr. CROTHERS: I was reminding you of what you did, that is all.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If my hon. friend is satisfied with that explanation, of course, I have nothing further to say. It does seem to one that this Government ought to have grappled with this question long ago. The British Government is commandeering every flour mill in Great Britain for the purpose of controlling the cost of flour. Why did not this Government adopt a similar course in Canada? The cost of flour regulates very largely the cost of other food products. Why did they not take charge of the mills of Canada when they saw that millions upon millions of dollars worth of stock, absolutely watered, not representing a single dollar of investment on the part of the capitalists, was earning 10, 15 and 20 per cent, the money coming out of the pockets of the Canadian consumer? Why did the Government not intervene and take charge of the flour mills, thus keeping down the price of flour and the cost of bread? When they saw that the cost of transporting coal between the mines of Nova Scotia and the cities upon the St. Lawrence was increasing because of the scarcity of shipping, why did they not take steps early in this war to acquire ships for the purpose of transporting coal from the mines to the places of consumption, in order to make the price of coal as low as possible to the thousands of poor people who were compelled to use it? When they saw, as they ought to have seen two years ago, that the cost of transportation between the anthracite mines of Pennsylvania and the ports of the Maritime Provinces was increasing so as to cause great hardship to the people, why did they not take some steps to engage in the building of ships and go into the transportation business in order to keep down the cost of fuel? My hon. friend must not treat the matter lightly; and while he may agree with the Minister of Finance that there is a condition of prosperity in this country, in the part of the Dominion from which I come there are thousands of people with a limited and a fixed income who are placed in a deplorable condition by reason of the high cost of flour, butter, meat, eggs, poultry and fuel. People who were ordinarily in comfortable circumstances are placed almost

in a condition of distress. The matter is not one to be dealt with lightly and it is one which reflects upon this Government that while this condition of affairs exists, and while there are thousands of people in this country who are growing poorer and poorer as a result of this war, the Government does nothing. Do I say the Government does nothing? Not exactly that—it does nothing but appoint commissions and have its members interviewed by the news papers, telling the people what the Government is doing in order to ascertain whether or not the cost of living is too great. Let me, even now, implore the Government to take effective measures, to take control of the flour mills of the country, to take control of the transportation business of the country.

Mr. CROTHERS: Would it do for us to fix the price of wheat to the farmers?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have no objection to that whatever.

Mr MEDERIC MARTIN: There is no necessity for that in Montreal or in the other cities of Canada. If you do that you will enrich the farmer to the detriment of the rest of the people. You are looking for votes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think there would be no objection for the Government to take control of the price of wheat provided they do as Lloyd George's Government has done, namely, guarantee to the farmers a minimum price for their wheat because thereby the production would be increased. But what is the use to-day of the western farmer increasing his production when up to a few days ago when this Order in Council was passed granting free wheat, the farmer has not been able to get his produce out to market, because it is a fact that to-day every elevator in the Canadian West is filled with grain? It is an open secret that millions of bushels are still in the hands of the farmers as they are not able to get their grain to market. I was told the other day of a man who had ten thousand bushels of grain in one of the districts of western Canada which he is not able to dispose of because he cannot get cars to take it to the market, and that is the case with thousands of farmers in the West.

Mr. CROTHERS: Would my hon. friend suggest that we should fix the price of potatoes for the farmers of New Brunswick?

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have no objection whatever.

Mr. CROTHERS: We want the farmers of New Brunswick to hear that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Let the Government do exactly what the British Government has done, namely, fix the price of potatoes for a term of years, having reference to the cost of production. If that is done, the patriotic farmers of New Brunswick will be heart and soul with the Government and a reduction will be affected in the cost of living. Reference has been made to Australia. Let us consider for a moment how differently the Australian Government deals with the farmer from the way in which this Government does. The Australian Government realises that the farmer cannot raise produce without fertilizer or without machinery. I do not know as to the tariff on machinery in Australia, but I am told that it is very much lower than in this country. On the Government railroads in Australia fertilizer is carried absolutely free for the farmers in order that they may get it as cheaply as possible, whereas in this country the farmers have to pay the highest possible price for their fertilizer. Let us take the case of farm tractors, with one of which a farmer can plough in a day as many acres as he can with a large number of horses and men, and at very much less expense. As was well shown to-day by my hon. friend from West Kent (Mr. McCoig), this Government is charging 27½ per cent duty on the value of farm tractors, and yet the farmer is asked to increase production, and the Government is asking the people to believe that it is giving encouragement to the farmers. There is a duty upon fertilizer, and when it was proposed to impose this increased duty of 7½ per cent as a war tax, it took all the pressure which it was possible for members on this side of the House, assisted by agricultural societies throughout the country, to bring to bear upon this Government in order to get it to do away with the tax which it was proposing to put upon fertilizers. Has the Government done anything to give to the farmers of Canada fertilizer at a low price? Was the Government not aware that to-day not a pound of potash could be bought in the whole Dominion of Canada, although it is a fertilizer which is most essential to the farmers and the lack of which makes it necessary for him to secure some other kind of fertilizer in regard to which he ought to have Government assistance?

Mr. EDWARDS: Where did the farmers formerly get that potash from?

Mr. PUGSLEY: From Germany, but there are other fertilizers which should be secured.

Mr. LALOR: Is this Government to blame for the German potash not coming here?

Mr. PUGSLEY: This Government is to blame for not getting other fertilizer into this country to take its place.

Mr. STEELE: Does my hon. friend say that there is no potash purchaseable in Canada?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Practically none.

Mr. STEELE: I think I can give him the names of firms that can supply all the potash he wants.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If he will send it down to New Brunswick he will find a market at a good price for every pound of it. Contrast the conduct of this Government with regard to farm tractors with the conduct of the British Government. The British Government wants to increase production just as this Government professes to do. The British Government, however, is in earnest. It is a working Government. Within the last two months the British Government has given an order to American manufacturers for two thousand tractors to be sent to England for the purpose of assisting the farmers in increasing production. This Government, instead of doing that, says to-day, through the Minister of Finance, the farmer is doing mighty well in this country, and here is a chance to take 27½ per cent out of their pockets, and while we cry with one voice: produce, produce, produce, with another voice we say: put your hands in your pockets if you want the farm tractors and pay into the treasury of this country all we demand for the purpose of revenue. Let me ask the Minister of Labour really to do something; let me ask his colleagues really to do something. We have in this Government the most splendid set of talkers that one could gather together. They go to New York and with their eloquence thrill the audiences which gather to meet them. We next hear of them at Boston, where they thrill the people with a beautiful story of Canada, its splendid present and its glorious future, and they hold a high reputation for oratory in that city. They are the greatest aggregation of talkers that one could gather together, but I doubt if one could scrape together a bunch of gentlemen with less desire than the present Government for real solid productive work.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What strikes me in connection with this Order in Council is the roundabout method of prosecution. I do not wish to deal with this matter as a party question, because the constituents of hon. gentlemen opposite as well as of hon. gentlemen on this side are both confronted with the high cost of living. I think it was Charles Dickens who exposed the circumlocution office in London some years ago, but to my mind the circumlocution office is not to be compared with the Department of Labour in its methods of prosecutions under this Act. I read a description of the method in a speech by the Hon. Mr. Lucas in the Legislature of Ontario some time ago. One of the members had asked him how offenders would be proceeded against and, if I remember correctly, this was the method: If a citizen of my constituency wishes to complain about the price he has to pay for flour, sugar, or any other commodity, he complains to the municipal council of his county, and here I might say that the municipal council in my county meets only twice a year, and their next meeting will not be till January, 1918.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Is that place on the map?

Mr. SINCLAIR: So if a citizen in my county wishes to complain he will have to wait till early next year. The complaint comes up before the municipal council, and they appoint a commission to investigate; evidence is taken, and they have a case, we will suppose. But they cannot prosecute; my hon. friend from Pictou was mistaken about that; they have no power to prosecute under these regulations. What they do is to refer the matter back to the Minister of Labour. Then he looks at the papers that have been sent on from the municipal council, and makes up his mind whether the case shall go any further. If he thinks he has a good case he appoints another commission to go over the very same matter, call the very same witnesses, and hear the very same evidence. When the commission make out their report to the minister, even then he does not prosecute, but turns the matter over to the Attorney General of the province in which the offence took place, and the Attorney General decides whether there shall be a prosecution or

not. That is the roundabout method the minister has adopted. Suppose that any other of the laws of this country were attempted to be enforced in that way! Would not every one think it ridiculous? If a man were guilty of smuggling, for instance, and some person had to complain to the municipal council in the first place, and then six months afterwards the council investigate and send on the papers to the Minister of Labour; the Minister of Labour investigates, and turns the case over to the Attorney General of the province in which the offence was committed. Would not every body laugh if such a method were adopted in this Dominion in regard to smuggling? And is the high cost of living any less important to the people of this Dominion than the law relating to smuggling? I cannot help thinking—it strikes me most forcibly—that the Minister of Labour is not sincere. If he had been he would never have adopted such a roundabout method of prosecuting. I should like him to explain to the House why he did not pass a regulation empowering himself to take proceedings against an offender, instead of having the matter dealt with in such a roundabout way.

Mr. CROTHERS: It is clear that the hon. member for Guysborough has not read this Order in Council. There is no necessity for such a circuitous method as he has described. The municipality, or the member for Guysborough himself, may, with the consent of the Attorney general of the province, prosecute any body without any reference to the Minister of Labour whatever, and the fact that he can do that, taken in conjunction with the speech we have just heard, shows that the hon. member for Guysborough has not read the Order in Council at all. I must also send him a copy to-morrow.

Mr. MACDONALD: What was the trouble that my hon. friend the Mayor of Montreal had in regard to prosecutions?

Mr. CROTHERS: The Mayor of Montreal is quite able to speak for himself.

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN: Of course he is. I hope my hon. friend will not mind my speaking in French.

(Continuing in French) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, the newspapers reported yesterday an interview given lately by the honourable the Minister of Labour, stating that the Mayor of the city of Montreal had not done his duty by the citizens of that city.

The increase in the cost of living is not a question of recent date; yet the minister has been pleased to do what he has always done since he has the honour of sitting on the Treasury benches: he springs up at the last minute and tries to get the people of this country to believe that he is ever intent on securing their welfare. But we know otherwise, as I shall endeavour to prove.

First the coal question. Some time last March, I received a telegram from the minister, about eleven o'clock at night, and the next day I got in touch with the Board of Control to have an investigation made into the causes of the increase in the price of that commodity. The next day, I gave instructions to the superintendent of Municipal Charities to go around—the coalyards in the city and secure prices. It was found that the abnormal rise in the price of coal was not due to the retailers, but was a result of the importers or wholesale dealers, refusing to supply the retailers unless the latter agreed to let them fix the price beforehand.

Regarding the high cost of living, the matter had been foreseen by us last fall. The Montreal Board of Control and Council had passed resolutions requesting the Government to lay an embargo on some necessaries of life, and it should have been done for instance on potatoes, wheat, flour and some other farm produce, as was just now pointed out by the hon. member for St. John, N. B. (Mr. Pugsley). We were of opinion that the transport and sale of commodities should be under the control of the Government, who would see that enough remained in the country to feed the population. In this case as in all others, the Government has pursued its usual policy of inaction, with a vi w to getting votes, especially the farmers' votes, at the next elections. But our farmers are wise enough to understand that present prices for farm products are abnormal. I say further that the greater part of such abnormal increase in the price of commodities does not go to the farmer, but to the monopolists and speculators. This year had the Government been in earnest, a commission would have been appointed by the Minister of Labour in all the large centres, to inquire into the quantities of produce held in the cold storage plants, such as poultry, mutton—I know that some has been stored up for as long as 36 months,—beef, butter and cheese. The quantities of wheat and flour

in warehouses and elevators might also have been investigated.

The Government should have held back what was required of those staple commodities for the people, set a price on them, and allow the rest to be exported to our allies. What is the present situation regarding potatoes? They are selling to-day in Montreal at $4.00 a bag, and of this the farmer gets only $1.75 to $2.00. I myself bought them in the country at $2.00 a bag when they fetched $4.00 in the city.

At the beginning of the war, especially last year, it was the Government's duty, as they saw prices soaring all the time, to at once lay an embargo on those commodities, and to withold from exportation a sufficient quantity to meet the needs of the community. The farmers are not the only ones to be considered; but one must also take into account the workingman, the under-paid or small earner, who do not hope to see their salaries keep pace with the ever-increasing cost of living. You failed to do so; the city of Montreal entreated the Government to commandeer these commodities, and the Government had not the pluck to do so. As to the coal situation, again I say that the minister wired me at the last minute, stating that coal was selling in Ottawa at $8 a ton and asking whether it was true that $14 to $15 was asked for them in Montreal, and if so, to let him know immediately. I replied to the Minister; I did every thing possible under the circumstances and I find it strange that the minister should now see fit to cast any blame on us.

There is another point I should like to deal with before I take my seat. The Government has lately passed an Order in Council providing for the free entry of wheat. In 1911, I was in favour of reciprocity, but it seems to me that to-day is not the time to apply it without at least taking steps to keep enough wheat in the country to feed our families and ensure cheap bread instead of helping to increase the price. It is a move merely to catch the western farmer's vote, as can be seen by the statement in the Order in Council to the effect that the measure is intended to secure a better price for Canadian wheat. Here again, I claim, it is not the farmer who will reap the greatest share, but, as was said a moment ago by the hon. member for St. John, N.B., the speculator who has stored the grain of the western prairies in order to enhance the price through exportation into the United States. I say that here again a state of things is created which tends to raise the price of commodities; and so much is that the case, that since the Order in Council has been passed, the price of a certain quality of bread in Montreal has been raised from one to two cents since yesterday.

The Government has always been keen on unloading its blunders not only on the corporation of Montreal, but in all important centres it has been anxious to shift responsibility for its action on the shoulders of the provincial governments, as was instanced by the speech of the Minister of Labour this evening. As a parting word, let me tell him that he has not worked in the interest of the people at large, or of the city and towns in particular, but has always favoured the trusts, of which he is the protector and friend.

Mr. CROTHERS: I regret that I did not follow very closely what the hon. member (Mr. Martin) said, but I assume that he was discussing the cost of living. I had the honour and pleasure of spending a day in Montreal some months ago, and the hon. gentleman, as mayor, treated me like a prince. He spent nearly the whole day with me, and there was nothing in Montreal too good for me. And all the time I was with him he did not say anything about the high cost of anything we ate or drank.

Mr. MARTIN: Did the hon. gentleman say it was a few weeks ago?

Mr. CROTHERS: About a year ago.

Mr. MARTIN: On Labour Day?

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes.

Mr. MARTIN: That was not the time. The war—

Mr. CROTHERS: We had had war for a couple of years then, and the hon. gentleman did not say a word. We noticed in the press a few months ago that coal was selling in Montreal at very high prices—$15 a ton in the centre of the city, and $20 a ton in the suburbs. I did not wait to write to the mayor, but sent him a telegram, asking as to the facts. And, if I remember well, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) wrote back stating that it was true. So, I wrote that the best thing he could do was to send a solicitor to represent the city corporation, and we would help him to deal with the matter. But the mayor did not send anybody, he did not give us a chance to help him, and I took the matter up without hearing from Montreal.

Mr. MARTIN: But I sent some one to make inquiries, to secure bills for coal and these were sent to the hon. minister. At least, if they were not sent, my instructions were not obeyed. What would the minister have us do? The mere fact that a sale has been made at a higher than reasonable price is not an offence? We have to prove that he has coal in his yard which he refuses to sell. That is what our attorney—

Mr. CROTHERS: Why did you not send a man up to consult?

Mr. MARTIN: Because it was not necessary. I spoke to Mr. Lamarche, formerly a member of this House, and to Mr. Laurandeau, and they told us that what we must do is to make an inquiry and send the facts to the minister. We sent bills for coal that had been received. And the commission is going yet.

Mr. CROTHERS: It was not necessary to send anything of that kind to us. If the hon. gentleman found that any man was selling coal at prices that were unreasonable or unjust, he could take action against him.

Mr. MARTIN: That is not what Mr. Laurandeau tells us, and he is an ex-judge. The minister may say that Mr. Laurandeau did not understand it. In that case I am ready to believe that nobody could understand it.

Mr. CROTHERS: If my hon. friend had sent his solicitor as we requested we would have pointed out to him what should be done.

Mr. MARTIN: The Government should have entered upon an inquiry last fall, to find out just what supplies were available. Then they should have put on an embargo wherever it was necessary, in order to keep food for the family—the family of Canada, whose interest the Government has in charge. They should have provided that what food was necessary should be kept at home and the rest sent to the Allies.

Mr. CROTHERS: And what was the hon. gentleman's duty as mayor of Montreal?

Mr. MARTIN: To work for the people, as I did. And next election will prove that they think I did well.

Mr. VERVILLE: Has anybody been prosecuted under this Order in Council?

Mr. CROTHERS: No, we have no power to prosecute.

[Mr. Crothers.]

Mr. VERVILLE: I believe the time has come—in fact, came some time ago—when the Government should try to control the prices of foodstuffs. In dealing with the case of the miners of the West the minister stated that the Government had paid $92,000 on account, as I understood him, of the increased cost of living, that increase for the time covered having been $1.75 a week. But if the minister does not proceed to the regulation of food supplies in four or five months from now, perhaps, the cost of living will have gone up another $1.75 a week. Will he then take another $92,000 to make that up? Anybody who knows the conditions here and on the other side of the line knows that the profits paid in Canada in some cases are quite unreasonable. The minister spoke of the increase in the cost of living in the United States, but he forgets that the wages there are higher than in Canada.

Mr. CROTHERS: No.

Mr. VERVILLE: Then, they must have changed very lately, for about the first of the month I was in Detroit, Chicago, Indianapolis and Cleveland, and in those cities wages were higher than in Canada. And the minister knows it. We cannot compare the cost of living on this side and on the other side unless we take wages into account. The hon. gentleman knows that as soon as war was declared between the United States and Germany the heads of the labour people in the United States were called into consultation by the Government upon the cost of living. There is an example which the minister might well follow. If my hon. friend has not done it so far, why does he not do it now? It is better now than never. Why does he not consult the best labour men in the country and ask them to help him to solve the problem of the high cost of living? I do not say that my hon. friend can do it alone but if he would gather together a number of men, the same as they have done in the United States, he would do something towards finding a solution for this difficulty. The resolution which No. 149, International Association, signed——

Mr. CROTHERS: Have they reduced the price of anything yet?

Mr. VERVILLE: They have not reduced the price but they are going to control prices. It is only three weeks since war was declared.

Mr. CROTHERS: But before war was declared they had street riots over there

concerning the prices of food and we have not had any here yet.

Mr. VERVILLE: Certainly, but here, the increased cost of living goes on and I believe that in September we will have two labour days; on the first of September they will parade the streets and next day they will supply themselves in the cold storages, and I would be the very first man to tell them to do so if things keep on as they are. I am supposed to keep the peace, but there is a limit to everything and my hon. friend knows that the people of the country will not stand for much more and that they are calling upon him to take this matter up with the best elements to be found in the country, to settle this question and to endeavour to prevent what will be a great calamity. He may not be able to prevent it. My hon. friend said a moment ago that the Order in Council was put on the same basis as the Lord's Day Act. But, the Lord's Day Act was a matter of conscience; this is a matter of hunger and there is a great difference between your stomach and your conscience. The people make this appeal to the minister and he can himself see what the condition is in any part of the country that he may care to go to. You must regulate the food of the people. Seven-eighths of the people of Canada are just on the verge of revolution because they are short of food supplies and they will not stand it all the time. My hon. friend knows the conditions under which the people are living and he has been told it by a great many of his friends. My hon. friend's own officers must have kept him informed as to the conditions and he cannot ignore the facts that are existing in different parts of the country. The fact that he stated that there was an increase of $1.75 per week in the cost of living in connection with mining in the West shows that he realizes that the cost of living has gone up. If the cost of living has increased in the West it has also increased in the East and that is the danger. If you cannot lower the cost of living at the present you can regulate it. You can regulate the profits that some of those large interests are making. I am willing to give them a living profit but to take a profit over and above that is wrong. If my hon. friend does not know what is going on in this country amongst the rank and file of the people, then he has not received reports from his officers, but I believe that he does know. That is why I am appealing to the minister to immediately get the best elements from among the labour movement and the business men, if you like, and try to find a solution of the cost of living problem because it is getting very dangerous.

Mr. CROTHERS: The hon. member for Maisonneuve is a leader amongst the working people of this country, and he has told us a good deal, but he has not told us what he has done towards paying the advance in the cost of foodstuffs. Under this order he could take action against any man in the city of Montreal whom he thought was overcharging, and prosecute him with the assent of the Attorney General. I do not apprehend that it would be a very easy matter. What is it that controls the price of most of these things? Take cheese; there is a very great demand for cheese to be sent across the ocean to the army. What would my hon. friend do there—fix the price at which the maker of cheese should sell the cheese for at the factory and bring it down below what he could get for it for export? Would he adopt the same method with regard to butter, flour or anything of that kind? When you get down to the actual work you will find it very difficult to fix the price of any of these things. I would suggest to my hon. friend that he would probably learn something of a very practical nature if he would take this order, and finding some one on the corner in Montreal whom he thought was charging too much for his butter or bacon, he would ask the Attorney General to authorise a prosecution, lay an information, bring the dealer before the police magistrate and have him convicted and fined $5,000. If he did that it would be a lesson to him and an example to every other man who was overcharging. It is an easy matter for him to get up and say that you should do so and so, and the Government should do so and so, but what is he doing for the working man?

Mr. VERVILLE: If I were Minister of Labour I would do more than he has done. I would have a change in the whole situation or I would not stay in the Cabinet. I would be man enough to get out of it.

Mr. CROTHERS: You are representing the people in this House. Why do you not get out because you cannot do anything?

Mr. VERVILLE: I have not the responsibility nor the power to do that; the minister has that in his hands.

Mr. CROTHERS: I have just the power you have under this order.

Mr. VERVILLE: Yes, but I have only the power of an individual while the Gov-

ernment are absolutely powerful in the country. Perhaps the Minister of Labour inside the Council room was in favour of regulating the prices of food and his colleagues did not look at it in the same light. If that were so I would get out of the Cabinet. I would do something for those I represent or get out.

Mr. EDWARDS: There is no doubt the price of foodstuffs has risen considerably since the beginning of the war, especially during the last twelve months. We have had two solutions proposed this evening. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) suggests in all seriousness that the Government should fix the price of potatoes, wheat, flour and so on. He does not say what that price would be but he proposes to make the price arbitrary and force the farmer to take whatever the Government says he should take for the article that he produces. I do not think that would meet the situation, because if the member of St. John was a member of the Government and was looking for votes, he would fix the price according to the number of votes that he could get by fixing the price. If he thought he could get more votes by fixing the price in the interest of the man who was producing the foodstuffs then his bowels of compassion would be all dried up in regard to the man who was consuming the foodstuffs. But that does not meet the situation. Then the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) has a plan for meeting the situation and meeting it most certainly. He stands up in this House, professing to represent the labour interests of this country and he says that if something is not done to reduce the price of these foodstuffs he will encourage the mob in Montreal or anywhere to break into the storehouses and help themselves. In the time I have had a seat in this House I have never heard a responsible member of Parliament give expression to anything approaching the statement made by the hon. member for Maisonneuve, and I say it is very little credit to him to make such a statement. It is one which he should not have made as a responsible member of Parliament, because in that position more importance is attached to his utterances than perhaps should attach to them.

I remember in years gone by, when the farmers of this country were not making one-half of one per cent on their investments during the regime of the Liberal Government, one of the responsible members of the Laurier Government offered a solution to the farmers of the country who were making nothing. His suggestion was that they should work harder and eat less. That was the Liberal solution of the difficulty so far as the farmers of Canada were concerned during the fifteen years they were in power—work harder and eat less. In all the discussion we have heard this evening in regard to the high cost of living and foodstuffs, not one gentleman has attempted to get at the real reason for these high prices. Why is cheese the price it is to-day? Would any hon. member opposite say that the Government should step in and tell the farmers that they must take fifteen cents or eighteen cents or twenty cents a pound for cheese instead of the price they are getting, which is fixed by the demand across the water? Will any member opposite, as a member of the Liberal party advocate that ? The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) said that he would fix the prices. He did not say at what figure he would fix them. In regard to the price of butter and nearly all of these articles, if you look into the facts you will find that there is a reasonable cause at least for the great part of the increase in price. Take grain for instance. What about the grain crop of the United States for last year? The corn crop there was about 400,000,000 bushels short. The wheat crop was hundreds of millions of bushels short. The oat crop was short. Look into the number of head of cattle, sheep and swine in the United States, and you will find an enormous decrease; not only last year but for several years. The same holds good in this country and has held good for many years back in the countries of Europe. These are natural causes for a part, at least, of the high cost of foodstuffs. You have also to take into consideration, when you are considering the price of butter and eggs and things like that, the produce of the farm, the difficulty that the farmer has in securing labour for the production of these articles. Not one hon. gentleman who has spoken with regard to the matter has touched on that phase of the question. And yet that is something which every farmer in the country is thoroughly aware of. He is up against the difficulty of getting labour and has to pay many times what he paid a few years ago.

The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) said that the Government should have foreseen all these things, the need of ships, and what was about to happen in this war. When the members on this side of the House sounded a note of warning in regard to the war which is now on, every

hon. member opposite, including the member for St. John, ridiculed the suggestion. We were talking utter nonsense when we spoke of the war cloud hovering over Europe. They ridiculed the idea of war coming and did not want us to make any preparation for the effective carrying on of our part in this great struggle. It is true that the price of food products is high, but I will venture the statement that during the winter which has just closed, taking into consideration the wages paid, the demand for labour in almost every walk that you could speak of, at high prices, and the cost of foodstuffs, there has been less actual distress in the centres of population in the Dominion of Canada than there has been during any winter in the last ten or fifteen years. And if you are considering the question of the high cost of living and foodstuffs and all that sort of thing, it is only fair to consider the ability of the population to pay the prices which are being demanded at the present time, as well as to inquire into the real causes for the prices being high. But I believe that during the last winter and at the present time there has been, as I have said, less distress throughout the Dominion of Canada because of the high cost of living than there has been in this country in the last fifteen or twenty years.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is now eleven o'clock. We have had a very interesting discussion and perhaps we might pass an item and adjourn.

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not know whether hon. gentlemen opposite desire to discuss the other three items? There are only three others.

Mr. GRAHAM: But they are fraught with great significance. I should not like to have to reply to the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) to-night, for instance. I would suggest that we pass item 265 and adjourn. We have worked pretty hard.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir Thomas White the House adjourned at 11 o'clock p.m.

Monday, April 24, 1917.

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

PAY OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT IN OVERSEAS FORCES.

Sir EDWARD KEMP (Minister of Militia): I desire to present an amended return with respect to the pay of Members of Parliament serving in the Overseas Forces. In the return as presented to the House there was a clerical error, the effect of which was to show that Lt.-Col. W. F. Cockshutt was drawing separation allowance and pay. As a matter of fact, he has drawn neither separation allowance nor pay from the Government. The figures should have appeared immediately opposite the name of the officer preceding his, on the return.

Mr. GRAHAM: What officer was that?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Lieut. Carroll.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO moved:

That the Public Accounts and the Report of the Auditor General for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1916, be referred to the Committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

NATIONAL SERVICE CARDS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. EDWARDS: Yesterday a question of which I had given notice, relating to National Service cards, was put, and the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) gave what is supposed to be an answer. I do not know who prepared the answer, nor where he got his information. It is given at page 702 of yesterday's Hansard. I would draw the attention of the minister to the fact that in this answer the second part of the question is entirely ignored.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The information came from the National Service Commission. I shall draw the attention of the Director of National Service to the observations of my hon. friend.

ENLISTED CIVIL SERVANTS.

PAY AND SEPARATION ALLOWANCE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir EDWARD KEMP (Minister of Militia and Defence): The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) each asked questions yesterday, the first with regard to Civil Service enlistment and statutory increases of pay, and the second with regard to Civil Service enlistments and separation

allowance. The answer to these questions is as follows:

A civil servant who enlists receives full pay the same as if he were employed doing his civil service duties, provided always that his civil pay is greater than that which he would draw as a soldier.

The Government has undertaken to see that a civil servant receives pay not less than what he would have received had he remained at home and had not enlisted. He does not, therefore, receive separation allowance extra, but it is the intention that he shall receive the regular statutory increases provided he is receiving only one salary.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understand that no civil servant who is allowed his pay as a civil servant receives separation allowance?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The answer covers that question. The civil servant receives his full pay as a civil servant.

Mr. PUGSLEY: And no civil servants have been allowed separation allowance?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Civil servants are not allowed separation allowance.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then, am I to understand that members of Parliament, with the exception of Mr. Cockshutt, have received separation allowance in addition to their sessional indemnity, although they have been absent from Parliament?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I am not sure on that point. The return speaks for itself. I am not sure that the hon. gentleman is quite correct in saying that all members of Parliament have received separation allowances.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then the minister will withdraw the statement that there is no discrimination?

MONEY ORDERS FOR PRISONERS OF WAR.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) yesterday asked for information in reference to money orders and parcels for Canadian prisoners of war. First, in regard to money orders, the answer is:

About the beginning of the year 1916, arrangements were made by the Chief Paymaster, London, England, through the Red Cross and Post Office, to forward small amounts of pay to prisoners of war in Germany. The requests come from the men themselves by post card, and up to January, 1917, the remittances were made by post office order. This practice was discontinued at our request because no receipts or absolute guarantee that the money reached the men were obtained. Since January, 1917, the American Express made payments in cash to the men themselves and obtained individual receipts, at first through their own agents in Germany, and, since United States declared war, through Dutch agents of the American Express Company in Germany. Small sums are sent, not exceeding three pounds, which are charged to the men's accounts in London. I may add that the pay of prisoners of war is credited to the men's accounts, and accumulates, less these small remittances.

PARCELS FOR PRISONERS OF WAR.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: In regard to parcels for Canadian prisoners of war, the answer is rather a long one, and therefore I will lay on the table of the House the particulars in reference to this matter. These particulars are set forth in the regulations which were in effect prior to the 1st of February, 1917, and the regulations which have been in effect since that time.

Mr. MACDONALD: I would ask my hon. friend the Minister of Militia if he would be good enough to assent to the proposition that the answer in regard to parcels be published in Hansard. The question is an important one, and that would be the most convenient way by which the matter could be made public for the information of the House and the country generally.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, and the permission of the House, I would be very glad that the documents which I have laid on the table of the House should be published in Hansard.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have before me the statement submitted by the hon. the Minister of Militia. While it is somewhat out of the usual order, yet, owing to the importance of this document and the desirability of this information being published as widely as possible, with the unanimous consent of the House, I can see no objection to this document being considered as read for the purpose of being printed in Hansard.

The regulations are:

Post Office Department,
Ottawa, Canada.

Regulations in Force Prior to 1st February, 1917.

Re Correspondence for Prisoners of war in Germany.

1. Letters (letters should be left open) postcards and postal parcels should be addressed as follows:—

1. Rank, initials, name.
2. Regiment, or other unit.
3. British (or Canadian, French, Belgian or Russian) prisoner of war.
4. Place of internment.
5. Germany.

Place of internment should be stated always if possible, and parcels cannot be accepted unless place of internment is stated. All addresses must be in ink.

2. Communications should be limited to private and family news and to necessary business communications, and should not be sent too frequently.

No references to the Naval, Military or Political situation or to naval or military movements and organizations are allowed. Letters or postcards containing such references will not be delivered.

3. Friends of prisoners of war are advised to send postcards in preference to letters as postcards are less likely to be delayed. If letters are sent, they should not exceed in length two sides of a sheet of note paper and should contain nothing but the sheet of note paper. On no account should the writing be crossed.

4. Letters cannot for the present be accepted for registration.

5. Postage need not be paid either on letters or parcels addressed to prisoners of war.

6. No letters should be enclosed in parcels, and newspapers must not on any account be sent. So far as is known there is no restriction on the contents of parcels; tobacco may be sent and will be admitted duty free but foodstuffs of a perishable character should not be sent. Parcels should not exceed 11 pounds in weight.

7. Remittances can be made by money order to prisoners of war. Instructions as to how to proceed can be obtained from Postmasters of Accounting Post Offices. The transmission of coin, either in letters or parcels, is expressly prohibited. Postal notes and Bank notes should not be sent.

8. It must be understood that no guarantee of the delivery of either parcels or letters can be given and that the Post Office accepts no responsibility. In any case, considerable delay may take place and failure to receive an acknowledgment should not necessarily be taken as an indication that letters and parcels sent have not been delivered.

9. So far as is known, prisoners of war in Germany are allowed to write letters or postcards from time to time; but they may not always have facilities for doing so and the fact that no communication is received from them need not give rise to anxiety.

Regulations at present in force.

Circular to Postmasters.

Post Office Department,
Ottawa, Canada, 29th January, 1917.

Effective on and from 1st February, 1917.
Communication with prisoners of war interned abroad.

1. Letters, postcards, parcels (up to 11 lb. but not to contain foodstuffs or articles of clothing as set forth in the following regulations), and Money Orders may be sent free of all postal charges to prisoners of war (of whatever nationality) interned abroad and to British civilians interned in Austria-Hungary, Germany, Turkey and Bulgaria. In the following paragraphs the term "Prisoners of war" includes all interned persons, military or civilian.

2. Letter Post:—

(a) Method of address—The address of letters whether for officers, non-commissioned officers, privates or civilians, must be on the following form and must be written distinctly in ink. As regards the address of parcels, see paragraph 3 (a).

The place of internment, if known, should always be stated. Correspondence for prisoners of war employed in working camps in Germany should be addressed preferably to the "parent" camps to which they belong, and not to the working camps.

Form.

Regimental number, rank, initials, name.....
Regiment (or other unit).....
British, Canadian, French, Belgian, etc., prisoner of war .....
Place of internment.....
Country .....

Example.

No. 12345, Private A. G. Robinson,
48th Highlanders, Canadian Contingent, B.E.F.,
Gottingen,—Canadian prisoner of war,
Germany.

In the case of Naval or Military prisoners.

It is necessary in the case of Prisoners of War interned in certain countries to insert the additional addresses shown below:—

Turkey—"Ottoman Red Crescent Society, Constantinople, Turkey."
Norway—"c/o Vaktchefen, Jorstadmoen, Faaberg, Jernbanestation, Norway."

(b) Only letters and postcards may be sent by Letter Post. Letters must be left open. Anything else must be sent by Parcel Post (see below). Communications intended for Prisoners of War must be addressed direct to the persons who are to receive them. Communications apparently intended for a person other than the addressee will not be forwarded. Communication through Prisoners of War with persons residing in territory occupied by the enemy is not permitted.

(c) Letters to Prisoners of War in Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, Germany or Turkey should not exceed two sides of a sheet of notepaper and should be clearly written; otherwise they are liable to delay, and may even not be delivered by the authorities in the country to which they are addressed. They must not contain any kind of printed matter, pictorial illustrations or photographs, except unmounted photographs of persons (see also paragraphs 2 (e) and 8).

(d) Letters to Prisoners of War in neutral countries should also be short and clearly written in order to avoid delay. Letters containing newspaper cuttings or unmounted photographs of persons will not, however, be stopped, but will be liable to considerable delay (see also paragraphs 2 (e) and 8).

(e) Letters to Prisoners of War in any foreign country must not contain any information which might be of use to the enemy. No reference to the naval, military or political situation or to naval or military movements or organizations, is allowed. Letters containing such references will not be delivered. Illustrations of warships, camps, docks, or conspicuous landmarks or bird's-eye views must not be sent. Any enclosures whatever in a letter may entail delay.

(f) All letters must contain the name and address of the sender.

3. Parcels for British (including Canadian) and Allied Military or Naval Prisoners (other than officers), or Civilians.

(a) Method of address.—Parcels for a Canadian Prisoner of War belonging to the Canadian Contingent must be addressed in care of the Prisoners of War Department, Canadian Red Cross Society, London, England. Unless they are so addressed they cannot be accepted. The address should be in the following form:—

No. 12345, Private A. G. Robinson, 48th Highlanders, Canadian Contingent, B.E.F.,
Canadian Prisoner of War, Gottingen, Germany,
c/o Prisoners of War Department, Canadian Red Cross Society, London, England.

Parcels for Canadian Prisoners of War belonging to the Imperial Forces, for Canadian civilian Prisoners of War, and for Allied Prisoners of War, must be fully addressed to the place of destination, care of Central Prisoners of War Committee, 4 Thurloe Place, London, S.W.

(b) Packing.—Parcels should be packed in the same manner as parcels for delivery in the United Kingdom. Despatch Notes and Customs' Declarations are not required. The parcels will be repacked before being despatched from the United Kingdom.

(c) Prohibitions.—The following articles, in addition to those mentioned in paragraph 5 (d), must not be included:—

(i) Tins or other receptacles which cannot conveniently be opened for inspection.

(ii) Foodstuffs of all kinds.

(iii) (To enemy countries only).—Regulation uniforms, and all articles of clothing, and boots for naval and military prisoners other than officers.

(d) Persons desiring to have food or articles of clothing sent to a Canadian Prisoner of War belonging to the Canadian Contingent should send money for the purpose to Prisoners of War Department, Canadian Red Cross Society. Articles other than food or clothing for such prisoners may also be purchased through the Prisoners of War Department, Canadian Red Cross Society, London, England, or may be sent to the Prisoners of War Department, Canadian Red Cross Society, London, England, to be forwarded if not prohibited. A letter (closed) containing a remittance and asking the Prisoners of War Department, Canadian Red Cross Society, London, England, to send food or other articles to such a Prisoner of War should be addressed to the Prisoner of War, care of the Prisoners of War Department, Canadian Red Cross Society, London, England, in the form indicated in paragraph 3 (a), and

[The Speaker.]

if so addresed, may be sent free of charge in respect of postage or (where necessary) of registration.

The remittance should be in the form of a Post Office Money Order drawn in favour of the Prisoners of War Department, Canadian Red Cross Society, London, England, for the Prisoner of War in question.

The letter will be opened by the Prisoners of War Department, Canadian Red Cross Society, London, England, and the parcel will be sent in accordance with the request contained in the letter. The name of any adopter or relative at whose expense a parcel is sent will be communicated to the Prisoner of War.

(Letters addressed to the Canadian Red Cross Society, London, England, as distinct from those addressed to Prisoners, care of the Prisoners of War Department, Canadian Red Cross Society, London, England, must be prepaid).

In the case of Canadian Prisoners of War belonging to the Imperial Forces or of Canadian civilian Prisoners of War or of Allied Prisoners of War, the terms of this regulation apply, and the same procedure should be followed, with the exception that in all such cases letters should be addressed care of, and Money Orders drawn in favour of the Central Prisoners of War Committee, 4 Thurloe Place, London, S.W., England, who are acting for this class of prisoners.

4. Parcels for Officers:—

(a) Method of address. Parcels should be addressed in the manner stated in paragraph 2 (a) as applicable to letters. Parcels will not be accepted for transmission unless the address includes the name of the place of internment. The address must be clearly written in ink in at least two places on the outer cover of each parcel.

(b) Packing.—Parcels for Officer Prisoners of War must be very strongly packed. Ordinary thin cardboard boxes such as shoeboxes, and thin wooden boxes should not be used; nor does a single sheet of ordinary brown paper afford sufficient protection. Parcels which are found to be inadequately protected will not be forwarded. Even where proper materials are used, it is important that the contents should be tightly packed so as not to shake about during transit. All parcels should be packed in such a way as not to impede examination by the censors.

(c) The following forms of packing are recommended:—

(i) Strong double cardboard or strawboard boxes. Those made of corrugated cardboard and having lids which completely enclose the sides of the box are most suitable.

(ii) Strong wooden boxes.

(iii) Tin boxes such as are used for packing biscuits.

(iv) Several folds of stout packing paper.

Parcels for Prisoners of War in Bulgaria and Turkey must be packed in wood, tin or hemp canvas; no other kind of textile material may be used. Parcels packed merely in paper or cardboard cannot be accepted.

Parcels for Prisoners of War in Germany or Austria-Hungary must not be packed in any kind of textile material.

Butter, etc., should be wrapped in several folds of grease-proof paper and enclosed in a tin which should have a tightly fitting lid but not be sealed against inspection; the tin should be enclosed with any other articles for transmission in an outer box.

(d) Customs Declarations, which must be prepared in ink in duplicate, are only required for parcels addressed to Holland.

Despatch Notes are only required for parcels sent to Turkey and Bulgaria.

(e) In addition to the articles mentioned in paragraph 5 (d), perishable foodstuffs must not be included in a parcel for an officer.

5. Parcel Post—General.—The following regulations are applicable to all parcels for Prisoners of War, whether officers, naval or military prisoners other than officers, or civilians.

(a) The name of the sender must be clearly shown on the covers of all parcels for Prisoners of War. A list of the contents must be given on the cover of the parcel.

(b) The address of the sender must also be clearly shown.

(c) No Customs Duty is payable. Information as to any special restrictions that may be imposed from time to time at particular camps, may be obtained from the Central Prisoners of War Committee, 4 Thurloe Place, London, S.W., England.

(d) The following articles must not be included in a parcel:—

(i) Written communications (letters must be sent separately by letter post).

(ii) Printed matter.

(iii) Pictorial illustrations and photographs.

(iv) Money..

(v) Stationery, stamps, playing cards and similar articles affording facilities for secret communications.

(vi) Textiles, wool, cotton, leather or rubber. (Articles of clothing may, however, be sent to Officer Prisoners of War).

(vii) Tennis-balls, footballs, and golf-balls.

(viii) Spirits or solidified spirits for cooking stoves, matches or other inflamable material.

(ix) (To enemy countries only.) Photographic apparatus, field glasses, sextants, compasses and other instruments of use for Military or Naval purposes.

(e) Any parcel found to contravene these rules will be returned to the sender or sent to the Dead Letter Office for disposal if the name and address of the sender are not known.

6. Printed matter from the United Kingdom (i.e., newspapers, books, magazines, etc.) may not be sent to Prisoners of War in neutral or enemy countries except by the holders of special permits from the War Office (publishers or newsagents in the United Kingdom) to whom therefore orders for the dispatch of papers, books, magazines should be given by members of the public desiring to have such articles forwarded. Addresses of firms holding permits for this purpose may be obtained from the Chief Postal Censor, Strand House, Portugal St., London, W.C.

Educational books (not fiction, magazines or current war literature) may also be sent from the United Kingdom to British (including Canadian) Prisoners of War through the medium of the British Prisoners of War Book Concern (Educational). Information respecting that scheme may be obtained on application to A. T. Davies, Esq., Board of Education, Whitehall, London, S.W.

7. No printed matter to be sent from Canada. No newspapers, books, magazines, or printed matter of any kind, are to be sent from Canada to Prisoners of War interned in neutral or enemy countries.

8. Registration.—Letters addressed to Prisoners of War in Holland only may be registered.

No charge is made for registration; but the fact of registration does not necessarily give any claim to compensation for loss.

9. Remittance of Money.—(a) Remittance may be sent direct to Prisoners of War and should be made by means of Post Office Money Orders, which are issued free of commission. Instructions as to how to proceed can be obtained from Postmasters of Accounting Offices. The transmission of coin, either in letters or in parcels, is prohibited.

(b) Postal notes, bank notes and cheques may not be sent to Prisoners of War in enemy countries.

(c) Bank notes and cheques may be sent to Prisoners of War in neutral countries.

10. No guarantee of delivery of either parcels or letters can be given. Considerable delay may take place, and failure to receive an acknowledgment need not be taken to mean that letters and parcels sent have not been delivered.

11. Prisoners of War abroad are allowed to write letters or postcards from time to time; but they may not always have facilities for doing so; and the fact that no communication is received from them need not give rise to anxiety.

12. Central Prisoners of War Committee.—Persons seeking information and advice in regard to British (including Canadian) Prisoners of War are invited to apply to the Central Prisoners of War Committee, 4 Thurloe Place, London, S.W., England.

13. It is to be noted that the above regulations governing communication with Prisoners of War contain numerous and important changes, superseding previous regulations on and from 1st February, 1917.

R. M. COULTER,
Deputy Postmaster General.

LANCE CORPORAL READ.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Militia (Sir Edward Kemp) to the case of Lance Corporal Read, who is now at the front and who is a member of the 13th Battalion. Corporal Read wrote me a letter, dated the 7th April, in which he calls attention to something which I believe is important not only to himself but to others in a like situation. He was married on the 8th October, 1916, with the permission of his commanding officer, after having fulfilled all the formalities required of a soldier. He finds now that a separation allowance is refused his wife, the conditions having been changed. He sets forth all the facts in a communication to the chief paymaster of the regiment, and he asks me to call the attention of the minister to the case. I do so now because Corporal Read was formerly a resident of Notre Dame de Grace, Montreal. Two certificates accompanied the letter. His wife has been left without support of any kind. I hope the minister will give the matter his attention.

CANTEEN SYSTEM IN ENGLAND.

Mr. MACDONALD: Would the hon. the Minister of Militia be good enough to give the House a statement, similar to that which he has just given in reference to the treatment of prisoners of war, in regard to the position of the canteen system in the various camps in England which are under the control of the Canadian authorities, as to whether there are wet canteens still in existence, as to who the contractors are who have to do with their maintenance and carrying on, and what is the policy of the Government and the department overseas in regard to the matter?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I will look into that matter and endeavour to get my hon. friend an answer in due course.

THE BUDGET.

ANNUAL STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.

Honourable Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance) moved:—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I avail myself of the opportunity afforded by this motion to make the annual budget statement.

The features of the public finances in which I conceive the House to be chiefly interested at the present time are the relationship between national income and national expenditure and the increase in the national debt. For the first year of the war the revenue from all sources was about one hundred and thirty million dollars. It rose during the second year to $170,000,000. For the year ended March 31 last, I am happy to say, our income will reach two hundred and thirty-two millions, or one hundred million in advance of the fiscal year 1915. In round figures, $134,000,000 of the aggregate was derived from customs, $24,000,000 from excise, and $12,500,000 from the business profits war tax. From this last named tax, which was introduced by the Budget of last year, we estimated that we should receive twenty-five million dollars during the three years of its currency. Our experience has proved that this estimate will be largely exceeded. This tax was retroactive, being levied in respect of business accounting periods ending subsequently to December 31, 1914. The profits of the first accounting period of businesses subject to the tax were much affected by the severe depression and dislocation of business incidental to the first months of the war. Nevertheless, from this first period the sum of $12,500,000 has already been collected, and when the full levy is made we expect to have collected in respect of this period as much as $15,000,000. For the second accounting period the taxes for which are payable during this year we estimate that the amount collected will be much larger—in fact, as high as $20,000,000, or more. The increase will, of course, be due to the business prosperity which has prevailed in Canada during the past year and the profits made in supplying munitions of war. On the whole, notwithstanding the difficulty of organizing on short notice the official machinery necessary to cover so large a country as Canada the tax has worked out much more satisfactorily than we expected, and the total results will be much greater than the estimate.

I have said that the total income of the past fiscal year was $232,000,000. Leaving aside for the moment our direct war expenditure, our outlay for the past year was upon ordinary account $145,000,000 and $27,000,000 upon capital and subsidy account, or a total of $172,000,000. It is to be borne in mind that of our ordinary expenditure $25,000,000 represents increased interest and pension charges due to the war. Taking our total revenue at $232,000,000 and our total current and capital expenditure at $172,000,000, we find that during the past fiscal year we were able to pay from our income all current and capital expenditure, all charges of interest upon our increased national debt, all pension outlays, and in addition devote the sum of $60,000,000 to payment of the principal of our war expenditure. For a country such as Canada, of sparse population and without the conditions of long-established and concentrated wealth prevailing in older and more settled communities, the result must be regarded as extremely satisfactory.

Coming next to the question of our direct war expenditure, we find that with our increasing military effort it also is continually increasing. Since the beginnng of hostilities our total war outlay, including estimated and unadjusted liability to Great Britain for the maintenance of our troops at the front and inclusive of withheld pay, totals, so far as we can calculate, about $600,000,000. As the result of this large war expenditure, the net national debt of Canada, which was $336,000,000 before the outbreak of war, has risen to over $900,000,000, although this will not be shown by our official statements for some months to come.

By the end of the present fiscal year it may reach $1,200,000,000.

From the beginning it has been clear that it would not be possible for the people of Canada to pay, during the war, more than a part of the principal of our war expenditure. The policy of the Government has therefore been directed along two main lines: first, to fund the war indebtedness so as to postpone its maturities to periods well beyond the end of the war, and secondly, by increased taxation on the one hand and the reduction of current expenditure on works on the other to be in a position to meet from annual income all annual outlays including increased interest and pension charges and in addition a substantial amount of the war expenditure itself.

In order to carry out this programme it will be necessary, as our war expenditure, and consequently our interest and pension charges increase, to increase also our income. This raises the question of the sources of revenue still open to us. A higher customs taxation upon luxuries has been frequently suggested, but this proposal overlooks the fact that most articles of this character are embraced under fixed rates in the treaty with France, and the tariff cannot therefore be raised in respect of these. Apart from this we should hesitate at a time when France needs the advantage of all her sales on this side of the Atlantic to assist her exchange, to place a prohibition or increased duty against importations from our great Ally.

Then it has been frequently suggested that following the example of Great Britain and the United States, we should adopt an income tax upon all incomes beyond say $1,000 or $2,000. The comparison in this regard, however, of Canada with either of these countries is fallacious. We are not a country of large accumulated wealth and of incomes derived from investments. Canadian incomes are derived mostly from personal earnings, and while there are many exceptions, the rule prevails generally throughout the Dominion. So far as I am aware the incomes of the professional and salaried classes throughout Canada have not materially increased since the outbreak of the war. In the case of many they have actually declined. This being so, it does not seem equitable to impose upon these the burden of an additional income tax—for they are taxed now upon their incomes by municipalities and provinces—at a time when owing to the war the cost of living has so greatly increased. If such a tax is to be imposed, it seems to me that so far as the great majority of Canadians are concerned, it might better be levied in time of peace, when the cost of living is again normal. It is further to be pointed out that the maximum amount which would be obtained from such a tax in Canada would in terms of Dominion finance be comparatively small and that its administration would require almost a second Civil Service sufficient in number to cover every municipality, rural and urban, throughout the Dominion. The cost of levy and collection of such a tax would be much higher proportionately than in a geographically small, wealthy, densely populated country like Great Britain or than in the United States, which although of the same area as Canada has twelve times the population and much more than twelve times our wealth. On the whole it would appear to me that the income tax should not be resorted to by the Dominion Government until its necessity becomes clearly and unmistakably apparent notwithstanding the drawbacks which I have mentioned. In connection with this tax it is also to be observed that the larger incomes in so far as they are not personally earned are derived in part from holdings in joint stock companies already subject to taxation under the provisions of the Business Profits War Tax Act. It must also be remembered that the Canadian public are voluntarily supporting the Canadian Patriotic, Red Cross, and other funds. The amount contributed annually to these funds is much in excess of the amount likely to be realized from any income tax. It is true that some wealthy men do not contribute their fair share to these funds. But this would also be true in any scheme of income taxation especially with issues of Dominion bonds exempt from Dominion taxation.

The question of further revenue then narrows down to abnormal profits made by business firms during the period of the war and this in my view is the proper and legitimate source to which to look for increased revenue to meet the increased cost of the war. If a business is making, in war time, profits above the normal, they must be due to the abnormal conditions created by the war, that is to say such a business is deriving advantage from the war. It follows that it may properly be required to contribute a share of such profits to the Government for the purposes of the war. I do not see, Mr. Speaker, that

it makes much much difference whether the business in question is the making of munitions or of any other class. Munitions are needed and no discredit attaches to the enterprise which provides them. The steel company which engages in the production of munitions could in most cases make as much if not more money by selling its steel products in world markets. Moreover, it would be inequitable to discriminate against the firm which makes a profit upon the finished article known as munitions and leave untaxed the profits (it may be equally large) of those firms which manufacture and supply the raw material or partly manufactured products from which they are made, or the businesses throughout the country which make abnormal profits from the distribution of money expended by Governments in payment for such munitions. If higher profits are made in the manufacture of munitions the higher the tax taken under business profits legislation.

In accordance with the principle which I have enunciated the Government last year imposed the Business Profits War Tax. Under that legislation profits in excess of a certain percentage upon capital invested were taxed to the extent of twenty-five per cent of such excess. This measure has proved quite successful, not the least of its merits being the small cost of its administration which will probably not exceed one-half of one per cent upon the amount collected. In view of the increasing interest and pension charges due to the war and believing this to be the true source to which recourse should now be had for further revenue we propose to extend this tax by taking an increased share of profits.

We propose to take from persons, firms and companies liable to the Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, fifty per cent of all profits in excess of 15 per cent but not exceeding twenty per cent per annum and seventy-five per cent of all profits in excess of twenty per cent per annum upon capital. That is to say up to fifteen per cent they will be liable to the existing legislation and in addition we shall take one-half of their profits between 15 per cent and 20 per cent and three-fourths of their profits beyond 20 per cent. The increased tax will chiefly affect manufacturers of munitions and other war supplies. While the percentage of excess profits which is taken is large, sufficient is left to provide incentive to effort on the part of all subject to the war tax.

[Sir Thomas White.]

The new legislation will apply to the last accounting period of the three year term provided for in the Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, namely, to all accounting periods ending after December 31, 1916, I am unable to estimate what amount will be derived from this taxation as it will depend upon the condition of business during the year. It will however give us without doubt a very substantial additional revenue.

Before leaving the question of taxation I desire to say that the measures we have adopted have necessarily broadened in their scope as the war has progressed. No one has at any time been able to forecast the length of the war. It has now lasted nearly three years and the end is not yet in sight. Should another year be added to its duration with the consequent increase in our financial burden new sources of revenue must undoubtedly be sought. In seeking for these it should I am sure always be kept in mind that Canada has been in the past and will likely be for many years in the future a country inviting immigration and capital to develop its resources and contribute to its prosperity. Especially should we in considering taxation measures for the period following the war keep in view the desirability of the flow of settlers and of capital to Canada not being retarded through fear on their part of heavy Federal taxation.

Canada's War Loan.

The question of our financing since the last Budget was fully explained and discussed in the first part of this session. During the recess we successfully floated the third Canadian War Loan, an issue of $150,000,000 five per cent, twenty year bonds at 96. The public response was most gratifying, the issue having been oversubscribed to the extent of about one hundred million dollars. The proceeds of this loan will enable us to finance both ourselves and the Imperial treasury in respect of expenditure in Canada until June. It is my present intention to arrange then for an issue of notes or treasury bills and if conditions are favourable offer another war loan in the early fall.

Since the outbreak of war we have floated in Canada domestic loans aggregating $350,000,000 and have in addition furnished $150,000,000 through our chartered banks to the Imperial Treasury to meet its commitments for munitions and supplies purchased in Canada. Everywhere, I believe, this is regarded as a very notable

achievement on the part of Canada. It has not only made possible our participation on a large scale in the war but it has in greater measure than we realized brought about the present state of prosperity in the Dominion. Without the aid afforded by the savings of our people the expenditures which have been made in Canada by both Governments for supplies and munitions could not have been made, so that those who have saved have benefited not only themselves but the entire community. While our national saving during the war has been gratifyingly large it is not so great as it should have been and to-day no better advice can be offered to the public than to exercise the strictest thrift and economy. Every additional day the war lasts makes this individual and national duty the more imperative.

Canada's Trade 1916-17.

No aspect of our affairs during the war is more striking than the vast increase which has taken place in our international trade. The aggregate of our imports and exports (excluding coin and bullion) for the fiscal year 1912 was $841,000,000; for 1913 $1,063,000,000; for 1914 $1,090,000,000; for 1915 $958,000,000; for 1916 $1,309,000,000. For the year ended on March 31 last, the total international trade of Canada reached the enormous total of $2,043,000,000.

Mr MICHAEL CLARK: Would the minister kindly give us a statement of the exports and imports?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If my hon. friend does not mind, I would prefer to give them in committee. I have them here, but I cannot conveniently lay my hand upon them. This, Mr. Speaker, is nearly double the volume of the largest trade in the history of Canada before the war. Equally notable with this huge increase in volume is the change which has taken place in relative amounts of imports and exports. For 1912, the balance against us was $125,000,000; for 1913, $309,000,000; for 1914, $180,000,000; for 1915, $36,000,000. For 1916, we had for the first time in many years a favourable balance of $249,000,000. During the last fiscal year this favourable balance increased to $314,000,000. Figures such as these indicate a very prosperous condition within the Dominion. It must however be steadily kept in mind that the higher prices obtainable under war conditions for our national products and the output of our industrial plants of war supplies and munitions are chiefly responsible for this extraordinarily favourable condition of our external trade, and that with the cessation of the war dislocation of industry and modification of prices are bound to ensue. I take it that it is unnecessary for me to mention the large increase in our exports due to our grain and other commodities sent abroad by us and the high prices which have been and are being obtained for them. I said that, with the cessation of the war, dislocation of industry and modification of prices are bound to ensue. The only safeguard against these conditions is saving on the part of all who are now engaged at good wages and are in a position to save and the careful husbanding of their resources by firms and companies engaged in business. The position of most businesses in Canada is now thoroughly sound and it is for their proprietors, with the prudent watchfulness of their bankers to keep them in that condition. The sources of danger to business in war time are speculation in commodities and stock exploitation on the exchanges. With these avoided and national savings greatly increased we might look forward with confidence to whatever may occur in the reconstruction period after the war.

We have no tariff changes to propose.

To carry out the taxation proposal which I have announced and certain necessary amendments to the Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, I beg to give notice of the following resolution which I shall move in committee:

RESOLVED, That it is expedient to amend the Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, by providing:—

1. That in any business taxable under the Act where the annual profits exceed fifteen per centum per annum the tax shall be increased to fifty per centum with respect to all profits in excess of the said fifteen per centum but not exceeding twenty per centum per annum, and where the profits exceed twenty per centum per annum the tax shall be increased to seventy-five per centum with respect to all profits in excess of the said twenty per centum, and such increases in the tax shall be levied against and paid by the person owning such business for each and every accounting period ending after the thirty-first day of December, one thousand nine hundred and sixteen;

2. That for the purposes of the said Act, the actual unimpaired reserve, rest or accumulated profits held at the commencement of an accounting period by an incorporated company shall be included as part of its capital as long as it is held and used by the company as capital;

That any enactment founded on this resolution shall be deemed to have come into force on and from the eighteenth day of May, one thousand nine hundred and sixteen;

3. That the tax shall be paid each year within one month from the date of the mailing of the notice of assessment;

4. That with respect to every business liable to taxation hereunder the period for which the returns shall be made and during which it shall be liable for assessment shall be at least thirty-six months, commencing with the beginning of the first accounting period ending after the thirty-first day of December, 1914, or for such less period as the business may have been carried on from the beginning of the said accounting period to the end of the period for which the said tax may be levied under the said Act.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, circumstances have conspired to make it impossible for me to give any close study to the financial operations of the Government during the past year, and I therefore cannot discuss many of their phases which are usually debated when the annual statement of the Minister of Finance is under consideration. Consequently, my remarks this afternoon shall be of a very general character, and, I trust, brief. I am sure we all can at least congratulate the Minister of Finance on the brevity of his remarks this afternoon, and I only regret that I cannot promise the House to imitate his example myself.

The speech to which we have just listened is a statement in a very compact form of the trade and financial conditions of the country during the past twelve months, but beyond that I think it may be said of the speech that it is disappointing for what it does not contain. At the present time, the Canadian people are anxiously interested in many pressing matters of an economic nature, and they naturally expected from the Government some reference to the same, or some intimation that consideration was being given them. Considering the world-wide conditions of to-day, it is gratifying, not only to friends of the Administration, but to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House and to the people generally, to learn of the volume of our import and export trade and the buoyancy of our revenues. At the beginning of the war one could hardly have expected the conditions which prevail to-day. One would have been optimistic indeed to anticipate the commercial condition which at present exists throughout the country. It is gratifying indeed to learn that during the past fiscal year our total trade amounts to over $2,000,000,000, and that our revenues reach the sum of $230,000,000. One might, however, also say with accuracy, that it is disappointing that our revenues are not larger than they are, but this I shall make reference to later.

[Sir Thomas White.]

While, in a general way, these trade and revenue figures indicate a pleasing activity in the trade and economic affairs of our country, we must remember that they are largely artificial and do not represent a normal or healthy condition, a condition that will endure for long in this country. The high prices which prevail to-day alone account very largely for the increased total money value of our export and import trade. Our revenue, which, after all, is almost wholly derived from our imports which are dutiable, is in turn made possible by our export trade In other words, it is impossible for this country to have imports unless it has exports, there is no way by which we can pay for our imports other than by our exports. It is, therefore, important and desirable to understand the clear relation which exists between our export trade and our general commercial and financial conditions.

If we study our export trade it will be seen that our fortunate position is largely the result of the misfortunes of our Allies, a circumstance which should impress upon us the necessity of contributing now, in our days of prosperity, to the cause for which we are fighting. The taxation of war profits, and the securing of revenue should not be postponed for a year, or two years, but should be accomplished now to assist in defraying the large expenditures which the country is making on account of the war.

The Minister of Finance was exceedingly fair this afternoon in disclaiming any credit for himself or the Government for the great increase in our total trade, which amounted, he said, to over $2,000,000,000. I wish to give the House a few figures to show how this large volume of trade is dependent upon war conditions—in fact, attributable to the war almost entirely. I am not giving these figures because I think hon. gentlemen around me are not aware of the fact, but rather because there is a tendency on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends, sometimes in the House and sometimes outside, to ascribe to themselves and the Administration credit for the great growth of our domestic and external trade. During the present session of Parliament the Minister of Finance, in answer to a charge from this side of the House that the Administration lacked leadership, practically ascribed to the Administration the credit, or a very large share of it, for the great development of our trade. He said:—

Years ago we used to talk of the total trade of Canada as being $500,000,000. The year

before the war the total trade of Canada, exports and imports, amounted to $1,000,000,000, and we congratulated ourselves upon the fact. It was wonderful that the total trade of Canada should be one-fifth of the total trade of Great Britain. Canada was coming on. For the first six months of the year just past the total trade of Canada exceeded $1,000,000,000, which was the high-water mark for the year preceding the war, and this year we shall have a total trade of over $2,000,000,000. And yet my hon. friends say there is no leadership. Of course, being modest men, we give the credit to the public. If my right hon. friend had found a condition like it he would take the credit for the party. We say that under our administration the favour of Providence, and the energy and intelligence and patriotism of the Canadian people, all these things have been accomplished

The Minister of Finance was good enough, in apportioning the credit, to associate with the Administration a bountiful Providence and a generous, intelligent and patriotic Canadian people. He failed, however, to apportion the exact values to these three agencies, but I suppose that our friends supporting the Government would, under urgent circumstances, take great care to give the Administration the major proportion of the credit, and a very small share to a bountiful Providence, and to a generous, intelligent and patriotic people. I almost feel like apologizing for occupying the time of the House in referring to this matter, but I wish to remove, if I can, the impression which hon. gentlemen opposite frequently seek to give the country that this great growth in our volume of trade is due almost entirely to the efforts of the Administration. I shall now give a few figures to indicate how directly war conditions are responsible for this trade development.

4 p.m.

According to a return furnished on my motion some few days ago, I find we exported for the nine months of the fiscal year ending December 31, 1916, in value $22,959,000 of explosives, whereas in 1914 we exported only $228,000 worth. In guns, rifles, cartridges, rifles and ammunitions we exported $160,310,000 for the same period in 1916, whereas during the year 1914 there was exported but $143,921; $5,187,000 is the money value of chemicals exported in 1916; it was less than a million dollars in 1914; $4,419,000 represents the value of our exports of automobiles in 1916, as against nothing in 1914. Very large increases over the years before the war, were maintained last year in the export of horses, wheat, steel, iron, and the manufactures of iron and steel. The excess of exported manufactured goods in 1917 over 1914 will alone amount to over $300,000,000.

I trust that hon. gentlemen will not consider that I am unnecessarily consuming the time of the House in seeking thus to accentuate the fact that our abnormal trade development is almost absolutely the result of unfortunate war conditions, that it is not a healthy or normal development, and that it must cease with the ending of the war, which we all hope will be soon. So, really, it does not afford us much ground for unbounded gratification. It is rather a situation of gravity, for the future at least, and contains many features demanding our serious consideration. Friends of the Administration are therefore not in a position to ascribe to this Government any credit or glory for this abnormal trade development.

I wish to say a few words with respect to our income and expenditure during the past year. According to the statement of the Minister of Finance this afternoon, our revenue from all sources during the past year was $230,000,000, $134,000,000 of which was derived from customs, $24,000,000 from excise, and $12,000,000 from the business profits tax. Our expenditure in consolidated revenue account and capital account combined amounted to $170,000,000. This leaves a surplus of $60,000,000 to be applied against war expenditure. We are also informed by the Minister of Finance that our war expenditures up to the end of last year had reached the tremendous sum of $600,000,000; and he anticipates that at the end of the present fiscal year our national debt will amount to $1,300,000,000. This will entail an interest charge of about $65,000,000 a year. There will be a pension account also of about $25,000,000 a year. That is to say, there will be fixed annual charges of from $90,000,000 to $95,000,000, or more than the total revenues of Canada from taxation in any year since Confederation, except for about five years and these all in the latter part of the last decade. We find that the war is costing us over $1,000,000 a day. Now, I think that, if one were to go carefully into the figures it would be found that our contribution from revenue to war expenditures thus far has been less than $60,000,000. Against the surplus of $60,000,000 which we have to apply to war expenditure at the end of the last fiscal year this year, there was a considerable deficit in 1914 which must be reckoned into the calculation. I speak subject to correction, but I think we have

paid considerably less than $60,000,000 on account of our war expenditures from the beginning up to the present time. Now, it is a fair question to put to this House and to the country: With our expenditures on war account, great as they are, and with this country so prosperous, whether it is satisfactory that we should have contributed out of our revenue toward that expenditure only $60,000,000 or less? Are we now doing our full duty, or are we leaving too much to the future to pay? I believe that we are borrowing too much and paying too little.

There are facts which should be carefully considered in this connection. After the war, we shall have a national debt of from $1,300,000,000 to $1,500,000,000, with charges for interest and pensions approximating, as I have already pointed out, $100,000,000 a year, which must be paid and for which the people must be taxed. We shall have a smaller supply of capital, interest rates will be higher, and the productive capacity of the country will be less. The transition from a state of peace to a state of war was made easier in our case by the absorption of men into the army, but the transition in the reverse direction will be complicated, not only by the discharge of munition workers from their employment, but in addition there will be the demobilization of the army. These are important facts and should be considered in discussing the question whether we should or should not now tax ourselves more in order to pay a greater portion of our war obligations than we are paying. We must further remember that the immense expenditure for war which is being added to our debt is unproductive. It leaves us richer in ideals and in history, it is true, but in a monetary sense the expenditure is unproductive. If the amount which we are obliged to borrow for war purposes were expended in the construction of railways, the development of agriculture, and the establishment of industrial enterprises, it would add to the productive power of industry and trade thus making it relatively easier to meet interest and sinking fund charges upon the debt. With these things in mind, is the Government policy with respect to taxation for war expenditure the correct one? Is it one which is approved by the best judgment of our people? Are we not handing down to posterity the obligation to pay too largely for our patriotic performances?

Taking the position, as I do, that we are not presently contributing sufficiently to war expenditures, I realize that hon. gentlemen opposite will naturally inquire what suggestion hon. members on this side would make, what policy they would propound. In the first place I assert, and this is but a repetition of what we on this side have said on every budget deliverance of the Minister of Finance since the beginning of the war, there should be further retrenchment in civil expenditure so as to leave a greater amount to apply to war expenditures, thus minimizing the additions to our debt. We have presented this view in the past, generally and in detail, and there is no necessity for me to repeat at length these arguments, nor do I intend to do so. Some little improvement has been made, and I think hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have reason to feel gratified that their criticisms in this respect in the past, have borne some fruit at least.

Our consolidated fund account expenditure for the last year amounted to $122,392,000. Our interest charges and pensions, due to the war and payable in the last fiscal year, amounted to $14,500,000; at least that is what I make it from an official statement furnished me, although I understood the Minister of Finance to say this afternoon that it amounted to $25,000,000. But, I think $14,500,000 represents the actual additional amounts chargeable to war and paid on interest and pension account for the year ended March 31 last. If you deduct this $14,500,000 from the $122,392,000, the total amount of the consolidated fund expenditure last year, you have a net consolidated fund account expenditure of $107,482,000, not a cent of which is attributable to war. The question naturally arises, and I put it to the House, if that is a fair amount for this country to expend in war days, a sum which is above the amount expended for similar purposes in days of peace, and when the country was growing and developing in population and in wealth, and when every branch of the public service was adequately fed. In 1910 our expenditures on consolidated fund account amounted to $79,411,000; in 1911 to $87,774,000 and in 1912, to $98,161,000. These were prosperous days in Canada; they were days of peace. Am I making an extravagant statement when I say that in the year ended March 31 last, having in view the circumstances and conditions prevailing, $107,482,000 was an expenditure for ordinary purposes which was unnecessarily excessive. If that had been reduced to the amount of the expenditure in 1910, our sur-

plus for this year, instead of being $60,000,000, would have been over $80,000,000, and that we would have reduced the national debt to that further extent.

On previous occasions I have discussed with some particularity the financial operations of some of the departments of Government. I find that still there is very little reduction, if any, in many departmental expenditures, and it is very difficult for me to understand why this should be so, because in several of these departments at least there is not the peace time activity, and there is not accordingly the necessity for the same volume of expenditure as in days of peace. I find that our Immigration expenditures for 1911 and 1917 are practically the same, the difference being only $68. In 1911 I suppose our immigrants numbered 300,000 or more—I am speaking from memory only—last year our immigration did not much exceed 50,000. The quarantine branch expenditures are practically the same as in peace days notwithstanding the fact that at our national ports we have no immigration. I suppose if one took the time to inquire why there was no diminution in the expenditure of this particular branch of the Government one would find that at the ports of Halifax, St. John and Quebec we have quarantine officers who are being paid the usual salaries which they received in peace days, notwithstanding the fact that there is absolutely no immigration at any of these ports, and there has been none practically during the last three years, yet these quarantine officers, I believe it would be found, are being paid for services which are not performed. The expenses of administration of the Indian department are a little larger than they were in 1911, a circumstance which is difficult to understand and more difficult to explain. The Dominion Lands expenditures to-day are greater than in 1911 notwithstanding the fact that our lands entries in the Canadian Northwest are necessarily far below those of peace days, the natural result of the loss of immigration. In the Public Works Department there was last year a very substantial reduction, a reduction which should have been commenced immediately after the beginning of the war. I might inform the Minister of Finance that the Public Works Department made unnecessary expenditures in 1915 and 1916 which will exceed the amount he will likely obtain next year from the taxation proposals which he announced to-day. We find that public works expenditures on consolidated fund account are still practically spending what it was in 1911. I have not the figures before me, but they are somewhere about $8,000,000. I repeat what I have said on many other occasions when discussing the budget that there is no reason why the expenditures of this department should not be very much reduced below what they were last year, and they were very considerably below what they were the previous year. I find that the Post Office Department expenses were greater than in 1911, or 1912, by about $6,000,000. I do not intend to refer to the departmental expenditure at greater length. I have said what I have largely to again impress upon the Government if I can the fact that the method of procuring money to meet war expenditures and to keep the national debt down to the minimum, is to retrench in our civil expenditures, and I submit to-day, as I have oftentimes done in the past, that there is an opportunity for a saving of $25,000,000 in that field, which is a very substantial sum, and it should be saved.

It should be said that very substantial reductions have been made in two or three branches of the public service; but they were forced reductions, they were unavoidable. For instance, in the fiscal year ending in 1917 the expenditures on account of the militia were $3,800,000. In 1914 the expenditures for militia were $11,000,000. Here we find a saving of over $7,000,000 in one department alone. That, of course, was a forced reduction in expenditure. It was inevitable, it was unavoidable. Similar reductions have occurred in respect of the naval service, in respect of steamboat mail subsidies; and were it not for the fact that in respect of these three branches of the public service savings aggregating ten or eleven million dollars, have been forced, there would have been, in reality, no reduction in the civil expenditures of the country as compared with the expenditures of former years.

One cannot but ask: Why are not some very substantial reductions being made in our ordinary expenditures? I think I have established pretty clearly, and pointed out, I trust, in a very fair way, that there is an opportunity of administrative retrenchment which would amount to $25,000,000 or $30,000,000, and naturally I ask: Why is this not done? I submit that if the Government made up its mind to be bold and strong in the crisis and to part company with patronage and party considerations, this could be done, and that if patronage and

party considerations were eliminated from war expenditures we would be relieved of adding to our public debt a sum which would approximate over $100,000,000. The announcement of the application of $60,000,000, being the surplus, towards the reduction of our war expenditures was received with much gratification by hon gentlemen opposite. But that is no proof or evidence of proper administration upon the part of the Government. The statement I make is that instead of the application of a surplus of $60,000,000, there should have been an application of a sum of considerably over $100,000,000, and that would have been more gratifying still to hon. gentlemen opposite, as it would have been to hon. gentlemen upon this side of the House.

Upon the occasion of the Budget debate last year, we received from the Minister of Trade and Commerce some encouragement that hereafter there would be an elimination of party and political considerations in the expenditure of public money, particularly in these days. I should like to read to the House, in order that hon. members may not forget, the very noble utterance, the solemn exhortations, of the Minister of Trade and Commerce upon that occasion directed largely to his own colleagues in the Government and his friends behind him, in respect to this phase of public affairs. He said:

> Now, as to patronage, I have been thirty-four years in public life; I have been a pretty close student of political parties and political history in this country, and I have simply this to say—I give it as my individual opinion—I have long felt it and I feel it now—that in the whole course of my political life I cannot point to a single instance where political patronage ever raised the status of the bench, ever promoted the efficiency of the Civil Service, ever helped to economy in administration or enhanced the status of public administrators, no matter what functions they performed, ever helped a member of Parliament in reality, or ever strengthened a Government in reality. On the contrary it almost always causes the dry rot and disintegration that break up government after government and party after party, and I wish now, in the white heat and light of this great contest and struggle and the self-sacrifice that we are called upon to make, that we might speak from the heart out, and make an agreement in this country between both parties, that hereafter patronage shall not be applied by political parties in the administration of our public services.

I had hoped for much from these remarks of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, given to the House last year. I had hoped that he would have been a powerful influence in translating this solemn exhortation into actual practice. I had hoped that he would have exercised a favourable and compelling influence upon his colleagues towards the elimination of patronage and waste in respect to Government expenditure. But, the Minister of Trade and Commerce has been on many and on long journeys since then. I fear he is absorbed in visionary occupations which consume too much altogether of his time and energy and which apparently up to this date have all been barren of result, so far as the good of the country is concerned. It would seem that the solemn injunctions of the Minister of Trade and Commerce last year and the practice of the Government in this respect are practically two separate currents, running in absolutely opposite directions and seldom, if ever, gliding into one another. A great gulf, I am sorry to say, separates the preachments of the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the actual practice of the Government in this respect to war expenditure during the year that has just closed. In respect to war expenditures I wish to submit, though I do not propose discussing the matter in detail, that we still find partisanship and patronage entwining their vulgar forms around the beautiful administrative ideals which the Minister of Trade and Commerce held up to our adoration last year and which he exhorted the Government to adopt.

I notice upon the Order Paper a Bill standing in the name of the Minister of Railways, entitled "An Act to Encourage and Assist the Improvement of Highways." I have not seen the Bill, but, according to the newspapers, it involves a contemplated expenditure of $10,000,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In these war times?

Mr. MACLEAN: $10,000,000. I say that this Bill is for the relief of the Government, not for the relief of highways. It is founded not upon public policy, but upon party exigencies. It cannot but shock all sensible people to find that in the existing circumstances the Government proposes to introduce a bill involving an expenditure of $10,000,000—an expenditure which, by the way, they do not intend to make this year, or next year. I shall lose my confidence in the judgment of the people of my country if they approve of the action of the Government in bringing forward for the approval of Parliament at this present moment a measure of this character. Perhaps the measure is not the Government's; it may be that of the Minister of Railways, who has a reputation for inflexible determination to turn neither to the right nor to the left when he undertakes anything. This is an

admirable quality and I admire it wherever found. Sometimes, however, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways is diabolical in his pertinacity and determination to swerve neither to the right nor to the left. He recently drove a whole family almost to political suicide in my province; there is one constituency in the province of Nova Scotia which does not know whether or not it is represented in this Parliament. This Bill involves an expenditure of $10,000,000. The Government have no policy, no scheme, no plan worked out in regard to this proposed expenditure; I venture the assertion that the matter has not received from them five minutes' consideration. They have had no conferences with provinces or municipalities, or with men who are expert in highway construction. They do not know whether they could go to the money markets of the world to-day and borrow $10,000,000 if the purpose of their borrowing were disclosed. Further, they could not expend one single dollar of that money this year if it were voted to them this minute by Parliament. If they attempted to do so it would be nothing less than utter and wicked waste. I assert that the purpose for which this Bill has been placed upon the order paper at this stage is to meet party exigencies. I do not say that at the proper time, under proper conditions and safeguards, when the Government shall have given mature consideration to the matter of assisting the highways of our country, such a policy would not be a beneficent and truly wise one; but at this moment, without these safeguards and without these conditions existing, it is not a wise proposal. If the Minister of Railways has not yet spoken to his colleague, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, as to the propriety, financially and morally, of asking for this legislation, I would suggest that on the return of the Minister of Trade and Commerce from Washington he should enter into a serious and solemn conference with that colleague and obtain his opinion in regard to the matter. I hardly think, however, that the Minister of Trade and Commerce, if he still entertains the altruistic ideas which he propounded to the House about a year ago in respect to public expenditures, will approve the proposed scheme.

I have spoken at some length as to the propriety of husbanding our financial resources which are derivable from customs, excise and our special war taxation. The question naturally comes to one's mind: should these sources of revenue be supplemented? From what I have already submitted to the House it would logically appear that our revenues should be supplemented in some form or other. How far should a Government finance a war by loan and how far by taxation is a very interesting question and a somewhat difficult one to answer in precise terms. All countries engaged in war at the present day or in times past have been obliged to consider this matter. In the case of Canada, inevitably we must do a great deal of borrowing, but it is an important question for consideration as to how much of war expenditure we should secure by taxation. It is my opinion that the impression is deep-seated and widely prevalent in Canada that a vast quantity of substantial wealth and income is not contributing to the revenue of the country for war purposes. In my personal experience I have found men who really feel that they are not contributing out of their abundance more than they do towards the payment of our war expenditures. Concerns and individuals who are enjoying unprecedented profits and incomes due to the war are not in many cases reached at all in the matter of revenue for war purposes. The limit which the poor can pay is soon reached. They may be fairly prosperous, but that will be short-lived, and there is this to be remembered as well: their incomes buy no more, perhaps less, than it did before the war. I submit, as a sound principle of taxation, that of the money needed by the state, the rich should contribute more than the moderately rich and the moderately rich more than the poor, and that the amounts contributed should increase, not proportionately, but progressively, as wealth increases. There is a great distinction between financing a war by loans and financing it by taxation. In financing by taxation the rich and the moderately rich bear the whole burden of the charge placed upon them at the time. Under the loan method they are compensated by taxation laid on all sections and classes of the community which future generations must pay as a reward for the patriotic conduct of those who have been good enough to loan money to the state. We have spent now in connection with the war some six hundred million dollars, and, at the very most, we have paid but sixty million dollars. Is that sufficient? It is not sufficient; there should be more taxation and less borrowing, that being the proper policy to pursue in the circumstances. The scope of the Business Profits War Tax Act should be

widened, as it is a fair matter of complaint on the part of many of those who are already taxed under that Act that there are many other concerns and partnerships which barely fail to qaulify within the Act as taxpayers, but which should be contributing something. In many cases their profits exceed the profits of companies and concerns which are taxed under the Business Profits War Tax Act. It is very hard to answer that criticism because, as the minister himself stated this afternoon, any businessman or concern that is to-day making a profit, is doing so almost entirely owing to war conditions, and therefore, as the minister put it, such profit is fairly a matter of taxation.

I shall not, at the present moment at least, analyse the announcement made by the minister this afternoon in respect to additional taxation under the Business Profits War Tax Act. I would, however, point out to him that it would have been far better had he last year imposed this taxation under that Act to the same extent as he proposes to do this year, because the profits earned by those liable to taxation under that Act were very much greater last year than they will be this year, or than they will be next year. Many concerns in Canada manufacturing munitions which made large profits last year are not likely to make very much profit this year and are likely to make much less the next year. The minister states that if the war continues, the Government will probably have to make a further levy of taxation upon business profits. The time to secure all you can as a tax on business profits is when the maximum profits are being earned, because it is useless imposing taxation when such profits have practically ceased to be earned. It is in the day of prosperity that he should secure by taxation the maximum amount, and he should not wait until the last days of the war, when the financial conditions of the country will not be as they are to-day, to impose fresh taxation in the hope of securing additional revenue. If he does so, I believe he will fail.

I wish to refer briefly to that portion of our revenue which is secured by taxation upon imports. At the beginning of the war or shortly afterwards, the minister brought into effect amendments to the tarriff, imposing seven and a half per cent surtax upon the general tarriff, and seven and a half per cent upon non-dutiable goods. This application of the seven and a half per cent tax was made indiscriminately, and I said then and I say now, I am of the opinion that it was not in the interest of the country, nor of the revenues, to have applied the seven and a half per cent tax indiscriminately as he did. In the one case to the general tarriff and in the other by applying it to free goods. Were one to take the time to study carefully the result of the imposition the seven and a half per cent upon the general tarriff, one could, I think, show that it has yielded little or no revenue. I find in the Customs returns for 1916 at page 192 sets forth that the tariff war tax yielded $21,-814,000, and I take it that that statement in the Customs returns means that the $21,-814,000 came from the seven and a half per cent super tax on dutiable goods and the seven and a half per cent tax on free goods.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What year was that?

Mr. MACLEAN: The year ended March 31, 1916. I find that in that year free goods were imported to the amount of $254,312,000, and seven and a half per cent on that would yield about $19,000,000, so that it would appear that out of the total revenue of $21,-814,000 received from this source, $19,000,000 came from free goods and practically nothing came from the imposition of the seven and a half per cent super tax upon imports already dutiable. If that statement be susceptible of any explanation, I have no doubt we shall have it. As a matter of fact, however, I think it was always anticipated by the Minister of Finance that he would get little revenue by reason of the imposition of the seven and a half per cent super tax on dutiable goods, but that he would get a substantial revenue from the imposition of the seven and a half per cent tax on free goods. If it be the case that the imposition of the seven and a half per cent super tax on dutiable goods is yielding little or no revenue, it should be removed, it does not promote trade interests it rather impedes trade. It adds to the cost of articles essential to life to-day, now oppressive in prices, thereby involving a great hardship to the masses of the people. I submit there should have been some readjustment of the tariff this year, and what more natural than to expect a remission of the surtax of 7½ per cent upon the general tariff. Why should it not be removed, in some cases at least? If its imposition was intended virtually to prohibit some classes of imports, which might at present in some cases be desirable, I would not object. It might be justifiable to continue

the present duties on luxuries. Speaking generally, however, I say that the imposition of the 7½ per cent surtax was a mistake in the first place, and I think in justice to the people of this country it should be removed, or modified at least and this would have been a proper time for the Minister of Finance to act in that respect.

The Minister of Finance was considering the question of tariffs quite recently, from motives of party welfare I have no doubt, and not in the interests of the state, and by subterranean paths rather than by direct routes. I am sure it must have been a veritable Gethsemane for him when the hon. gentleman who now sits at his right hand (Mr. Meighen) returned from the West a few days ago and informed him that he must enter into a reciprocity treaty with the United States. The Government have, in fact, entered into a statutory reciprocity treaty with the United States, terminable at the will of either country, in respect of wheat and flour, which have been so long the subject of discussion in Parliament and the country. If the Government are truthful men, and speak after intelligent consideration of the matters upon which they assume to guide and instruct the public, I suppose now, in view of this arrangement, we must expect Canadian wheat to lose its identity, Canadian eastbound and westbound traffic to be very much injured, if it does not altogether cease to exist, the flour mills of this country to be ruined and go into the hands of receivers, and this country to become, for a time at least, the back-door of Chicago. But if the Government are not true prophets, and the prevailing view in Western Canada is correct, we shall all be benefited temporarily, and later this temporary arrangement will inevitably be made permanent.

5 p.m.

Mr. GRAHAM: Under which flag?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am not going to say very much about the placing of wheat on the free list, because there are many gentlemen on this side of the House who are better informed on that subject than I, and they propose discussing the subject in this debate. I have only one word to say about it. This statutory treaty, was negotiated and put into effect under the War Measures Act. Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that by no flight of the imagination can any man truthfully say that that Order in Council was properly a war measure.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It was a death-bed repentance.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It was a political measure prompted by partisan motives almost entirely, I venture to say. It involved an amendment to the tariff of this country. Now, in our Customs Act, we have ample machinery for doing exactly what was done by this Order in Council passed under the War Measures Act. At any rate, Parliament was about to meet; the representatives of the people were soon to assemble in this forum to deliberate on all matters of interest to the country, and in fairness and justice to the people, who are the masters, I say this change in the tariff should have been announced here by the minister. He should have given Parliament his reasons for the change here to-day; the representatives of the people should have heard from his own lips the reasons which prompted him to make this move, so that we could determine whether or not he was justified in making it.

Mr. GRAHAM: His reason for the change is sitting right beside him (Mr. Meighen).

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I doubt very much if he had authority under the War Measures Act to pass the Order in Council. I have not given the matter much consideration, though I propose to do so later on, but I doubt very much if the Order in Council is within the spirit of the Act, and I am afraid my hon. friend had no legal authority for passing the Order in Council. Indeed, I doubt very much whether the United States will accept the Order in Council as the equivalent of placing wheat and flour on the free list. I doubt if in the end they will permit our wheat and flour to enter the United States duty free. It is certainly not within the spirit of the conditions contained in their tariff Act. I doubt whether the proper authority in the United States responsible for rulings on tariff questions will consider this Order in Council as placing Canadian wheat and flour on their free list in the sense intended by the United States Tariff Act. However, this matter will be discussed later on. I assume that hon. gentlemen opposite consider that the passage of this Order in Council will result in some benefit to the producers of wheat in western Canada. I assume they had that in mind when the Order in Council was passed, although not so much as they had in mind party considerations. But if they thought it would benefit the West, why was not the Order in Council passed last

autumn? Would it not have done more good then than to-day, when last year's production has been largely disposed of, although no doubt a considerable portion of the crop is still held in the West. But if it was a good thing to do at the beginning of the seeding season of 1917, would it not have been a better thing to do at the beginning of the harvest season of 1916? Will the Minister of Finance or his colleagues explain upon what grounds the Government refused to place wheat and flour on the free list in August or September last, when it was urged just as strongly then as now? How long does the Government expect that this Order in Council shall remain effective? Do I understand the minister and the Government to say that as soon as the war ends this Order in Council becomes void?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Order in Council has precisely the same effect as an Act of this Parliament.

Mr. MACLEAN: We understand one another, I think. When the war ends the Order in Council ends.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No, the effect of that Order in Council is to place wheat, wheat flour, and semolina on the free list, and they remain on the free list until a change is made by or under the authority of Parliament.

Mr. MACLEAN: I am glad to have that as the opinion of the Minister of Finance. I suppose it is the view of the Government. But from the proposition stated by the minister I entirely dissent.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If the hon. gentleman wishes, I can give him the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice, whose opinion is entitled to some weight.

Mr. MACLEAN: It is.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Does the minister say that these articles can be removed from the free list only by the authority of Parliament?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Wheat, wheat flour, and semolina have been placed on the free list by Order in Council, which Order in Council has precisely the same authority as an Act of Parliament.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: So far, so good.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The effect of that Order in Council remains until some other disposition of the matter is made by or under the authority of this Parliament.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The minister does not say, by Act of Parliament?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If the hon. gentleman wants a legal opinion, and if he will permit me, I will read the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice on this matter. It is as follows:

> I have considered upon your suggestion the effect of the Order in Council of 16th instant, whereby His Excellency the Governor General in Council directed under the authority of the War Measures Act, 1914, that wheat, wheat flour and semolina should be transferred to the list of goods which may be imported into Canada free of duty of customs.
>
> Section 6 of the War Measures Act 1914 confers upon the Governor in Council very comprehensive powers to make such orders and regulations as he may by reason of the war deem advisable for the peace, order and welfare of Canada, and for greater certainty, but not so as to restrict, it is declared, that these powers extend to all matters coming within certain classes of subjects specially mentioned, among others, "trade, exportation, importation, production, and manufacture." It is provided, moreover, that all such orders and regulations shall have the force of law.
>
> This section has always been interpreted and acted upon as intended to confer legislative powers, and I am of opinion that that intention is expressed with sufficient aptitude, and that therefore the legislative powers of Parliament, within the purview of the section, have been delegated to the Governor in Council. Moreover, having regard to the narrative of the Order in Council, the power executed in the sanctioning of the Order in Council, appears to fall very clearly, not only within the general description of powers, but also within the special enumeration to which I have referred. Therefore I am of opinion that the Order in Council became effective as from its date permanently to remove the duty imposed by the customs tariff from wheat, wheat flour, and semolina, and that these products accordingly become free of customs duty, and will remain free unless fresh duties be imposed by or under the authority of Parliament.

Mr. MURPHY: What is the date of that memorandum?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is dated 17th April.

Mr. MACLEAN: I have great confidence in the legal acumen of the Deputy Minister of Justice, and ordinarily I should defer to his opinion; but in this matter, I submit with confidence, the opinion which he has given the minister is an erroneous one, if it is contended that the opinion is to the effect that the Order in Council extends beyond the end of the war. I believe that the Order in Council passed under the War Measures Act ends with the war. And if that be true the houses of Hohenzollern

and Hapsburg have as much to do with the termination of this Order in Council as have the Government and the people of Canada. The letter which has just been read is to the effect that under section 6 of the War Measures Act ample authority and power is vested in the Governor in Council to pass the Order in Council in question. That is a debatable question I submit, though I do not deny that there is room for the position taken by the Deputy Minister of Justice. But I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to section 3 of the Act, which is as follows:

3. The provisions of sections 6, 10, 11 and 13 of this Act shall only be in force during war, invasion or insurrection, real or apprehended.

That is, when the war ends, Section 6 is no longer in force.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But what is done under it is still in force.

Mr. MACLEAN: Not at all. That is an absurd position, I submit, for my learned friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) to take. Perhaps I should not say "absurd"—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Let me ask the hon. gentleman a question. Under the War Measures Act we are expropriating the Ross rifle factory. Will he say that when the war is over that factory reverts to its former owners?

Mr. MACLEAN: No, because nothing is left to revert.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The factory would still be there.

Mr. MACLEAN: The powers of the Government were exhausted to the absolute extinction of the title of the Ross rifle property in its former owners.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But not of the factory.

Mr. MACLEAN: Under this Act it is explicitly stated that the provisions of section 6 on the cessation of the war shall no longer be in force. An Order in Council cannot remain alive unless it is based upon some living statutory authority. That is the rational, the reasonable construction of the Act. It was never intended that the War Measures Act should permit an amendment of the Customs Act that should continue in operation after the cessation of the war. At the most it was intended that this power should be extended to the Government temporarily and during the continuance of the war, and during that time the Act and possibly the Order in Council is in force. Therefore, I say, this Order in Council with respect to flour and wheat is in operation only during the war and terminates with the ending of the war. If the Minister of Finance intended that these products should be placed upon the free list, there was a positive and direct way to accomplish that end. He should have proceeded under the Customs Act. He could have announced an amendment to the Tariff Act to-day in this House, and in that very instant of time the amendment would have become operative throughout the whole country. I always anticipated that it was the intention of the Government that this Order in Council should be operative only during the war. The Parliamentary Secretary for External Affairs (Mr. Hugh Clark), speaking recently at Montreal, stated that it was proper to do this for the United States, because now she was our ally. Now, it seems the logical inference that when the war is over and the United States is no longer our ally in war, the reason for the Order in Council having ceased to exist, the Order in Council itself will automatically pass away. The Parliamentary Secretary for External Affairs evidently entertains the same view I do about the scope of the Order in Council.

It was for these reasons that a few moments ago I ventured the statement that the passage of this Order in Council was not a declaration of settled policy, but was a matter of party and political manoeuvring forced upon the Government by their friends from the western provinces. The hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) is not as astute as the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Railways is a plain, blunt man who goes directly to his objective point, but the Minister of Finance has more experience and skill in finesse, and he will endeavour to achieve his point, not always by direct, but if needs be by indirect and circuitous routes, if to him it seems politically more advantageous. Had the Minister of Railways been as astute as the Minister of Finance, he would have introduced his Highways Bill under the War Measures Act. The Highways Bill will be designated by the people of Canada of both parties as a piece of political manoeuvring, and the Minister of Railways will likely go down in history as a pure politician. The Minister of Finance attempted to amend the Tariff Act by means of the War Measures Act, and his friends will claim that he is a patriot. That is the dis-

tinction. It shows that they were brought up in different schools. The one is the product of the methods adopted on King street, Toronto; the other is the plain, old-fashioned, product of the school of North Bay, Ontario.

If this new reciprocity treaty is to be stable, and if it represents a declaration of public policy on the part of the Government, then it will have the hearty approval of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. If it is to be in force during the continuance of the war only, and is terminable at the will of our enemies, or at the moment we accomplish their defeat, or if it was enacted, as it would appear to have been, as a purely party and political expedient, it is to be condemned by every right-thinking man in this country. This is not a time to play fast and loose with such a matter as our tariff. These matters should be dealt with by open, frank and proper methods. It appears to me that it was never intended that this Order in Council was to represent the real economic policy of the Government upon a vexed issue; I believe it to be a pure party and political measure. If the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) desired for the people of the western provinces, whom he represents in the Government, that they have permanently the advantage of the American market for their wheat and flour, he would have suggested and insisted that the Order in Council be based upon, not the War Measures Act, but the Customs Tariff law, or better still, that the amendment to the tariff be made on the floor of Parliament by the Minister of Finance when he was delivering his annual budget. I am not saying that if this Order in Council is to be effective only during the period of the war it will not be of some benefit to the western producers of wheat, but I do say that it will be more beneficial to them if they know that it is to be permanent. You could not encourage the western wheat producer to grow wheat under this Order in Council if he knew that it ended on the 30th day of June, 1917, if the war should then end. You must have the element of permanency in anything to ensure the full measure of benefit, and particularly in an Order in Council of this character.

Mr. LALOR: Is the hon. gentleman aware that wheat is 27 cents a bushel to-day higher in Winnipeg than in Chicago?

Mr. MACLEAN: If the hon. gentleman says that is a fact I accept his word. I am not endeavouring to argue that phase of the question at all. If the price of wheat is 27 cents a bushel higher in Chicago than in Winnipeg then I say, let the western farmer feel that he is likely to reap that advantage permanently.

Mr. LALOR: I think the hon. gentleman misunderstood me; what I said was just the opposite. I said that in Winnipeg it was 27 cents higher than in Chicago.

Mr. MACLEAN: Well, I suppose my hon. friend will then say to his friends and the Government that the passage of the Order in Council was a foolish thing. Now, they give a further reason for the passage of this Order in Council and I want to read it to the House. This is a most astonishing thing as it appears to me:

> And whereas it is desirable at a time when a special appeal is being made for increased agricultural production to supply grain and food stuffs to Great Britain and her Allies which now include the United States of America,—

It would appear that the Order in Council was passed to encourage the production of wheat and flour in this country so that we might help our ally the United States. That is what that portion of the Order in Council which I have read seems to suggest. I suppose it was inserted for that purpose. If so, it is deceptive, because it does not truly set forth the facts. The United States is a great producer of wheat, as we are, and our Allies, Britain, France and Belgium look to the United States as they look to us, to exert our utmost efforts to see that sufficient food products are grown this year, next year and the following year after that, whether the war so long continues or not, in order that the needs of the Allies, present and future, may be met. The Order in Council is based in part on the theory that the rich and powerful republic to the south of us might need our wheat and our flour, and as our ally and for her possible succor we should encourage the production of wheat in this country. That is a proposition I cannot subscribe to. The United States has just entered the war. She has dedicated her life and her fortunes, everything they have, and everything they are, with the pride of those who knew that the time had come when they were privileged to spend their blood and their might for the principles which gave them birth and happiness, using the exact words of President Wilson

And they came in at a very opportune moment for the Allies. They came in with $7,000,000,000 to start with, an amount almost equal to the total gold supply of the whole world. I do not think it is fair to say in that Order in Council that we should necessarily encourage the production of wheat in the Canadian provinces for our new and mighty Ally, the United States. Our wheat is not vital to her life, I trust. If they want wheat they are willing to buy it and pay for it as a commercial transaction.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN: While the Government were considering the matter of amending the tariff under the War Measures Act, which was an objectionable method, I say they should have considered further amendments to the tariff. The Minister of Finance was sweating great drops of blood and undergoing terrible agony when he consented to the new reciprocity treaty to satisfy his friends of the western provinces, and he might as well have considered the abandonment of further items of tariff taxation, limited though it might be, to encourage agricultural production, which is needed now and in the next few years to come. Should the war fortunately end during the current year, as I trust it will, there would still exist a great necessity for increased productions in all the food-producing countries of the world for 1918, and the same will be true of 1919 and 1920. The world will be fortunate indeed if it escapes a famine, not only during the days of actual war, but after the days of peace come and the armies have been restored to their several countries. Any Government policy should be predicated not upon the demands of to-day or to-morrow, or of this year, but upon those of several years to come. Talking production is waste of time unless we encourage and assist as far as we can those who are engaged in agricultural pursuits. The removal of duties upon fertilizers, farm machinery and all the instruments of production would be of considerable advantage in these years to the men who are exhorted by Governments and by business men and by everybody to increase their productions. Even if you did it under the War Measures Act, it would be evidence of good intention at least. But we observe that there is nothing in the speech which has been delivered by the Minister of Finance to indicate that he has given any consideration whatever to aid in this manner increased production.

In many other respects much might be done to encourage production. There might be a reduction in freight rates upon all the commodities which are instruments in production, such as farm machinery and fertilizers. It would not be a difficult matter for this country to arrange in one way or another, even if it were paid for out of the treasury, to have the freight rates reduced upon these commodities which are so essential in production. It would assist in the accomplishment of the end which we all desire. Then I think the Government might very well insist upon a preference in transportation for such things as seed, fertilizers, farm machinery, etc., in view of the existing congestion of traffic. If we desire to actually increase production it is only a fair suggestion that there should be some preference in transportation in view of the congestion and the many restrictions to-day placed upon transportation, in order that we might thus encourage the men whom we are continuously and persistently exhorting to increase production for the good of this country, for the welfare of humanity, and for the great cause which we have at heart. Further, would not a reduction, or an elimination entirely in many cases, of the duty on high-priced articles of necessity be of advantage to the Canadian consumer to-day? Would it not widen the field of competition and assist in the restoration of more healthy trade conditions and thus restrict the possibility of manipulation of prices and the withholding of products from the market? Every other protectionist country in the world has since the beginning of the war reduced or removed entirely the duties upon food products. This is the only country in the world, I think, which deliberately undertook to increase taxation upon the actual necessities of life, even food products, when the 7½ per cent was added to the general tariff in 1915. I think I may fairly be justified in expressing my surprise that nothing has been done by the Government in this direction. Apparently they have not taken into consideration at all the doing of anything to relieve the distress and anxiety of so many of our people in respect to the high cost of living. Nothing has been done. A commission was appointed some years ago to inquire into this matter, but, instead of being called a commission to inquire into the high cost of living, it might more properly be described as a commission to inquire as to what was the cost of the living of the dead. They have been engaged

upon this investigation for a long time now, and it looks as if most persons in this country who might be interested in that report will probably be numbered among the dead before any report is made. An Order in Council was passed not so very long ago delegating to the provinces and the municipalities the power of investigating, and, in certain circumstances, taking action where it was found that the prevailing prices were unfair and unjust. That was not a serious attempt to meet the situation, I submit. It is purely a jest. It was never intended as a serious act in respect to a very serious and vital question to the people of this country. I am perfectly justified in designating that Order in Council as an intended jest.

I said at the beginning of my remarks that there were many things not contained in the financial statement of the Minister of Finance which the people of this country might naturally expect to find in it. But I do not propose prolonging further my remarks at the present time. My colleagues upon this side will amplify and add to all that I have ventured to address to the House this afternoon in my imperfect way, and I shall no longer continue my remarks upon the motion of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): I rise, Sir, because, in the first place, I think it would be unfortunate for this debate to collapse at this moment without some attempt to bring home to the Parliament and to the people of Canada the exact financial position of the country as a result of the war; some conception of the magnitude of the problems which have arisen during the war and which are, no doubt, present to the mind of the hon. Minister of Finance, as, indeed, he indicated in very, very brief references in a very brief speech.

I cannot, Sir, quite join in the congratulations of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to the minister on the brevity of his speech. I myself believe in a brief speech; it is, as a rule, more effective than a long drawn-out harangue. But a Budget speech may be so brief as to be almost perfunctory. We have been accustomed for years in this House, in dealing with trade questions in the Budget, to hear our Finance Minister of either complexion of politics, in stating the figures of the trade, go into a little detail as to what part of it constitutes exports and what part of it constitutes imports; as to what part of the trade takes place with the United Kingdom and what part of it takes place with the United States, the two countries with which, of course, we do the vast proportion of our trade. That is one of the items in which, I venture to say, the speech of my hon. friend was brief almost to the point of being perfunctory. I can join, however, my hon. friend, the junior member for Halifax, in his congratulations to the minister on the favourable statement he has to make to the House as to the mere figures of the trade of the country and as to the prosperity we are enjoying at the present time. I join equally my hon. friend in the warnings he gave the House—warnings which were not needed by the minister—as to the transient nature of that prosperity and as to the peculiar way in which our trade has been increased.

Let me repeat, that it would be a misfortune if this debate had been allowed to collapse at the present moment. I do not think that the minister's speech, apart from dealing with the mere figures of our trade at the moment, can be considered a satisfactory statement of the financial conditions of the country; nor yet did it afford evidence of any idea in the mind of the minister or in the policy of the Government, as to the necessary steps which must be taken to deal with the terrible problems which are before this country and which have been referred to in a measure by my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax. Take the one figure that was given to us by my hon. friend from Halifax, that of a yearly interest charge of $65,000,000 which has already accrued as debt interest alone in this country since the beginning of war. When I reflect, Sir, that the total income and expenditure of Canada for all purposes was much below that figure twenty years ago, I cannot but think that as we are approaching the end of the war—we all hope so, anyhow—the minister might have given some evidence of the steps and the policies which will be necessary to deal with such interest charge and with the other innumerable problems which have already arisen out of the war and which will increase as the months go on.

The Minister of Finance closed his statement by saying that there were no tariff changes in the Budget. Well, as my hon. friend from Halifax has pointed out, that is not the way we get our tariff changes nowadays. In other words, if we are to apply the arguments which we heard in the country six years ago from my friend the Minister of Finance and from every gentleman on the other side of the House whose speeches I have perused—and which

we have heard from the minister in very recent times—we have been annexed to the United States by an Order in Council. Our railroads and our railroad services have been automatically twisted north and south by those who swore upon a hundred platforms that so far as they could they should never run any way except east and west. Well, if my hon. friend the Solicitor General and the Deputy Minister of Justice are right in their law—or, rather, I ought to say, if my hon. friend from Halifax is right in his law and the Order in Council lapses at the end of the war, I can only trust that the annexation will lapse then also.

I would not like to be in the position of the Minister of Finance on this question. He and I have had many good-natured bouts across this floor, and I do not think any one in the House has a greater admiration for many of his qualities than I have. But I must say that there is one of his qualities which I would not want to emulate, however much I might admire it. I have had far too little experience myself as a quick-change artist to envy his position at the present time. I cannot help recalling that only in the last session of Parliament my hon. friend delivered a speech one hour and three-quarters in duration—and that was quite a long speech, much longer than the Budget speech; one of his speeches upon which the member for Halifax could not have congratulated him on the quality of brevity—in which he gave the reasons why we should not have free wheat. What changes this war has brought about! I recall a special sentence in the first speech which my hon. friend delivered in this House. After having told us how his party had been put in power by the assembled and serried hordes of men behind him from the province of Ontario and how he had got the support of all classes in that province, he turned to us and said: "Would it not be the part of wisdom, the great province of Ontario having spoken in this way, for hon. gentlemen opposite to accept the verdict?" And now he himself, by an Order in Council, has torn the verdict to shreds and tatters. What changes, Mr. Speaker, this war has brought about! But I should be the last man to quarrel with the change, and here I offer my hearty congratulations to the minister. I hail with pleasure anything in the way of freer trade, come from where it may, and I offer the minister my hearty congratulations, as I do also upon his increase of direct taxation announced in his Budget statement.

I know, in answer to the comments that I have been making, that it will be said by some hon. gentlemen opposite—they have already been saying it in the country—that this free wheat is a mere war measure, and they leave the people of Ontario to infer that it will disappear at the end of the war. The Minister of Finance and the Solicitor General do not feel disposed to take that course; and if they do not, I shall give them credit for courage and honesty; but the fact remains that hon. gentlemen opposite are saying on the public platforms now that this is a war measure, and the inference is that it will disappear after the war is over. Something of that meaning must have been in the mind of the Minister of Trade and Commerce at an interview he gave on the status of the change. He made one of those curious statements that only he is capable of producing, when he said: "This is removed from the realm of trade." When I read that statement, two thoughts occurred to me: the first was, if it was removed from the realm of trade, into what realm was it removed? I wondered whether it had gone into the realm of science or astronomy or some realm of that kind. The second was, that we are dealing in wheat with the United States, disloyal though that may be, especially in this time of war. The keystone of the arch, as my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) said in the debate six years ago—I remember what he said because I followed his speech—is gone. We are dealing with the United States, but the Minister of Trade and Commerce says that this thing is removed from the realm of trade. Had he been here, I would have asked him what realm it has gone into. Then I would have gone on to ask him why a Minister of Trade and Commerce should rejoice in any act of the Government being removed from the realm of trade. To an ordinary man like myself, a Minister of Trade and Commerce ought to be a man whose endeavour is to promote trade, but the gentleman who holds the portfolio of Trade and Commerce at the present time might be better described as a minister to prevent trade. He went to the Antipodes and came back without paying expenses as the greatest commercial traveller in the world. On his way back he stopped off at Japan, but I do not know that our trade with Japan has increased by reason of his visit, and I do not

know of anything he has done to increase the trade of the country; and now when the Minister of Finance, aided by the advice and assistance of the Solicitor General, brings in a measure for the establishment of free trade in wheat with the United States of America, the Minister of Trade and Commerce rejoices in the fact that it is removed from the realm of trade. It will be said that this is a war measure and the inference will be drawn. I suppose every one says it is a war measure; that this is being done under the War Measures Act. If it be that, then I think even as fair an opponent of the Administration as I am myself, or as fair a critic of the Administration as I claim to have been, is entitled to point out that a little tardiness has been shown in producing this measure. The war has been in existence for two and three-quarters years. Surely, if it be only a war measure it should have occurred to the Administration sooner. The war was in a very active state a year ago when the Minister of Finance delivered a speech lasting an hour and three-quarters, telling us why we could not do this very thing. If it be a war measure—and we are all interested in war measures and in their success, I call you to witness, Sir, that no man can charge me with having taken much interest in anything else than the war for the last three years—why was it not put into force at the beginning of the war? My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has pointed to the fact that nearly every country at war made tremendous tariff changes almost immediately the war began. Take Germany, our great opponent in arms, but the exemplar of hon. gentlemen opposite in tariff matters—at least until lately. I really hope they will not go to Germany. The Minister of Trade and Commerce will not even call them Germans; he always refers to them as " Huns." What an illogical thing it would be for a civilized gentleman in the twentieth century to do—to go to the " Huns " for a fiscal policy. I should be sorry to do it myself; I would rather go to free England. That, however, is by the way. What did Germany do in regard to these matters? I read:—

On September 17, 1914, His Majesty's Minister at Copenhagen forwarded a list of the articles in respect of which customs duties had been suspended by the German Government up to that date.

From some points of view these Huns are a pretty wide-awake people, for this was done within six weeks of the commencement of the war.

[Mr. M. Clark.]

This list, which is a lengthy one, includes inter alia: Bread, beans, butter, eggs, poultry, edible fats, fish, meat, prepared alimentary products, cereals and flour, potatoes, cheese, cattle, pigs and sheep, and margarine.

The Board of Trade have also a copy of a German proclamation dated March 8, 1915, which temporarily suspended the customs duties on a large number of other articles, including certain fruit, game, arrowroot, sago and tapioca, sugar and yeast.

Let me say that similar changes were made—and almost as early—in Austria-Hungary, France, Italy, and in non-belligerent countries, such as Portugal and Spain. In Sweden customs duties on wheat and wheat flour—the very change to which my hon. friends opposite have become wide-awake after the war has been in existence for nearly three years—were suspended in December, 1914, when the war had not been in existence six months. I think it is fair to give the history of what these countries have done and to indulge in the reasonable criticism that, if this is to be defended as a war measure, then the Government must, with that defence, receive the condemnation of having been at least two years and a half too long in introducing it.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer) (resuming): Mr. Speaker, the war will pass. It is taking a long time and has brought heavy burdens and large problems, but it will pass. But the problems arising out of it, I venture to predict, will remain as long as the breath lasts in the body of the youngest member of this House. When I arose this afternoon it was with the serious purpose of endeavouring to contribute my humble quota to the financial principles which I believe will need to be followed by this country through its responsible ministers, of whatever political stripe they may be, if we are to deal satisfactorily with those problems within the present generation of men. I believe there will be such a change brought into the life of our country by the experiences of the war, and especially when our soldiers return, our soldiers who have gone in numbers which no one would have predicted was possible for Canada before the war, that our people will not be content with any perfunctory handling of these problems. They will demand that our public men shall go to the roots of them, shall study the needs of the

country, and the economic principles which are necessary to solve those needs.

I want to lay down four principles which I believe will guide our statesmen of the next generation in the solution of these problems. These principles will compel themselves to be adopted by our statesmen, whatever they may call themselves, Liberal, Tory or Independent. The first of them has nothing novel about it, but there must be something good about it, for it has always had very strong supporters in this House. I know that in enunciating these principles to my hon. friend the minister of Finance, I not only have one of the aptest minds to impress that Canada has at the present time in her service, or has had at any time so far as my knowledge of those minds goes, but from his utterances today I know that he is partially converted to my views already, and to the extent that he is not converted he has such an agile mind that I know his conversion will be simple if the conditions are at all favourable.

The first principle that I want to emphasize was dealt with at considerable length and in very great detail by my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) this afternoon. It will be absolutely necessary to economize to the utmost extent in the moneys of the country. Since Confederation, as far as my reading of Hansard has informed me, every party in this country when in opposition has preached ecomomy and I am afraid it is equally true that every party in office has practised extravagance. That is a very lamentable record for the people of this country. There are two reasons why that record will be broken after the war. I believe, Sir, for a time conditions will be so bad that there will not be the money to spend, and that is a sure way of curing a man of extravagance. I indicated the other reason a moment ago, when I said the people of this country will be so chastened, so changed by the war, and will direct such close attention to the proceedings of Parliament that they will no longer be content to watch the struggle between the ins and the outs, but will demand that sound principles be applied to finance and to the public policy of the country generally.

We have ten governments in this country; ten prime ministers for seven millions of people! Heaven save the mark. Ten sets of cabinet ministers, and ten sets of legislators. That is a pretty formidable thing just as I have stated it, but when you have each of these governments spending far more money than they should, I submit, Sir, that public extravagance has become in some of its aspects, the most serious problem and the most serious evil in the public life of this country. I do not want to say more under that head. I am perfectly certain that what I have said finds a resting place in the mind of every serious hon. gentleman in this House. It must do so, because the moment they get into Opposition they say exactly what I am saying, and have said so ever since Confederation.

The second principle which I want to lay down, and which will be forced upon the attention of our finance ministers, is that wealth must contribute more largely to the expenses of the Federal Government than it has ever done in the past. My hon. friend the minister indicated that this afternoon; he bases his proposed taxation in this Budget, as he did in his last, upon that principle. But I am not quite satisfied with the extent to which he is carrying his principle out. I am sure he means well, and I am sure the country recognizes that he has brought to the greater problems that have arisen during the course of this war a very acute mind and a very great knowledge of financial technique, and I am sure he has done what is perhaps the best thing that any man can do in this world: he has brought to the discharge of his duties an enormous amount of energy, continued application, and hard work. I say that with the very greatest pleasure, and I believe that it is generally recognized throughout the nation. But when I reflect that the business tax imposed last year, with all its retroaction, raised only $12,500,000, I do not think any one will seriously claim that wealth is making anything like its proper contribution in this day. towards the expenses of the Government. It is making no contribution comparable to the services and the sacrifices of the men in the trenches, and the generosity of the whole of our people, from the poorest to the wealthiest, in their private capacity, in support of the Belgian Relief, Red Cross, and Patriotic Funds, and in the hundred other ways that money has had to be raised in the course of the war. Compare that sum of $12,500,000 with the enormous increase in our trade, as revealed in the figures of the Finance Minister, especially the enormous increase in our export

trade. What, Sir, do those tremendous figures mean, figures running into the hundreds of millions, carrying our trade at once very close to the $2,000,000,000 mark? Those figures mean what we all know they mean from other sources of knowledge. They mean that there are men making enormous sums of money at the present time out of munitions and other war supplies, because of the enormous expansion of our trade, and I submit that the sum of $12,500,000 is an extremely paltry sum compared with the tremendous figures revealed by the trade of the country since the war began.

I was not quite content with the reasons, not heard for the first time, which the Minister of Finance gave for his want of belief in an income tax. He says our population is sparse. He forgets that in the year 1842, when Sir Robert Peel imposed his income tax, Britain was a very small country and had a comparatively sparse population. And after all, wealth is not entirely derived from the number of people in a country. Though our population is small, if we compare the resources in which our people operate with the resources that Britain has had at any time, we see that the boot is on the other leg. We have sources of untold wealth in Canada, if we but had the courage to embark upon a fiscal policy which would enable our people to use them.

The Minister of Finance referred to Great Britain and the United States as if they were the only two countries in the world which had an income tax. But Germany had an income tax before the war—it had to come to it; it found, as every country will find that follows tariff legislation, that a tariff is no good, that it is an effete and always dying thing. There was a proposal in the German parliament in the early portion of the year in which war broke out to increase the income tax enormously on the lines of graduation which have been followed for a good many years in Great Britain, which form of tax has produced such enormous sums of money for Great Britain since the war began. And some believe that it was in part their fear of this graduated income tax that led the junkers to engage in the machinations which brought about the war. I should like to impress upon the Minister of Finance that the example of Great Britain, followed seventy or eighty years later by the United States—and in a great many things we follow the United States in pretty close proximity—and followed later by Germany, will stand careful consideration upon his part. He was surprised that his business tax gave him so much money as it has given. If my memory serves me well, he was surprised last year at the results of other forms of direct taxation which he had introduced in the previous Budget. The fact is that direct taxes, in fairly prosperous countries, generally yield results that surprise the Ministers who propose them.

The hon. gentleman said that the greatest objection to an income tax is that it is inequitable in its application. He spoke in that connection of people drawing salaries, salaries not too high considering the high cost of living. I venture to think that if he would give the necessary accompanying relief in tariff taxation and so reduce the cost of living, a man receiving a salary would be far better off to pay an income tax directly, for then he would be able to buy the things he needs to keep his house going as cheaply as he can get them in the free markets of the world. That was the experience in Great Britain before the war. But, however the hon. minister thinks about it, either he or some successor of his will be compelled within the next half generation to get vastly more of the federal revenues from the wealthy men of the country than he has done by tariff legislation in the past. The hon. gentleman talks of the inequitableness of an income tax! There is no form of direct taxation that has ever been devised, or even dreamed of by the mind of man, that could be nearly so inequitable in its application as a tariff. The mischief of a tariff is that it gathers most of our revenues from the poorest of our people. In the presence of the sacrifices and sufferings of this war, and in the prospect of the better character that I trust our people will have in the way of unselfishness as a result of that war, is not the statement I have just made enough to raise a doubt in the mind of every hon. gentleman present, who thinks seriously at all, as to how long we can impose tariffs in this country. I say, a tariff takes the most of our revenues from the poorest of the people. Do I need to prove it? It is easily done. The habitant in Quebec with fifteen children pays federal taxes upon the little stockings and boots even of the smallest child, and on all they use and wear, until those children become self-supporting. But the wealthy bachelor, living in apartments, wears one pair of socks and pays duty thereupon. The poorest of our population have the largest families, and they pay more taxes than the

richest of our population, so far as the tariff is concerned. An ingenious friend of mine told me to-day that if Mr. John D. Rockefeller should come to this country now, the poorest man in Canada with a large family would pay more federal taxes than Mr. Rockefeller would, in spite of the Minister of Finance's business tax, because the Rockefeller wealth is held individually and not through corporations. I give that statement for what it may be worth, but there is a great deal of truth in it anyhow, and it is a curious commentary upon the statement I have made, which statement is capable of the most direct proof. And the custom of raising revenues by a tariff has so seared the consciences of men that in the United States it was the custom to put a higher tax on the rough goods used by the poor than upon the fine goods used by the rich. That was the moral effect of the tariff, until the people grew so disgusted with it that they turned to a president with sense enough to lead them away from it, as President Wilson has been doing.

My third principle—and let me say there is a correlation, a distinct logical connection, between these principles which I am trying to bring before House in the most serious spirit—is that, we must maintain the foreign commerce of the country, and extend it. I think I can prove this from the minister's speech, brief as it was. He told us of the amazing prosperity that we were now enjoying, which contrasts very much with the conditions in Canada just before the war broke out. And in the next breath he told us that our foreign commerce had expanded in a way that no man would have believed possible a few years ago. Here we have two things—prosperity; foreign commerce. Of course, the hon. minister knows, and was perfectly candid in admitting, that the foreign commerce we are doing at the present time is largely artificial. Owing to no fault of our own, owing to circumstances in our conduct which will redound to the eternal credit of Canada, we are at war. We are obliged to borrow hugely because we are at war. We are at war in the best of causes, fighting for civilization and liberty. But Canada, though she is righteously at war, bears a striking resemblance financially to the man who has become hard-up and goes to borrow from a Jew.

He gets $50 or $100 and he signs a paper by which for the $100 he promises to pay in three months, shall we say, if he is a decent kind of a Jew, $112—pretty good interest—but it is only a decent Jew who would charge $12 for a $100 advance for three months. The man who gets into that unfortunate position is all right as long as the $100 lasts. One hundred dollars will carry him any way for a few days of the three months but £100 would probably be better for the whole period. But, if he gets through his £100, or his $100, at the end of two months the third month of the period is a pretty bad one for him and he is wondering where he will get the $112 to pay back the money he has borrowed. That is the position of Canada to-day, financially, not morally, and our trade is largely the result of that position. We are borrowing and are doing a trade that is absolutely artificial, that is promoted by the exigencies of war and that is not as big an increase in trade as it looks because of the rise in prices. It is very clear that if I were selling three hogs before the war for $10 apiece, and I am selling two now for $20 apiece, I am doing a trade which will look better in the value column but is not as good in the production column and certainly does not look as good on the breakfast table because, whatever our fiscal prejudices may be, most of us will admit that three hogs will feed more people than two. Our trade is artificially promoted by the exigencies of war.

But, is there not vast instruction, and needed instruction, along the lines which have been debated in this House ever since Confederation? Why, Sir, we are told that you need a tariff, and a long period of protection, to raise industries, to promote commerce and to create prosperity. Last year the United States created a record for all nations and all times up to the present in the financial value of her exports. She exported three billion dollars worth of goods. She was all the better able to do that because she had been gradually freeing her commerce under a fiscally enlightened president. Canada's figures as given to-day are simply marvellous. If we had exports comparable with our imports the exports must be marvellous. But, I venture to give the House a figure that is possibly more marvellous; before last year the record for export trade for all time was held by Great Britain and Ireland. There were two billion dollars worth of exports and that figure was reached in time of peace and not owing to the exigencies of war at all. How was that figure reached?—by promotion of foreign commerce. Two billion dollars' worth of exports from

two little islands which could be put twice into my province of Alberta and you would have 30,000 square miles left, and with all kinds of material out of which she had to make the articles of export brought into the country, not even found there as we can find them in such rich abundance here! Shall we as Canadians, in face of a record like that, made in times of peace, be content to follow false fiscal ideals and keep our progress as slow as it has been? Why, Sir, I venture to think that if this country had the courage to face the issue and to apply those principles that it ought to apply, there is no reason why in ten years time Canada should not have 15,000,000 people and be the most marvellous country, or one of the most marvellous countries, in the world. That is my belief in Canadians, and it is my belief in Canada if they will not hamper it. You should increase foreign commerce, you should broaden it out, and you cannot do it by building a Chinese wall around your border. You cannot increase foreign commerce in that way. You must release foreign commerce by taking off the obstacles that prevent its expansion. You must down with your tariff wall and trust to freedom. Why should we not trust to freedom? That is what we are fighting for in Europe. We are fighting for freedom; our sons are dying for it, and we have shouldered the burden in order that the fight for freedom may be brought to a victorious end.

But you say: Oh, yes, but we are fighting for freedom from oppression by a foreign tyrant, for civil and religious freedom, for the freedom of self-government. But what is any freedom worth if you cannot sell in the best market the produce of physical brawn and sinew and effort? We must increase our foreign commerce. That is my next principle.

The fourth principle I want to lay down, and which I think should be easily understood by hon. gentlemen opposite is that we ought to make Canada fiscally as good a country to live in as is the United States. When I first talked tariff in this House (before my hon. friend the Minister of Finance was in it, although he was a keen observer of Canadian affairs at that time) and when I first talked free trade, I was told that by hon. gentlemen opposite that I did not understand this country, that I was up against a condition. It was said to me: Look at the tariff of the United States. Well, I am looking at it, but my hon. friends opposite have stopped looking at it. It is they who are up against a condition now. My contention on this point is that instead of telling us that there were no tariff changes in the Budget my hon. friend would have shown more fiscal enlightenment if he had put everything on the free list in Canada that is on the free list in the United States. That would be the natural outcome of the principle which was enforced upon me by my hon. friends opposite. That would be in accordance with looking at conditions like those of the United States and looking at the tariff of the United States. I have not made a list of the articles myself but I could give one that occurs to me. Why should we have a 30 per cent tariff on boots and shoes and have free boots and shoes in the United States? Is it because the boot makers of Canada are duffers? I am sure that my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames), would not admit that for a moment. Why should we have to pay 30 per cent on our boots and shoes with free boots and shoes in the United States? Does Canadian stubble not wear out the farmer's boots, and the boots of the farmer's boys, as fast as the stubble in the United States? Do our streets not wear out the boots of our poor people and of our salaried people that my hon. friend has such compassion for in the matter of an income tax? Do our streets not wear out our boots as fast as the streets in the United States? As a matter of mercy and justice to our own inhabitants why should we maintain a tariff like this? But, there is a deeper reason. We should always try to look at these things as patriotic men who want to try to make our country big and great. We are looking for immigration from the United States and the Director General is moving heaven and earth to get people in from the United States.

Talk about trucking and trading with the Yankees! We would not be convicted of trucking and trading with the Yankees on this side of the House. Bringing people from there and sending wheat there! Is reciprocity dead? It is the liveliest corpse that ever came out of a grave on a resurrection morn. We shall need people to develop our resources, to create wealth, which we shall tax in a direct manner, to produce the material which we shall exchange freely, following the example of the Mother country and leaving forever the example of the Huns. We shall need these people after the war. They might have had the encouragement that I am suggesting, and I really hope that my hon. friend will look into this before he brings in another Budget—according

to the expectation of some people, he may not have opportunity to do that for a long while. But that is something that is in the lap of the gods and in the womb of the future. I hope he will study the question, anyhow, and that, if he does not, some successor of his will do so the next time a Budget is produced in this House.

I daresay that some of my hon. friends opposite would like to turn to me and say: Well you are a great bore; after all, your speech is just another exposition of free trade. Well it is, and what can one do but keep expounding what one believes to be true until it reaches the unenlightened, or those who do not want to be enlightened. I was told the same thing about free wheat. I got an immense encouragement from the recent history of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and every little encouragement, to a man who loves freedom as much as I do, will keep him going on preaching it as long as he is above the sod. It is an exposition of free trade, but I am afraid I have to give the House more than an exposition of free trade in these war times. I think that the war has afforded the greatest vindication of free trade that ever principle received in the history of mankind. I think so. I pointed out this afternoon that I was glad of the opportunity of putting on Hansard what had actually happened in other countries of the world in regard to fiscal policy since the war began. It is a very interesting study, this fiscal question, more interesting than any fiction if a man will only give his mind to it. The tariff conditions in the world at the time the war broke out were very interesting. It would have appeared at the time the war broke out that while Britain was wedded more strongly than before to her free trade policy, the Central Empires—Germany the leader of them—were more firmly wedded than ever to the system of protection. They had built up the system in Germany in a period of forty years. They had buttressed it in every conceivable way, and appeared to be wedded to it. But the moment the war struck them what happened? Well, this is what happened: that Great Britain stayed with her fiscal policy of freedom, fighting for freedom because she knew better what it was than any other country in the world. She appreciated it more—I mean in fiscal matters—and she knew that fiscal freedom and all-round freedom was worth fighting for. Little Denmark and Holland, each rather largely free trade countries and wonderfully prosperous as a result, did not need to alter their fiscal policy. They did not put any imposts on. Whereas Germany and Austria-Hungary and the neutral protectionist countries ran away from their fiscal policies the moment the storm of war struck them.

Mr. Speaker, when I go to sea I should like to go always in a ship that could stand rough weather—and protection is evidently no ship for sailing when the waves roll high. She is all right, perhaps, for foolish economic escapades on the part of young and inexperieced peoples when conditions are reasonably favourable, the breezes are favourable and things are good; but when a storm strikes her every principle she carries is jettisoned. Protection is deserted, their tariff walls are thrown down as I put on record from Board of Trade figures this afternoon. We are at the parting of the ways in Canada. We have these problems to tackle. Our people, I believe, will look more anxiously to us for the tackling of them than they have ever done before, and we shall have to choose whether Canada is going on along the line of freedom fiscally to get nearer to the Mother Country's example, or whether she is going to keep wallowing in the beggarly elements of the Hun's policies or former United States policies; whether she is going to keep decking herself in the worn out and cast aside garments of nations which have become more advanced and more enlightened. I put that to the House seriously, not in a contentious spirit, but with the love of Canada and hope for its future as strong in my heart as it can be in the case of any man not born in Canada. We shall have to choose.

Have we any other guidance as to the worthiness of the free trade ship? I venture to think that the greatest financial miracle of the war has been the financing of Great Britain. It has been a war of miracles; we live in marvellous times. We have lived to see the people of Russia apparently cast off in a moment, before anybody was looking for such a thing, the swaddling clothes and bands of autocracy and become one of the free democracies of the world. We have seen her reach her hands over the heads of the Allies and grasp the great democracy of the West to the south of us at a time when that great democracy, speaking the English tongue, is throwing in her lot with the British Empire and giving her guarantee not only of the winning of the war but of the results of the war being such as will be thoroughly satisfactory to every free man everywhere. But financially there has been no miracle in the history of the world like

what has been accomplished by Great Britain in this war. It is something worthy of our study, and something which we should follow as an example. Germany imposed some direct taxation before the war. Last year, (that is in the year 1916), she raised £25,000,000 sterling by direct taxation, when she needed money worse than ever before in her history—£25,000,000. Before the war Britain's income had risen to £200,000,000, in times of peace. That is what Britain was raising by direct taxation before the war. Last year Britain raised £500,000,000 by direct taxation of her people—£500,000,000 as compared with £25,000,000 raised by Germany. And yet there are people living—I am not sure whether my hon. friend from Halidmand (Mr. Lalor) would not be one of them—who would tell us that the tariff is the enlightened line of business, and not this free trade policy that Britain followed. £500,000,000 raised in the middle of this war by Great Britain, one and one-half times the greatest previous income she had ever raised. Was there ever a financial miracle like that in the history of the world? At the beginning of the war Britain needed in the worst kind of way to buy munitions because she had not prepared herself for fighting on land. Many people say it was foolish of her not to have done so. Well, I do not think so, because if she had prepared to the same extent on land as on sea she would have been bankrupt before the war began—no country could have stood it. Britain's defence was on the sea. She needed in the worst kind of way to buy munitions at the commencement of the war. She was able at once to do it on an enormous extent in the United States because of the wealth that she had built up by her fiscal policy in the generations that preceded the war. She needed for the purpose of correcting her exchange, rapidly to convert her securities, British held in foreign lands, into money, and she did that at once. She was able to do that and correct her exchange because of the enormous wealth which she had invested in the United States as the result of having become so wealthy through a wise fiscal policy. She did all these things while Germany's finances, as I have shown you by a single figure, showed no elasticity whatever. In addition to that, we all know how she has financed the Allies. It is admitted by the first action in the United States as the result of the important conference that is now going on at Washington that Britain has borne the heaviest financial burden of the war. She financed the Allies; she kept the seas of the world open for the trade of the world. If it had not been for Britain's fiscal policy and Britain's wealth anl Britain's command of shipping, the United States and Canada would have had a very different record to show in the matter of exports from the figures I quoted to you a few moments ago. She has preserved the trade of the world, financed the Allies, raised an amount of money by direct taxation that never was attempted, much less done, by any other country in the history of the world. She has done all that, and she has been a prime factor with the other Allies, whose efforts I do not for a moment deprecate, in saving, as the Allies are saving, the freedom of civilization and the progress of humanity. She has done that because of a wise fiscal policy, which I submit to you, Sir, this young country and its public men ought to study deeply and honestly, and to apply to the management of Canada's own affairs.

Sir HERBERT AMES (Montreal, St. Antoine): It is always a pleasure, Mr. Speaker, for us to listen to the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) and to hear that he still stands four-square by the principle of free trade. I do not think, however, that he is making very many converts on this side of the House, nor have we reason to believe that he is making very many converts on his own side of the House. I confess that I was waiting for him to tell us in what manner he would raise the $135,000,000 that has been raised during the past year by the present tariff to meet Canada's expenditures. By what means would he undertake to raise that revenue, which we all know is so much needed? The hon. member for Red Deer loves to tell us that he is a pioneer along the road of enlightenment, but I am rather wondering whether he is keeping as close a touch as he should upon the old land. I am wondering whether he is interpreting the signs of the times quite as faithfully as we have been led to believe he has been accustomed to do. If we can judge from the symptoms that are being evidenced in Old Country legislation, the days of free trade in old England are numbered. The Old Country, which has been so often held up to us as a shining example of free trade, is, under the stress of war, and of unification of the Empire, beginning to find that the time may not be far distant when it may adopt to some extent a policy of protection that will enable Britain and all her

overseas dominions, by reciprocal arrangement, so to help one another that the great British Empire will be stronger than it ever has been. So I was glad to-day when the Finance Minister, in making his Budget statement, did not deal with any further alterations of the tariff. When the question of free wheat was raised, I could not help feeling that our friends opposite were not altogether justified in considering that the action taken by the Government in this regard was a capitulation of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House so far as their views regarding reciprocity were concerned. It must be remembered that had the reciprocity pact gone through we Canadians would have lost control of our tariff; our tariff would have been regulated from Washington. As it is, we still keep control of the wheat and flour situation, inasmuch as we are taking advantage of a clause in standing legislation of the United States, and at any moment we can declare that wheat and flour shall again be placed on the protected list. We are in no way implicated in any arrangement that we cannot alter. Inasmuch as great events are probably pending; inasmuch as when this war shall be over new reciprocal trade arrangements may possibly be made throughout all parts of the British Empire, is it not desirable that Canada should not be tangled up with any other nation in such manner as to lose control of her own fiscal arrangements?

I rose not to discuss the remarks of the hon. member for Red Deer, but rather to say a few words in respect to what was advanced by the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) this afternoon. I did not intend to take part in this debate, but I could not quite allow all that he said in criticism of the Finance Minister and the Government and members on this side of the House to pass without challenge. He endeavoured to create the impression here and throughout the country that the present Government was not in any way endeavouring to exercise economy in order to hold the ordinary expenditure on capital and consolidated account within reasonable bounds. Now, those of us on this side of the House who since the war began have had occasion from time to time to make representations to our ministers urging that certain things be done in our constituencies have all certainly come to know that the war is on and that every ordinary expenditure that could be avoided is avoided by the Government. We have come to know also that the appointment of additional employees is discouraged. We have come to know also that the advancing of salaries is not frequent. We certainly, if the members on the other side of the House have not, have had brought to our attention daily instances of the economy practised by the Government. We have received the almost stereotyped form from our ministers: "Inasmuch as the war is on, it is not advisable to make any new expenditures, advances in salaries or things of that kind." We have only to take the figures as they are published to see that these professions are borne out by the facts. If the junior member for Halifax had presented to the House the comparative summary statement in the Estimates of the figures for last year and this year he would have been compelled in all fairness to admit that the Estimates for this coming year are by no means inflated. We find that even under very adverse circumstances the amount that this House is to be asked to vote this year out of the consolidated fund is less than it was asked to vote last year. That is not so outside. Every industry is increasing its staff; expenses are running up in every other walk of life; the expenses of railway companies are increasing. Every enterprise and industry throughout Canada is complaining that its expenditures in the way of salaries, supplies, and so on, are greatly increased. Yet we find that the Government on consolidated account purposes spending even less in the coming year than was spent last year. If we look over these figures more closely we find that there is still further reason for congratulating the Government on the evidences of economy that are to be found. If you turn to the summary of the Estimates you will find that an estimated expenditure of $182,359,000 is to be made on consolidated fund account in 1917-18 as against $183,956,000 in 1916-17.

First of all, it is necessary to notice that there is a great difference in the charges for interest, and you cannot blame the Government if the interest charges have advanced. We have borrowed money in order to carry on the war and the interest must be paid; that is something over which we have no control. In 1916-17, the interest charge was $39,649,000; while in 1917-18, the interest charge is $57,720,000, so, in order to make a fair comparison, we would have to deduct from those figures the amount

of interest in the two years. That would leave $144,306,000 for the fiscal year 1916-17 and $124,639,000 for the year 1917-18. But there is another item that will have to be deducted in order to make a fair comparison between the two, and that is the expenditure for pensions. We voted $3,000,000 for pensions in 1916-17 and $8,375,000 for pensions in 1917-18. If you deduct the pensions for these two years, you make the contrast still greater; you find that the straight expenditure on Consolidated Fund was $140,900,000; while for 1917-18, it was only $115,875,000, or a difference of about $25,000,000. That is evidence it seems to me, right in the Estimates that are presented to this House, that this Government is endeavouring to reduce ordinary expenditure by cutting out every possible unnecessary expense; and when one considers how the world over, all evidence goes to show that everything is costing more than it did before, one realizes that the actual saving on the part of the Government far exceeds $25,000,000 per annum on ordinary expenditure.

The same is true in regard to Capital Account. Let us turn to the Public Accounts on page 90 and read the amounts that have been expended for some years past on Capital Account. We can go back for ten years which would bring us to 1907, in which year we spent $30,000,000 on Capital Account. In 1908-09, we spent $42,000,000; in 1909-10, $29,000,000; in 1910-11, $30,000,000; in 1911-12, $30,000,000; in 1912-13, $27,000,000; in 1913-14, $37,000,000; in 1914-15, $41,000,000; in 1915-16, $38,000,000; whereas last year, we spent only $27,000,000, and in the Estimates for this year, it is expected that we shall spend only $21,113,550 on capital account, so that since the war began the expenditures on Capital Account have been very much less than during the previous eight or nine years. I give these instances merely in order that members may see that when the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) criticises this Government for not having put the pruning knife into the Estimates and not attempting to save money on current expenditure in war time, he is hardly doing full justice to the efforts of the Government.

I noticed while the hon. member for Halifax was speaking, his criticism in advance of the presentation of the Roads Bill which is to be brought in by the Minister of Railways and Canals. I do not in any way wish to discuss that Bill before it has been presented, but I want to look at that matter from a different angle, and one which perhaps has not occurred to the hon. member or his colleagues on that side of the House. We are in a short time to face a great problem in the matter of returned soldiers. The unfit men are coming back gradually at the rate of a thousand or fifteen hundred a month, and they are being taken care of by the Military Hospitals Commission, and the commissions founded in the various provinces. These men, as far as possible, are being given positions and they will doubtless all be absorbed. The day, however, is coming when the war will be over, when there will be between two and three hundred thousand men who will come back to Canada in a short space of time and who will have to be absorbed. Out of the first 216,000 men who went overseas, 142,000 had been accustomed to manual labour before they enlisted, so that it will be necessary, as an after-war measure, to find employment for very large numbers of men who have practically no trade, but who depend for their livelihood on manual labour. A very large percentage of these men, it has been found, are not willing to go on farms, that being the experience of all the commissions which have been working in behalf of returned soldiers. Therefore, although great inducements are being given by this Government and the provincial governments for men to go on the farms, the majority will look for work similar to that which they were engaged in before enlistment. Consequently there will have to be provided in Canada during the interim period, while these men are passing out of military life into civil life, a large quantity of labour by which men who are fit may be able to earn their livelihood from day to day and week to week until they are absorbed in various lines of activities. For that reason, I would like to see the authority taken by this House to build roads throughout the country, and expend $10,000,000 for that purpose, even if it be only as a provision made in advance for the employment of men coming from the front who cannot be absorbed in agriculture.

9 p.m.

It ought to be very gratifying to this House to have the minister point out this afternoon that during the past fiscal year $60,000,000 of the amount that has been raised by taxation has been applied to war account. If we are spending a million dollars a day on war account, that would mean that we are paying about one-sixth of our war expenditure as we go along.

That would mean that a single year of war, at this rate, represents a debt that will take six years to repay if we undertake to pay that off after the war. With the increased taxation that the minister suggested this afternoon and with the increased economy which the Government intends to exercise, I do not think the figure which the hon. member for Halifax mentioned this afternoon as the figure that we ought to aim at, viz., $100,000,000 for war expenditure annually, is a figure beyond our reach, and I should not be greatly surprised if that $60,000,000 should be very largely increased in the course of the next twelve months.

The principle that the minister has propounded this afternoon in regard to the additional taxation will find very little criticism on either side of the House. The minister has laid down the principle that those who have should give; that those who are making large profits out of the war should be the ones to contribute largely towards the carrying on of the war. If you analyze the minister's proposition, you will see that is exactly what he has accomplished. I took the trouble to work out a sample case which, perhaps, will make this clear to hon. members and will make it possible for them to make it clearer when they are passing it on to others. Supposing you have a business with a capital of $100,000, and supposing that business, under war conditions, makes a profit of 25 per cent or $$25,000. How much will that business pay under the old arrangement and how much under the new? Under the old arrangement, the first $7,000 was exempt, the taxation being only on $18,000. Twenty-five per cent on $18,000 is $4,500, so that the net profit on the business that was making $25,000 would be $20,500 or 20½ per cent, and the Government would receive 4½ per cent of the entire 20½ per cent profit. Under the new arrangement, the first $7,000 is exempt as before, leaving $18,000 to be taxed. The first $8,000 will be taxed 25 per cent; the next $5,000 will be taxed 50 per cent and the next $5,000 will be taxed 75 per cent. That will work out at $8,250, so that out of the $25,000 earned, that firm under the new taxation will have to pay $8,250 or 8¼ per cent to the Government, and will retain $16,750 or 16¾ per cent. In other words, when the firm reaches the stage where it is making profits of 25 per cent and upwards, it will give to the Government nearly double the amount it did under the taxation prior to this measure. The House will admit that as soon as profits reach the neighbourhood of thirty to forty per cent, it is only right that the Government under the circumstances should take a very large proportion of that amount, and I have reason to believe that this measure will, in the course of the next year, while it may prevent the establishment of new industries of a war character, be received favourably and the extra tax paid without protest by the established companies who are at present making large dividends. I believe it will increase the $60,000,000 which the minister is now able to lay aside for war purposes to perhaps $75,000,000 or $100,000,000 this year. I think the people of Canada are to be congratulated upon the splendid way they have taken all war taxes that have come to them, without grumbling of any kind. When you part a man forcibly from a large share of his profits, you are not liable to get a blessing from him, but there has been very little grumbling indeed from the people whose profits have been taken to carry on the war, and as the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) pointed out, it should be borne in mind that this does not begin to represent what the people of Canada have given for war purposes. I made a calculation not long ago that up to date the people of Canada have voluntarily contributed upwards of $40,000,000 to the various patriotic and benevolent enterprises that have been carried on during the war; every dollar of that was given voluntarily. In this calendar year I venture to say that the people of Canada will voluntarily contribute almost as much to carry on these patriotic works as the Minister of Finance will get by his special tax on profits. Certainly they contributed as much last year, and there is no reason to believe they will not do as well this year. So when we speak of what the people of Canada are giving to the war, we must remember that they are giving generously of their own free will, as well as what is being taken from them by taxation.

I have been indignant lately, on reading some of the speeches that have been made at certain political gatherings, more especially in my own province, to find a tendency on the part of some speakers to criticise this Government and hold it up to disparagement on the ground that the public debt is increasing. Of course the public debt is increasing; every man in Canada knows that, and every member of this House knows why it is increasing. Every dollar of war expenditure that has been voted has been voted with the unanimous consent of the House. The Bills that have been presented here for prosecuting the war have been endorsed by Liberals and Conservatives

alike, with equal unanimity. It was known when those Bills were presented that the Government intended to borrow the money and spend it for war purposes, and that the amount would be added to our consolidated debt, and for any man to criticise the Government at this time because the debt is increasing is almost equivalent to saying we are doing too much in our time in carrying on the war to the maximum of our ability. If the money is not being spent properly, if there has been extravagance, if we are not getting one hundred cents on the dollar, or as nearly so as possible, the hon. gentlemen have the right to examine and criticise.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is the only ground on which we criticise.

Sir HERBERT AMES: But to condemn the Government because these figures are growing from month to month is not a fair way of treating this question. The people of this country have responded magnificently in furnishing the moneys necessary to carry on the war. I had the privilege of speaking in New York and Washington recently on the part Canada is playing in the great war, and I assure you that the admiration of the American people for what Canada is doing in this war exceeded all expectations. They admire us not only for the men we have sent and the sacrifices we have made, but for the magnificent way in which the country has financed itself. At the commencement of the war we were under the impression that the only place to borrow money was in England. Almost all our funded debt was held there, a mere bagatelle being held in Canada, and the only loan we had floated in the United States was for purely domestic purposes, and we soon ceased to get money in that market. Since the beginning of the war, knowing we could not borrow money in England, and that we could not get money in America for war purposes, we have had confidence in our own people and have had no reason to regret it. It will always be a proud page in the history of Canada that when the Minister of Finance asked for $50,000,000 he got $100,000,000; when he asked for $100,000,000 he got $200,000,000, and when he asked for $150,000,000 he got $250,000,000. When this war is over perhaps two-thirds or more of our funded debt will be held by our own people, and if our securities grow in value as we expect they will it will be our own people who will benefit by that, and if anything goes wrong we will bring no one down but ourselves. So I think the country has reason to congratulate itself, and particularly have we reason to congratulate ourselves and the Minister of Finance on the magnificent way in which we have gone through the last year under conditions which have never been equalled in the history of Canada, or in any other land until this great war came.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat has told the House that he did not intend to speak on this occasion. Apparently, as the Government was worried over the way things were going, my hon. friend was put up to get them out of a difficulty, and it was very fitting that he should be selected for that task. For I remember in the year 1911, when the Conservative party found themselves in difficulties in the province of Quebec, and thought their only hope of salvation lay in an amalgamation with the Nationalists, it was the hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) who was chosen to make the necessary arrangements between the Conservative party and the Nationalists in order to bring the party home to victory. My hon. friend, of course, was also the party who furnished the money on that occasion. It is only natural, then, that to-night, when the Acting Prime Minister seems worried and his colleagues beside him, that my hon. friend should be put up to get them out of their difficulty.

My hon. friend began his address by pointing out to the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) that free trade in England was about at an end, and he spoke of certain legislation. I have not followed the legislation of the Old Land as closely, perhaps, as some other hon. gentlemen, but I fail to recall a single piece of legislation that has been introduced in the British House of Commons since the beginning of the war for the purpose of doing away with free trade in Great Britain. The hon. member for Red Deer gave a very able exposition this afternoon of what Great Britain has accomplished under free trade, as compared with what the Central Empires have done under protection. After the experience the British trader has had, and he is the cleverest trader in the world, of the value to Great Britain of free trade in this war, I do not think he will ever depart from the policy that has made Great Britain the greatest commercial nation upon the earth, and has enabled her to finance not only her own share of the war, but to help her Allies as well. Of course, there was a conference in Paris, and something was said there about trade

amongst the Allies. But we have had talk about preferential trade within the Empire for many a long day. For one, I hope I shall never live to see the day when the good relations between Great Britain and Canada will be hampered by any written agreement or any preferential trade. The farmers of the West, the men who it is supposed, will benefit most by preferential trade within the Empire, have declared time and again that they do not want preferential trade, they do not want an increased price for their wheat which will mean that the labouring masses of Great Britain will pay more for their bread. I hope the present relations will always exist, Great Britain being left free to do what she likes with her tariff and Canada free to do what she likes with hers, the cordiality of inter-Imperial relations being left wholly unhampered by any written or hard-and-fast agreement.

My hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine, (Sir Herbert Ames) made one very peculiar statement. If I understood him, he said that if the reciprocity pact had passed in 1911 our tariff arrangements would be made at Washington instead of at Ottawa. Then, what does he think of the Minister of Finance who adopts exactly that policy to-day? Has the minister transferred the making of the Canadian tariff from Ottawa to Washington?

Sir HERBERT AMES: I endeavoured to make as clear as I could the point that under this arrangement of free wheat we had not in the slightest degree impaired our control of our own tariff.

Mr. TURRIFF: Under the reciprocity pact it was left open to either side to bring the arrangement to an end at any time. It is true that in this case of free wheat—and I will take up that subject more directly later on—the Government have so provided that they can bring the arrangement to an end even without appealing to Parliament. So they can use the free wheat argument as a vote-catcher for three or four months, while at the same time they can tell their friends in the East, the millers and the railroads, that it is only a temporary war measure which can be cancelled by Order in Council. But in fact they can do more even than that—they need not even pass an Order in Council. The matter has been looked into, and it is clear that the moment the war stops free trade in wheat under the present Order in Council comes to an end.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who told you that?

Mr. TURRIFF: A better lawyer than my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen)—or rather, as I do not wish to say anything objectionable, a lawyer in whose opinion I should have much more confidence than in that of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Read the opinion of that lawyer.

Mr. TURRIFF: The hon. gentleman will get all the legal opinion he wants before this debate is finished. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, says that by putting wheat on the free list we are not following the example of 1911. But let my hon. friend consider the facts. In 1915 the wheat crop of Canada amounted to 370,000,000 bushels. That quantity of wheat at the price ruling to-day—say $2.25 a bushel—would represent one-third of the total export and import trade of Canada of which the minister boasted, and which certainly was something to boast about. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, would have us believe that the effect of the reciprocity agreement of 1911 would have been to put the making of the Canadian tariff in the power of Washington, but that putting wheat on the free list, though that crop alone might easily amount to one-third of our total trade, has nothing whatever to do with giving Washington any control in our tariff affairs. The two stories do not hang together.

The same hon. gentleman had something to say about the wonderful economy of this Government, and held it to be a matter of pride that the Minister of Finance was able to announce that $60,000,000 would be left to apply in paying for the war. Well, it seems to me that at this time, when we are having great business success, when we are taking in over a million dollars a day paid by Great Britain and our Allies for war munitions, and when a large part of that money is profit, surely this is the time when we ought to pay, not $60,000,000, but double that amount on account of the war. Had this Government practised reasonable economy during the years they have been in office, they would be able to pay towards the expense of the war more than twice what they are paying. And why not? Why should not we follow the example of Great Britain where, as pointed out by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) they raised one hundred and fifty per cent more revenue by direct taxation than had

been raised in the years previous to the war. But the economy of this Government only shows up when compared with their tremendously extravagant expenditure during the two or three years prior to the war. Compare their expenditure to-day with the really economical expenditures of the late Government—expenditures which the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, in those days criticised as being extravagant in the extreme, and it becomes manifest that the so-called economy of to-day is really extravagance.

Let us see how these figures compare? If I heard my hon. friend the Minister of Finance aright when he was beginning the Budget speech, I think he made the statement that the expenditure on ordinary account during the past year was $143,000,000. My hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) says that is very economical, but the last year that the Liberals were in power—1910-1911—the expenditure for the same account was under $80,000,000. When you compare the figures of last year with those of five years ago, the figures of last year do not look economical at all; they are very extravagant.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman say that what is $143,000,000 to-day was $80,000,000 five years ago?

Mr. TURRIFF: The expenditure on ordinary account was under $80,000,000 during the last full year the Liberals were in power, and I understood the Minister of Finance to say that the expenditure on ordinary account last year was $143,000,000. Of course, there is some deduction to be made for the extra amount of interest on the debt and pensions, but it does not begin to keep the expenditure of to-day anything near what it was in 1910-11. The only way you can show any economy at all is by showing that you are not quite as extravagant in your expenditure as you were two years before the war. But, in 1910-11 the country was prosperous, the revenue was buoyant, and the expenditures were very much lower than they are to-day. Here we are almost three years engaged in this war, we are piling up a war debt of $1,000,000 a day, as my hon. friend told us this afternoon, and instead of economising we are going on in the most extravagant way spending fifty per cent more than was expended five years ago. I think nobody will say that there are many more people in Canada to-day than there were five years ago. It is time that there should be economy practised. We are all hoping that the war will end this year, but there is nothing definite to show that it will end this year. It is quite possible that it will go on for a year and a half, and if it does, look at the debt we will have piled up at the rate of $1,000,000 a day; and it keeps on increasing. The longer we are engaged in the war the more the war costs in Canada per day. When this war is over, when 300,000 or 400,000 Canadians come back from the front, and, being turned out of employment, have to go out and find work wherever they may be able to find it, and when 300,000 or 400,000 men and women who are working in munition factories are turned out of work, see what it means. For two or three years after the war the country will be coming through an equilibrium again, and during that time the factories that are making munitions will have to find a new outlet for their product. The revenue will fall off, our imports will decline, prices of farm produce will go down, exports will decrease, there will not be the same amount of revenue coming into the Dominion, and if my hon. friend should be Minister of Finance then he will not have the revenue of $230,000,000 that he has now. He will have a much smaller revenue, and in the meantime our debt will be doubled up as compared with what it is to-day. How are we going to manage the affairs of this country, how are we going to take care of our ordinary expenditure, of the interest on our debt, of our pension fund, of our sinking fund, if we do not meet the situation by economy? This is the time to begin practising economy and not wait until hard times are upon us. We should practise economy now that the revenues are buoyant, when the money is coming in as never before, and when everybody in business is making money out of borrowed money. We are not paying anything practically on account of the cost of the war. As my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) pointed out to-day, since this Government came into power there have been more deficits than would represent the amount that we have paid on account of the war. We are going on borrowed money, but later on we will have to meet the interest on that money. In the meantime, my hon. friends, instead of practising economy, are going on full sail ahead and spending 50 per cent more than their expenditure a few years ago. Here is a statement showing the increase in the cost of running the different

departments as between the years 1910-11 and 1914-15:—

Department.	Increase, Per Cent.
Justice	13
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics	300
Civil Government	38
Fisheries	91
Mines and Geological Survey	92
Immigration	50
Indians	65
Legislation	43
Lighthouse and Coastal Service	30
Miscellaneous	151
Mounted Police	32
Ocean and River Service	30
Penitentiaries	63
Police	89
Public Works Consolidated Fund account	124
Public Works capital account	233
Public Works collection of revenue	36
Railways	14
Steamboat inspection	52
Administration of the Yukon Territory	12
Adulteration of Food	124
Customs	72
Dominion Lands	105
Excise	18
Post Office	114
Labour	32
Railways and Canals, collection of revenue	18
Weights and Measures	172
Naval Service	43

Although there was an increase of 50 per cent in the cost of immigration, we are not getting one-quarter of the immigrants that we got in 1910-11. With regard to Indians, there is absolutely no justification whatever for the increase of 65 per cent in the cost of running that department compared with five years ago. It is absolutely absurd and it shows the extravagance of this Government. They are not making any effort whatever to curtail the expenditure. The cost of the administration of the Yukon Territory increased 12 per cent, and, Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose there are a quarter of the people in the Yukon to-day than there were when it cost 12 per cent less. The increase in the Customs Department is accounted for by the fact that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) has just doubled up the number of civil servants in that department. And in the face of that my hon. friends on the other side of the House talk about this Government being an economical Government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What were the years compared?

Mr. TURRIFF: I was comparing 1911 with 1915.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Did you make up these figures yourself?

Mr. TURRIFF: I did not make them personally, but they were made from the blue-books, every one.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You should revise them.

Mr. CROTHERS: They are not right, I can tell you.

Mr. TURRIFF: I venture to assert that they are.

Mr. CROTHERS: I know that they are not as far as the Department of Labour is concerned.

Mr. TURRIFF: What did the Labour Department cost in 1915-16?

Mr. CROTHERS: I cannot give the figures exactly but I know there was not an increase of 30 per cent.

Mr. TURRIFF: I will give the Labour Department over again. In 1910-11 it cost $63,441 and in 1914-15 it cost $93,402, an increase of $29,961, or 32 per cent. I will venture this assertion, that if my hon. friend will take the figures I have quoted and go over them he will find that they are correct, perhaps not to a cent in every case but practically correct, because they have all been taken from the blue-books and checked over and over again.

Mr. CROTHERS: I am satisfied the figures given for my department are not correct.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend will be able to give the correct figures. When my hon. friend tries to make out that this Government is practising economy, it is only economical as compared with the extravagant expenditures of the year or two before the war, not with what was being expended a few years back.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why do you not take the expenditures for this last year instead of two years ago?

Mr. TURRIFF: I took the last expenditures that were available when these figures were made.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh no.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend from St. Antoine, Montreal, (Sir Herbert Ames) spoke of how much more the Government was going to tax the wealthy, the manufacturers, under the new arrangement as announced by the Minister of Finance.

Mr. CROTHERS: If my hon. friend will turn to page 77 of the Public Accounts, he

will find that the expenditures for the Labour Department for 1910-11 were $93,000, not $63,000 as he gave.

Mr. TURRIFF: We can settle that matter again. But I will venture the assertion that generally speaking those figures are right, and I may state that I risk my seat in the House on the correctness, generally speaking, of these figures. It is quite possible I may have made a mistake in one of them. The hon. member for St. Antoine division spoke about the new rate of taxation introduced by the minister this afternoon, and he showed how much more taxes a firm would have to pay that was capitalized at $100,000 under the new rate of taxation than under the old rate. But my hon. friend knows perfectly well that in his own city, not long ago, it was published in the papers by one of the munition firms there that they had made 1,500 per cent, and it was stated in the newspapers that they had paid 900 per cent. And how were they enabled to do that? They were enabled to do that owing to the prices fixed by this Government, through their Imperial Munitions Board—first through the old Shell Committee and subsequently through the Imperial Board. This Government, through their Imperial Munitions Board which they appointed, fixed the prices for these concerns who have been enabled to make not 25 per cent, as my hon. friend stated, but hundreds per cent, and I ask you is it right that the people of Canada should be compelled to pay for the munitions that their soldiers are using at prices so extravagant as those prices to enable companies to make many hundreds per cent? We know of a case in Hamilton where a man made all the money he wanted in the first year and then offered his plant to the Government to let them make munitions at cost and the Government refused it. My hon. friend the Minister of Labour stated that the Government was not going into competition with private enterprise. There was an opportunity for the Government to have found out how much it cost to make shells and shell cases and other munitions. They would not accept the offer, and the next year this man turned over his profits to the Government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, you are guessing.

Mr. TURRIFF: It was so stated in the papers and never contradicted.

Mr. CROTHERS: I never made that statement in my life.

[Mr. Crothers.]

Mr. TURRIFF: Did not Mr. Baily of Hamilton hand anything over to the Government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I believe he did to the Munitions Board.

Mr. TURRIFF: He offered this Government to hand over his factory to your Board, and the second year he handed over the profits, $775,000, and it was divided up, as was stated, between the British Patriotic Fund and some of the Canadian patriotic funds.

Sir HERBERT AMES: We did not get any of it.

Mr. TURRIFF: The Government fixes the price and enables their friends the manufacturers to charge almost any profit they like. And then we have my hon. friend from Montreal coming forward and stating that this is an economical Government.

I rose for the purpose of moving an amendment and on that amendment I wish to say a few words. The amendment I propose to move at the conclusion of my remarks is as follows:

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

This House desires to take the earliest opportunity of expressing its pleasure that the Government has at last yielded to the persistent demands of the Grain Growers of the West as frequently set forth by delegations and resolutions of the representatives of the farming interest, and repeatedly voiced by the Liberal party in this House, by placing wheat, wheat flour and semolina on the free list, and thereby securing a free market for wheat and wheat products in the United States.

This House is of the opinion that if the policy of Free Wheat is made permanent it will enormously increase the prosperity of the West and be to the general advantage of the whole Dominion.

In order that the country may be assured of such permanency and that the action of the Administration is not a mere temporary expedient which may be revoked at any time by the Government without reference to Parliament, this House would urge upon the Government the desirability of submitting early in the present session a measure to place by statute wheat, wheat flour and semolina on the free list, and thereby encourage the farmers to engage in the largest wheat production possible.

We have heard a good deal in this House during the past few years about free wheat, and the Government have at last been forced to listen to their friends in the West and in the East and to put wheat, wheat flour and wheat products on the free list. What has induced the Government to do

this? Not the welfare of the farmer; not the welfare of anybody in this Dominion; absolutely nothing but the partisan purpose of helping themselves out in the face of a coming election.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What coming election?

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend confessed that there were to be two, one in Alberta and one in Saskatchewan.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not on free wheat, surely.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend the Solicitor General made a trip out West.

Mr. GRAHAM: Free wheat was one of the prisoners that my hon friend let free.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend went West to ostensibly look into the question of penitentiaries, and while he was there he was told emphatically by his own friends that unless wheat were placed on the free list his candidates would have very little chance of returning to this House. My hon. friend, by one of his little adroit movements, has now practically got rid of the leading member of the Government from the West and is able to take his place. He does not want to come back from the West without some following there, so he sends out s.o.s. calls for help to his friend, the Minister of Finance, and they prepare this Order in Council to give free wheat to the farmers. I may say to my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, that of all the members on that side of the House I think he is the best.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is a doubtful compliment,

Mr. TURRIFF: I do not know that that is saying very much, but under the circumstances my hon. friend the minister has not done too badly, and I congratulate him for putting wheat on the free list. It will be a help; it is a good thing for the West. I told my hon. friends many times in this House that free wheat had to come; that it was a question that would not down. It has not been downed; it has downed the Minister of Finance and the whole Government and they have had to put wheat on the free list. They are entitled to all the credit they can get out of it, which will not be very much. There is not a man in the West who does not know that this move on the part of the Government is simply a death-bed repentance; it is just a little better than dying in sin. My hon. friends think it may help them to get out of purgatory; it may, but I doubt it. Well, we will give hon. gentlemen the credit of having done this, but I wish to point out to them that since 1911 there has not been one year in which free wheat would not have been worth more to the farmers than it is worth this year. I wish to point out to the Minister of Finance that the statements he makes in the Order in Council relating to free wheat are not correct. My hon. friend got his information, he says, from the Grain Commission. Who is the head of the Grain Commission? A police court partisan lawyer from Montreal, recently appointed, who knows no more about the wheat question than the man in the moon.

An hon. MEMBER: Who is he?

Mr. TURRIFF: A man by the name of Boyd, I think. At all events, he spent his life in Montreal studying and practising law. I assume that the only thing that recommended him to the Minister of Finance and his understudy the Solicitor General was the fact that he was president of a Conservative Association.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where?

Mr. TURRIFF: Near Westmount. It appears that he has qualifications that my hon. friend the Solicitor General was not aware of, so he is that much better. This is the kind of person who gives my hon. friend the Minister of Finance information about this wheat question. I quote from the Order in Council:

> And whereas in normal times there exists a good commercial export demand for milling purposes from Great Britain and the continent for wheat of all grades;
>
> And whereas this demand has for some time past almost entirely ceased on account of shortage of ocean shipping due to submarine warfare, practically all available tonnage being required to transport grain of the higher grades and flour made therefrom, purchased in Canada and the United States by the British and Allied Governments for their respective needs.

According to that, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance would want this House and the country to believe that there was not a good demand for low-grade wheat.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In Canada.

Mr. TURRIFF: There was demand in Canada, but the difficulties of shipping to the United States when there was a duty enabled the Canadian buyer to crowd the price down unreasonably. While this year there was a greater difference in the respective values of low-grade wheat

on the Canadian and American sides of the line, so little wheat was selling in those parts of the province where the quality was low-grade that it did not amount to much in the total. My constituency runs 110 miles along the American boundary; it is practically a wheat field 66 by 110 miles, one of the biggest wheat-producing constituencies in the West. In that constituency not 10 per cent of the wheat paid the cost of cutting last year. We were hit worse than any other part of the country. The wheat was of a poor quality, but dozens of my constituents drove their wheat across the boundary line and got from 25 to 50 cents a bushel more for it than they could get at home. If this Government wanted to benefit the farmers why did they not put wheat on the free list last fall? Why did they wait until the great bulk of it had passed into the hands of the speculator? To-day it is estimated that only 21 per cent of the wheat of the West is in the hands of the farmer, 79 per cent, less wheat has been sold, being in the hands of the millers and speculators. Although the elevators are filled with the wheat bought for the millers at $1.20 to $1.40 a bushel, they are compelling the bakers to charge the poor people of Canada the price of bread not on $1.40 wheat but on $2.40 wheat. That is the way in which the Government have handled this free wheat question. They have played right into the hands of the speculators from the first to the last. The measure is a good one, brought down at any time, even at the eleventh hour, but if my hon. friends opposite had had the interest of the farmers at heart, they would have given the farmers free wheat last fall. They knew last fall that the crop in the eastern part of Saskatchewan was ruined; they did not have to wait until the month of April to find that out. Just imagine how the farmers were dealt with on this low grade wheat. Let me cite an instance. When I was in the West two or three weeks ago, I was speaking to a man and this is what he told me: "I drew a load of wheat into Carnduff and the elevator man offered me ninety cents a bushel." I said, "all right, I am satisfied with that price, but this wheat was grown on flax ground where flax had been grown the year before; there is a lot of flax in it and flax is worth $2.30 a bushel; you should allow me something for the flax.' The elevator man said, 'I have no means of separating the flax from the wheat, but instead of docking you six pounds for the dirt in the wheat, I will dock you only two pounds." Just then a neighbour of his came in and said to him, "my friend, you are very foolish to sell wheat for ninety cents a bushel; take it down to Sherwood and you will get a much better price." Sherwood is in North Dakota just two miles south of the boundary line and south of Carnduff. The man replied, "it is only a poor grade of wheat which would ordinarily sell as feed wheat." His friend said, "I do not care what it is, you take it down there and you will get a much better price for it." He, however, sold his wheat at ninety cents a bushel and the next day he loaded up a similar load of wheat and took it down to Sherwood. The elevator man there separated out the flax and paid him $23.50 for the flax that was in it, viz., one bushel out of seven. Then he paid him not ninety cents, but $1.58 a bushel for the wheat, out of which the farmer had to pay ten cents a bushel duty. Then he paid him 25 cents a bushel for the screenings that were screened from the wheat, so that the farmer got in Sherwood double the price that he received in Carnduff for the same kind of wheat. That is the way in which the farmers have been dealt with on this poor crop and the Government wait until they have practically sold it all before bringing free wheat into force.

It is not necessary to draw the wheat to the American buyers across the line. Another constituent of mine living at Maryfield, in township eleven, sixty odd miles from the boundary line, shipped a carload of this wheat down to Minneapolis. It was only feed wheat that went forty-six pounds to the bushel and the price at Fort William for the wheat was 98 cents on the day that he sold it in Minneapolis for $1,70½. The man's name was Adolf Olsen of Maryfield, Saskatchewan. Out of the price he received he had to pay ten cents duty and three cents difference in freight, or thirteen cents altogether. That would give him 1.57½, whereas he could have got only 98 cents at Fort William.

Mr. LALOR: Is there a grain grower's elevator at Carnduff?

Mr. TURRIFF: There are three or four elevators there and it is quite possible there is one belonging to the Grain Growers' Association, but I do not know.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They could sell it to the Grain Growers' by shipping it to Fort William.

Mr. TURRIFF: There is a farmers' elevator owned by the farmers in that part

of my constituency. They have a farmers' elevator down at Sherwood, because during the last number of years millions of bushels have been drawn by wagons across the line.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why do the Grain Growers' Grain Company not pay a fair price for the wheat?

Mr. TURRIFF: I refer my hon. friend to the Grain Growers' Grain Company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend is a shareholder.

Mr. TURRIFF: I might be a shareholder if I wanted to be one, but I do not happen to be a grain grower and I never was a shareholder in that company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You repudiate their methods of buying?

Mr. TURRIFF: I do not.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. member is simply stating facts.

Mr. TURRIFF: As my hon. friend knows, to the cost of his party, the grain growers have done a great work all through that country in the education of the people, and they have done it in my hon. friend's own constituency, and nobody knows that better than does my hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They pay fair prices in my constituency and I have no criticism to make, but if they do not pay fair prices in my hon. friend's constituency, why does he not go after them?

Mr. TURRIFF: If my hon. friend thinks that the Grain Growers' Company are not doing their duty, is it the duty of the Opposition or the duty of the Government to interfere?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are doing their duty in my county all right. If they are not doing it in yours, why do you not complain? It is a delicate point.

Mr. TURRIFF: It is not a delicate question at all. I am just showing what this Government did during this season of poor wheat in that part of the country. This does not apply all over Saskatchewan, nor in Alberta, where they had a good season, but in the southern and eastern part of Saskatchewan and in the southern part of Manitoba the crop was very poor, and if the Government had wished to help out the farmers the time to do it was last fall, before the crops were sold, and not this spring, when 79 per cent of the fall wheat of the country had gone out of the farmers' hands.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the figures which the hon. member gave us he showed a difference across the border of 59 cents per bushel. He will admit the best the Government could have done would have been to modify the difference by ten cents, whereas the Grain Growers' Grain Company could have modified it by 49 cents. They must be robbing the farmers to the extent of 49 cents a bushel if his statement be true. How does my hon. friend explain that?

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend always tries to get away from the fact that the Government is responsible. Had my hon. friend taken off that duty last fall instead of this spring buyers from the United States would have come across and bought that wheat. The fact of having to put the wheat through the customs makes it difficult for the farmers. I do not want to be understood as saying that generally speaking there is any such difference as I have stated, but there has never been a year when there would not have been more aggregate profit to the farmers of the West, and the statement that there was not a demand for the low grade wheat is not correct, because you could sell your low grade in Canada at any time. The low grade wheat is not ground by itself, nor is high grade wheat ground by itself. They are always mixed in the grinding to a greater or less extent, and this low grade wheat is being bought by the millers in order to mix it with good wheat. Therefore, the Government have taken advantage of the farmers to the extent that they have waited until the wheat was out of the farmers' hands before giving them the relief that they might have given them last fall.

The Minister of Finance took credit for the great balance of trade in our favour. According to him, if the Germans had sunk 100 more ships laden with Canadien imports, our balance of trade would have made a still better showing. That was a point hardly worthy of my hon. friend. I am glad to see the minister is getting over the great fear he had five years ago that if we allowed the Canadian farmer to sell his wheat in the United States, the British Empire would totter in ruins, and Canadians become disloyal. That was the statement made by one of the celebrated eighteen Liberals who went back on us in 1911. Sir Edmund Walker said that if the Canadian farmer was allowed to sell his produce in the United States he would become a disloyal Canadian, and it would end in the annexation of Canada to the United States.

The Minister of Finance was one of those eighteen, and I am delighted to see that he has got over the nightmare he had then, and has now no fears of the Canadian farmer becoming disloyal if he sells his wheat in the United States. What has brought about the change in my hon. friend's views? Economics has nothing to do with the change. What did the Solicitor General say on this question last year? Closing the debate on the resolution I had moved in favour of free wheat he said (Hansard, 1916, p. 1068):

> I have always believed, and never more than now, that at least ninety per cent of this free wheat issue is purely political, while, for the other ten per cent it is economically unsound.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Was there a war on then?

Mr. TURRIFF: Yes, the war was on.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is ninety-five per cent political now.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend says that ninety-five per cent of the agitation is political. For once in his life he has told the absolute truth, because I am sure that ninety-five per cent of the reasons that actuated him in putting wheat on the free list were purely political. His object was to save the party. Will my hon. friend, who said last year that ninety per cent of the agitation for free wheat was purely political and the other ten per cent mistaken economics, tell us what has made him change his mind? Why has he insisted on the Minister of Finance putting wheat on the free list? Will my hon. friend give us his reasons now?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I said that the attitude of my hon. friend would indicate that ninety-five per cent of his talk was purely political.

Mr. TURRIFF: I say that ninety-five per cent of the motives that actuated my hon. friend in getting wheat put on the free list were purely partisan. His object was to save himself and the Government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is actuating your indignation at the present time?

Mr. TURRIFF: I am trying to tell the House and the country that we are pleased to have wheat put on the free list, but the Government made a great mistake, in the interests of the farmers, in not taking this action last fall. If the Solicitor General will put wheat on the free list now, when he still believes that ninety per cent of the agitation for it is purely political, why would he not do it last fall? What has the Minister of Finance to say? I could read pages of reasons that he gave why wheat should not be put on the free list. What has made my hon. friend change his mind?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Read the Order in Council.

Mr. TURRIFF: I have it here, and the statements it makes are not true. I do not say the Minister of Finance did not believe these statements; I think he did. I do not think he would put a statement in an Order in Council that he did not believe to be absolutely true; I have that much faith in him. But the statements made in the Order in Council are certainly not correct, and nobody knows it better than my hon. friend the Solicitor General, who went on a trip all through the West, with his ear to the ground, and from every direction the cry came, "Either free wheat, or no Conservatives go to Ottawa at the next election." So at the eleventh hour my hon. friend calls on the Minister of Finance to put wheat on the free list. It was a case of death-bed repentance. However, they are entitled to all the credit they can get out of it, and they will get some credit for it in the West; they will get some votes that otherwise would have gone against them.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: That is what hurts.

Mr. TURRIFF: It does not hurt me half so bad as my hon. friend will get hurt if he appeals to his constituents again.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Are you sorry that wheat was placed on the free list? What are you mad about?

Mr. TURRIFF: I am not mad about it. We are pleased to have it on the free list, and my hon. friends are entitled to all the credit they can get out of it. But now the Government have left it in such a position that not even an Order in Council is necessary; for as soon as the war ceases, unless the Order in Council is amended or wheat is placed on the free list in the ordinary way which should have been followed, wheat will be no longer free. As it stands to-day this accomplishes exactly the purposes hon. gentlemen opposite have in view —to enable their candidates in the West to declare that this means free wheat for all time, and the candidates in Ontario and in the East generally to do as they have been doing, to tell their electors that this is only a war measure and that as soon as the war is over things will be as they

were before. It is the same old story—playing the double game, one policy for the West and another policy for the East. Now, my resolution only asks these hon. gentlemen to make it clear that they have done that which they say it was their intention to do—to put wheat permanently on the free list. The cry of the Government is for more production. But how can they expect the farmers to go into heavy expenditure for increased production with the prospect before them that the moment the war ceases they will lose the American market?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not correct.

Mr. TURRIFF: Will the hon. gentleman make it clear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is clear.

Mr. TURRIFF: The hon. gentleman will excuse me, but it is not clear. I have taken the advice of lawyers who have looked into this question, and they tell me that not only is it not clear that the effect is what hon. gentlemen opposite say it is, but on the contrary it is clear that the moment war is over wheat will no longer be on the free list.

The Minister of Finance took great credit to himself for raising $12,500,000 of revenue from the wealth of Canada. He said Canada was not a wealthy country, that the wealth was not where it could be reached by an income tax. But the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, spent five minutes in telling us how wealthy Canada was in that it could absorb hundreds of millions of the war debt. Does not that prove that the wealth of Canada is a good field for taxation? Wealth yielded $12,500,000 in taxes last year, but I venture to say that the workingmen of Canada paid $25,000,000 within the same time. The Minister of Finance proposes to tax wealth more heavily. That is a move in the right direction. Why should not the incomes of very wealthy men be very heavily taxed? We have men in Ottawa with incomes of $200,000 and $250,000 a year, and they are not asked to pay a dollar on those incomes, while the poor man with half a dozen children, who finds it hard to furnish his table with proper and sufficient food, is taxed at every turn.

The Minister of Finance stated this afternoon that there was some correspondence on this subject of free wheat between the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and himself. May I ask if he will bring down that correspondence?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The hon. gentleman knows I could not do that without violating my oath of office. The correspondence from the Prime Minister, of course, is confidential.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am surprised at that statement from the Minister of Finance. Surely, on reflection, he will agree that correspondence between one minister and another is not necessarily confidential. Before the recess an ex-minister laid before the House correspondence that had passed between himself and the Prime Minister while they were both members of the Government.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That may be entirely in the discretion of the minister. I regard any correspondence between myself and the Prime Minister as being of the same character as discussion at the Council Board. Apart from the question I have raised as to a minister's oath of office, there is no doubt that the correspondence to which reference has been made was in fact confidential and could not be brought down.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That puts it on another ground.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It puts it on both grounds.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend (Sir Thomas White) cannot blame me or imimpute to me any wrong motives, I am sure, because he himself mentioned this correspondence. Now may I ask whether before passing this Order in Council the Government had any correspondence with the Government of the United States to know whether that Government would accept an Order in Council putting wheat on the free list as they would accept an amendment of the Customs Act for the same purpose? And will the minister please say if the United States was notified when this action was taken?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We had no communication whatever with the Government of the United States before taking this action. Immediately after the action had been taken, and after the close of the exchanges for the day, I notified the press, and at the same time I wrote a letter to the Consul-General of the United States in Ottawa, Colonel Foster, enclosing a copy of the Order in Council, and Colonel Foster immediately despatched it to Washington, and, I understand, also telegraphed it.

Mr. TURRIFF: And, of course, the Government have not had any further word from the United States as to whether they will accept that as satisfactory or not. Now, in conclusion, I move the resolution which I have already read. I hope the Government will see its way clear to carry out the idea expressed in this amendment, in order to satisfy the farmers throughout Canada that it is the intention of the Government that wheat shall remain on the free list and shall not be subject to an Order in Council or to automatic reversion to the dutiable list on the ending of the war. If this is done, the farmer will have some inducement to put in larger crops. Not this year, for nothing that this House can do now will effect the size of the crop of the present year. But the season from the latter part of May to the middle of July is the time when, in the West, new ground is broken for wheat for the following year. If it is made clear that wheat is on the free list permanently, you will have a largely increased acreage broken during the present spring and summer and a largely increased acreage sown to wheat during the next year which will be a benefit not only to Canada but to Great Britain, the Allies and the whole world. It was stated here today that there was a possibility of there being a food famine in the world on account of this terrible war and if anything can be done to increase production it ought to be done. There is nothing that can be done that will have as good an effect in increasing production as having it made absolutely clear to the farmers that wheat is on the free list permanently and that it is not to be taken off either by Order in Council, or automatically, as soon as the war ceases.

On motion of Mr. Meighen the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Sir Thomas White the House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

Wednesday, April 25, 1917.

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

RETURNED SOLDIERS.

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

Sir HERBERT AMES (Montreal, St. Antoine) presented the following Preliminary Report of the Special Committee of the House of Commons in reference to the care of and provision for returned soldiers.

The Special Committee, appointed to consider, inquire into and report upon the reception, treatment, care, training and re-education of the wounded, disabled and convalescent returned soldiers of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces, in accordance with a resolution adopted by the committee, beg leave to present to the House the following Preliminary Report:

Your Committee, pursuant to the resolution passed by the House on Wednesday, 7th February last, appointing nine members to constitute the Committee, met on the said 7th February, when the following members, namely, Sir Herbert Ames, Hon. Charles Marcil, Hon. F. B. McCurdy, Mr. W. S. Middlebro, Mr. F. F. Pardee, Mr. Duncan C. Ross and Mr. Donald Sutherland were present and elected Sir Herbert Ames as Chairman of the Committee. The Committee at once proceeded to consider what information could be secured regarding existing agencies of assistance given to disabled returned soldiers and instructed the Clerk of the Committee to request the attendance of certain gentlemen of the Military Hospitals Commission and of the Militia Department to appear and give evidence before the Committee.

On Thursday, 22nd February, when your Committee again met, the Chairman's attention was directed to what the members of the Committee considered a technical difficulty. Your Committee had not been given power to send for persons and papers, to report from time to time, to adjourn from place to place, to print for the use of the Committee the evidence taken, nor could it ask leave to do so owing to the extended adjournment of the House. Obviously, there was but one course to follow in order to conform strictly with the rule. All nine members present considered that the inquiry was urgent and that it was the undoubted desire of the House that the Committee should hold immediate sessions. Your Committee thereupon resolved to proceed with the inquiry as if it had been granted leave by the House to send for persons and papers, to report from time to time, to adjourn from place to place and to print for the use of the Committee the evidence taken. Notwithstanding this, your Committeee, during the adjournment, has held ten business sessions at which important testimony was given and statements and papers were submitted by representatives of Returned Soldiers' Associations, Provincial Soldiers Aid Commissions, Military Hospitals, Convalescent Homes and Benevolent Societies from every province of the Dominion. Four sessions were held in Ottawa, two in Montreal and four in Toronto. The inquiry, in respect to the first matter of reference, is almost terminated so far as the hearing of evidence is concerned, and your Committee will be able to present to the House an Interim Report in the course of three or four weeks.

Your Committee therefore recommends to the House the desirability of ratifying the action of the Committee in having proceeded with the inquiry as if the House had granted to the Committee, at the time of its appointment, the various powers and authorities above mentioned, and the Committee further recommends that such powers and authorities be granted for the future work of the Committee, and in addition thereto, that the Com-

mittee be empowered to sit while the House is in session.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Sir HERBERT AMES moved:

That the recommendations contained in the Preliminary Report of the Committee on Returned Soldiers be concurred in, and the action of the Committee in exercising certain powers and authorities referred to in the report, notwithstanding the fact that such powers and authorities were not given in the original appointment of the Committee, be approved and ratified, and that the said Committee is hereby empowered to send for persons and papers, to report from time to time, to adjourn from place to place, to print the evidence taken before the Committee; and that the Committee be authorized to sit while the House is in session.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT.

Statistics of Express Companies for the year 1915—Hon. Mr. Cochrane.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. COCHRANE moved:

That the names of Messrs. Hartt, Weichel and Bradbury be substituted for those of Messrs. Crothers, Fowler and Sir Herbert Ames on the special committee to whom was referred Bill No. 13, an Act to consolidate and amend the Railway Act, and also that the name of Mr. Macdonald (Pictou) be added to the said committee.

Motion agreed to.

NEWSPRINT PAPER.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: With your leave, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Government whether or not an Order in Council was passed during the recess fixing the price of paper to be supplied by manufacturers to publishers, and, if so, whether the Order in Council will be brought down to the House.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: An Order in Council has been passed giving the Minister of Customs authority to fix the price of newsprint paper in Canada. The purpose of the Order was to provide an adequate supply of newsprint paper at reasonable prices to the publishers of newspapers. The Order to which I refer was not to become effective until gazetted. It provided that newsprint papers could only be exported by license. That Order was not gazetted, because, upon taking the matter up with the manufacturers of newsprint paper, an arrangement was reached whereby they made a fixed mill price and by reason of that action it was not thought necessary to enforce the Order in Council. Subsequently, in order to meet a situation which developed, a further Order in Council was passed; under the provisions of which the Minister of Customs was authorized to fix the price of newsprint paper sold in Canada, and an officer of the Government was authorized, if necessary, to take possession of supplies of newsprint paper required by newspaper publishers throughout Canada and to sell at a price fixed by the minister, and distribute to Canadian newspapers. If my Rt. Hon. friend desires that both Orders should be brought down I shall be very glad to lay them upon the Table in due course.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This is a very important action, and I imagine it should have been communicated to Parliament as soon as Parliament convened. It is practically amending the tariff, and I should expect the minister to be kind enough to bring down these papers, the first Order in Council, the agreement with the manufacturers and publishers, and the second Order in Council.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There is no written agreement between the Government and the manufacturers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There is an agreement between the manufacturers and the publishers, as I understood.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: An understanding was reached whereby $2.50 was fixed as the mill price. I am not aware that there is any written agreement between the manufacturers of news print paper and the newspaper publishers of Canada, but the manufacturers agreed among themselves to fix a price of $2.50 at the mill to supply the Canadian newspaper publishers who have been their customers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: As a consequence of the first Order in Council which was passed but not gazetted, and which was not to come into force until it was gazetted, an agreement of some kind was made between the manufacturers themselves or between the manufacturers and publishers. The Government must have had communication of that agreement.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The communication which the Government had was that the price had been fixed at $2.50 at the mill, and we did not gazette the Order in Council or proceed further because that price had been fixed. The fixing of the price depended

on the passing of the Order in Council whose object was to secure to the Canadian publishers of newspapers an adequate supply of news print at a reasonable price.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Do I understand that the Government have not a copy of this document in their archives?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We have no document evidencing an agreement between the manufacturers themselves or between them and the newspaper publishers; but we have what I shall be very glad to bring down, the Order in Council which I have mentioned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The rest was hearsay.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am not sure whether there was a letter in which it was stated that the price had been fixed at $2.50 at the mill. If there is such a letter I shall bring that down too. It was verbally communicated to me by the President of the Pulp and Paper Association that the price of $2.50 had been fixed. That price having been fixed, it was not necessary to gazette the Order in Council.

QUESTIONS.

Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.

CAPTAIN ANGERS' DISMISSAL.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. What were the causes of the dismissal of Captain E. Angers, who had charge of the Government steamer "Verchères"?
2. Was there any investigation held?

Mr. REID:

1. Incompetence.
2. No, although the department has agreed to grant him one if he wishes it.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—PURCHASE OF CARS.

Mr. GRAHAM:

How many freight, passenger, and sleeping cars respectively, have been purchased for the Canadian Government Railways in the United States since January 1, 1916?

Mr. COCHRANE: Since January 1, 1916, five hundred coal cars, fifty sleeping cars; ten dining cars, eighteen tourist, twenty-three first class, two baggage and two mail and express cars have been purchased for Canadian Government railways in the United States.

[Sir Thomas White.]

INLAND REVENUE OFFICERS MONTREAL.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. How many new officers have been appointed by the Inland Revenue Department at Montreal since the 1st of January, 1916?
2. What are the names and salaries of each permanent and temporary officer so appointed?

Mr. SEVIGNY:

1. 10.

2. Permanent: Dr. A. A. Bernard, $1,800; J. Brunet, $1,200. Temporary: J. E. Parent, $100; A. P. Simard, $800; G. Normandin, $900; A. Parent, $100; A. Perreault, $500; J. Macduff, $900; J. Paquin, $1,200; J. L, Laflamme, $800.

A. Parent, appointed to replace J. E. Parent whose services were dispensed with. Dr. A. A. Bernard to replace Inspector Archambault who died. A. Perreault, to replace Miss M. L. Perreault during her illness. A. P. Simard was employed from July 3 to December 3, 1916, and left the service since.

INLAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

How many officers were appointed in connection with the Department of Inland Revenue, both inside and outside service, in 1916?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Inside service, 8; outside service, 58; total, 66.

Nineteen of the above have replaced other officers. One inside permanent officer resigned. One inside temporary officer resigned. Thirteen outside temporary officers whose services were dispensed with during the year. Four have been appointed on commission; 5 appointed as technical officers; 5 returned soldiers; 18 appointed throughout the Dominion for the different services of the department; total, 66.

DUNCAN J. CAMPBELL.

Mr. CRUISE:

1. Does Duncan J. Campbell, of Macleod, Alberta, hold a position in the Government service?
2. If so, when was he appointed, and what is his salary?

Mr. PATENAUDE:

1. Mr. Duncan J. Campbell, of Macleod, Alberta, is a secret service agent in the employ of the Royal North West Mounted Police.

2. He was engaged on October 28, 1914, at $75 per month and expenses, which amount was increased to $100 per month in February, 1915.

TRENT CANAL WHARVES.

Mr. BURNHAM:

Will the Government inform this House which department is in charge of the maintenance, custody and repair of certain wharves at points along the western shore of the Otonobee (Trent) river between lock seven and Rice Lake on the Trent Canal?

Mr. COCHRANE: No department of the Government is in charge of the maintenance, custody and repair of the wharves in question as these structures are situated upon municipally owned lands.

JAMES LOVETT.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Was James Lovett dismissed from the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Halifax, N.S., for acts of partisanship?

2. If so, what were said acts of partisanship, and when were they committed?

Mr. REID: 1 and 2. Yes. The information with respect to his dismissal will be brought down in reply to a notice of motion now on the Order Paper.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

On the Order Notices of Motion:

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is there any reason for further delay in proceeding with the Notice which stands in my name providing for the granting of the franchise to women?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The subject matter of this resolution is of great importance. It is not of immediate urgency as the question of the franchise is not before the House. I asked my hon. friend the other day if he would be good enough to let this stand because it is a matter of great importance involving a question of policy, and as the Prime Minister spoke to a somewhat similar resolution, I think in the early part of last session, it would seem to me not only expedient but courteous to allow the matter to stand until his return. I am sure that my hon. friend will be willing to agree to that. He will be given an opportunity of bringing forward and discussing his motion; in other words, he will be in precisely the same position as he is to-day. I have asked the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) to allow his motion also to stand.

Motion stands.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. MACDONALD:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, reports and other papers and documents relative to the application of Willis Keizer of Hall's Harbour, King's County, N.S., for a license to operate a fishing weir at Square Cove, King's County, N.S.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, recommendations and other documents applying for or having reference to the position of Postmaster at Charlottetown, P.E.I., together with a copy of all replies sent by the Government or the Post Office Department to such applications and recommendations.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE:

For a copy of all documents, papers, correspondence and reports concerning the suspension of Polydore Lebel, engineer on the Intercolonial Railway at Rivière du Loup, as a result of a wreck in the year 1916.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR A RETURN.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. How many members of the House of Commons are serving or have served in the Canadian Army?

2. What are the names of each of said members, the date of appointment, and rank?

3. What are the names of those members who have resigned or have withdrawn from military service and the date of withdrawal or resignation?

4. How much has been paid to each for military salary, expenses and separation allowance to wife or relatives, respectively?

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—PROMOTION OF EMPLOYEES.

Mr. Herménégilde Boulay (Rimouski) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the employees on the Government railway should be promoted to official positions on that line before allowing the General Manager to employ strangers.

Mr. H. BOULAY (Rimouski) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I gladly take advantage of the presence of the Minister of Railways here tonight to call attention to certain facts connected with the management of the Intercolonial. At every session of Parliament, I have reluctantly to revert to the same subject. This year, as nothing was done to remedy a situation which I consider defective, I must again take up the question, the more willingly because the minister is here present to hear what I have to say in criticism of that management. The main grievance relates to the unfair treatment meted out to old employees of the road—they are government employees—in the matter of promotion. Since I have the honour to sit in this House, I always heard it claimed by ministers who have charge of the several departments that they made it their duty to promote officials according to each one's deserts and as a reward for his zeal in the performance of his duties. Now, I am sorry to see a different policy has prevailed in the case of the Intercolonial and other Government railways since our party came into power. True it is that the liberal party —gentlemen on the left can take their med-

icine— set a poor example during the few years they were in charge. During the liberal regime, we had to fight the same abuses; but the remissness of the late Government towards old officials is no excuse why we on this side should adopt a similar policy.

Mr. GAUVREAU (Translation): You would be quite at a loss to point to any specific cases.

Mr. BOULAY: I recall immediately a man by the name of Russell who was imported by the liberal party, and also one McGovern, both of whom were most objectionable men. There are many others whose names I do not recall, but if the hon. member for Temiscouata should insist, I might supply him with the list not later than to-morrow.

I have no fault to find with the general manager, Mr. Gutelius, as regards his courtesy, civility, manners and his general ability as manager of the Intercolonial. But even admitting his fitness for the position, of which I have no doubt, yet it must be said old officials of the Intercolonial could have been found fully competent to fill this post. But no complaints have as yet been heard. If Mr. Gutelius's appointment as head manager had been the only one of the kind, if instead of strangers being brought in to fill the vacancies, old employees had received promotion, or again had those strangers once appointed given satisfaction, I should keep silent and admit that the appointments were made in the public interest. But facts point to a different conclusion. Last year, it may be remembered, or perhaps is it two years ago, I voiced a complaint against Mr. Devonish who had been appointed superintendent at Campellton notwithstanding my protests. At the time of the appointment, my adverse attitude was commended; Mr. Devonish had been imported from another country, Ireland, I believe; at any rate, he certainly had never been previously on the staff of that railway. As superintendent he was a dismal failure. All winter the trains were snowbound on the Intercolonial between Mont-Joli and Campbellton due to Mr. Devonish being absolutely unacquainted with the road, on which he had never been employed, and with the climate of the country. No more incompetent person could have been secured for the position. Fortunately last winter his place has been taken by an old Intercolonial railwayman who had twenty-five to thirty years' experience and who is proof how much better service can be obtained by promoting employees than by filling vacancies with outsiders. Notwithstand that the past winter was very severe, trains were operated regularly on the Mont-Joli-Campbellton section. There have been delays of course, but no complaints were heard regarding the inefficiency of the management as in the previous year.

Another remark concerns the men on the Campbellton-Mont-Joli division as well as all the employees of the road.

It just comes to me that the hon. member for Temiscouata asked for names. He must recall Mr. Brady who was brought in by the late government and who did not prove to be one of the very clever men.

Mr. GAUVREAU: He did better at any rate than your Mr. Gutelius, of whom you complain.

M. BOULAY: Mr. McNeillie was another general superintendent selected from the staff of the Canadian Pacific. What practical acquaintance did he have with the Intercolonial, to warrant his being appointed general manager from Halifax to Montreal? He was a very nice man, very courteous and polite, but could not old employees be found just as civil and competent? Some twenty superior officials come from the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk railways; they hold positions which could have been filled as effectively by Intercolonial railwaymen. What ambition can there be in a man who starts at the bottom rung, as an operator or switchman, if he knows that the authorities have no intention of promoting him as a reward for his good work?

I complained also on different occasions that for the last forty-five years that part of the line that crosses the counties of Rimouski and especially Matane is operated by men from New-Brunswick. I made many attempts to obtain redress, but to this day I have always been unable to persuade the Intercolonial management that this section should be handled by men from the province of Quebec. The late Government should have understood that it was unfair that matters pertaining to the province of Quebec be always controlled by people from other provinces. Are not the men on the Montreal-Mont-Joli section quite competent? Why is the Mont-Joli-Moncton section kept under the management of men who do not speak French and seem to make it a point not to understand the language? It would be easy to create a new division from Montreal to Campbellton, as I often advocated, and to appoint one or two super-

intendents, if necessary, who would have charge of the whole line in the province of Quebec. I am again referring to the section between Mont-Joli and Campbellton which comprises 105 miles, of which only twelve run into New Brunswick. Why should that whole section be operated by New Brunswickers, when only twelve miles of the line run into their province? Such a practice is unfair to the French-Canadian patrons of the road, a large number of whom do not speak English. They have to deal with superintendents, freight agents and yard masters who cannot understand them. Why persist in allowing such grievances to exist when by a mere stroke of the pen the whole situation could be remedied to everyone's satisfaction. My contention is borne out by the fact that Mr. Gutelius has transferred the train despatchers of the Lévis Rivière-du-Loup section to Lévis, and the Lévis train despatchers run the section from Lévis to Rivière-du-Loup, while the train despatchers of the Rivière-du-Loup section run the section from Rivière-du-Loup to Mont Joli, and the Mont Joli-Campbellton section is run by the New Brunswick office to Campbellton, that is to say backwards. Now the division from Rivière-du-Loup to Montreal is operated from Lévis, while that from Rivière-du-Loup to Mont Joli is operated from Rivière-du-Loup and from Mont Joli to Campbellton the line is controlled from the New Brunswick office at Campbellton. Can anything be more unfair? Why is it persisted in? Is it that I have the honour to represent the county of Rimouski-Matane, or in order to cause annoyance to the employees? I hope my words this year will be heard and the situation remedied. The train despatcher's office at Campbellton could just as easily be located at Mont-Joli. It would be to the benefit of the road, as those in charge would be familiar with the line and the people they would have to deal with, while the Campbellton men know nothing of the road, the slopes and the weather conditions along the line. I am quite aware that the latter men would not find the transfer to Mont-Joli congenial, but after all it is not of our making if they do not understand the two languages as we do, and if they are not satisfied they are always at liberty to remain in New Brunswick, to which province they rightly belong.

I would like to call attention to another grievance which constantly entails friction and animosities between the two races. Instead of fomenting troubles, every one of us should strive in his own sphere to eliminate any cause of disagreement. Thus when French-Canadian applicants are called upon to pass examinations for brakemen or firemen, those examinations should be conducted in French as on the other western divisions. But it is not done. If a man from Rimouski or Matane applies for such a position, he passes his examination at Campbellton before examiners who do not understand French and who, when they are so-minded, put all kinds of difficulties in the way of the candidate and cause him to fall out with his representative in Parliament and renounce his own party. Such is the case. I asked Mr. Gutelius to have the applicants examined in French, either at Rivière-du-Loup or Lévis. I hope this small favour will be granted. Such grievances are easy of redress if you only set about doing it. All kinds of petty means are taken to bring about the failure of the candidates. After being examined at Campbellton on the "Standard Rules" which are printed only in English, when there should be copies in both languages, they are sent to Moncton to be examined on colours. If the members of this House knew how many colours the applicants are called upon to distinguish, some hundred of them, they would be surprised at the possible extent of human stupidity. The colours are placed before them and they are asked to explain the difference between the different shades. It seems to me that the colours in use on railways are not so complicated; why not stick to the three colours used, red, green and white? Why require them to distinguish between all the colours of the rainbow? If, perchance, the unfortunate applicant mentions the French name of a colour placed before him, he is refused and sent back home. I wish to apprise the House of those facts, so that the members may understand to what length these vexations go. I was a railwayman myself for some time and know all about it. An examination is also made of the eyesight. I always thought that normally a man sees with both eyes; but the candidate is asked to read with his left hand or his right hand over one eye. If he cannot read with one eye closed, he is not accepted. I know many people who cannot read with only one eye, and yet read quite well with both? Where is the man who does not constantly make use of both eyes? Those minutiæ it seems to me, are ridiculous and merely a source of annoyance to the applicant. Why not examine him with both his eyes open and see whether he is short sighted or not.

For some years past I advocated the employment of French-Canadians on the dining cars, especially from Campbellton to Mont-

real. Something has been done as a result, but we have not yet obtained complete justice. All winter, while the local and express services were suspended, a dining-car was run between St. Leonards and Montreal, and not one single man on the car understood French; meanwhile, the French-speaking waiters were kept on the Nova-Scotia and New-Brunswick divisions, where a knowledge of French on the dining-cars is not requisite.

I must also take exception to the cancelling of the local train during a part of the winter. On the Campbellton-Moncton division, although the number of passengers is not more than a quarter of what it is in my county, a local service was kept up all winter. From Rivière-du-Loup to Lévis, the train was run as usual, but from Rivière-du-Loup to Campbellton it was cancelled, although it is one of the best paying parts of the line. The train was resumed again only lately.

Those are small grievances which are such as to provoke unnecessarily a part of the population and one wonders how it is that a part of the province of Quebec is thus unfairly dealt with when another section is well treated.

A few years ago what are called the "Standard Rules" were contrived. Well, I have a lot of experience with railway rules and when a knowledge of the Standard Rules was required of applicants, I refrained from criticism because I wished to examine them first. All I have to say is that they have been in force for the last two years and they have proven a real failure. They put the life of passengers in jeopardy and cause much annoyance to the railwaymen themselves by placing most of the responsibility for the running of the train on the conductor. Instead of giving him instructions, as was done before, to meet another train at a particular point, he is simply told that such a passenger train is so many hours late. The unfortunate conductor must at each station make a computation to see if a train running behind him or in the opposite direction will reach him at any particular siding. It is nothing but computation and worry and the conductor can scarcely bear the strain. I fail to see why this system was adopted, because it makes the position unbearable for the train employees and endangers the lives of the travelling public. A mistake in the number of hours a train is late may result in a collision.

Now what about the medical examination and the medical examiners for the Superannuation Fund of the Intercolonial? Here again the French-Canadians are submitted to gross discrimination. The employees on the Montreal-Mont-Joli division are required to repair to Moncton to be examined by physicians who do not speak a word of French. The applicants have to get interpreters and often return without having obtained satisfaction. Why not appoint a practitioner from the province of Quebec who could do the work as well as the Moncton doctors. It is a small matter and putting it right would satisfy the people. This is one of the grievances, and the employees on the Intercolonial suffer grievances, as they have proven by their vote at the last election.

The French-Canadians in the province of Quebec labour under another disadvantage. I often had occasion to call at the public offices of the Intercolonial at Moncton and, except Mr. Melançon, not one of of the employees speak both languages although there are twenty-five to thirty high officials who are paid fairly big salaries, judging from the list I shall give out. There are many in the province of Quebec who would willingly accept the remuneration. Here are some of the salaries paid to heads of departments: E. P. Gutelius, general manager, $20,000; Superintendent of Car Service, $200 monthly; Alward, General Solicitor, $5,000.

Mr. GAUVREAU (Translation): The latter was brought from Ottawa to replace Mr. Caron.

Mr. BOULAY (Translation): Quite likely. C. B. Brown, Chief Engineer, $6,000; Shannon, Comptroller and Treasurer, $5,000; Story, General Freight Agent, $416.66 monthly; Allen, General Baggage Agent, $125 per month; Joughins, Superintendent of Motive Power, $400 per month.

The member for Temiscouata might take note that this man was appointed by his own party.

Mr. GAUVREAU (Translation): You cannot say he is unfit; he is one of the best men on the Intercolonial.

Mr. BOULAY (Translation): Possibly; I am not discussing his ability; he is not a French-Canadian. C. E. Smith, Master Car Builder, $3,600; Appleton, General Master Mechanics, $3,600; Simpson, General Fuel Agent, $3,600; W. R. Devonish, Superintendent, $275 per month. There are others, but I do not wish to take all the time of the House. All those big salaries go to men who do not come from the province of Quebec and none of whom understand a single word of French. Here is room, it seems, for improvement,

if it were desired to treat us fairly, I called lately in an office at Moncton, where twelve men were employed, and not one spoke French, except a young stenographer. To my question whether she earned more than the others, she replied that she had the smallest salary. Does it not seem that an employee speaking both languages should in justice receive higher pay than any who can use only one language, especially when the knowledge of French is apt to help an important section of the public, such as the French-speaking population of Canada?

I shall not speak any longer to the resolution; but I hope the Minister of Railways will heed my remarks and prove he understands their capital importance by giving justice to the French element in Canada. If you wish to encourage the present members of the Civil Service, the best plan is to adapt a system of promotions. I had occasion now and then to recommend certain employees for promotion; the answer came back from Moncton, without the applicants being examined or even when the authorities knew nothing of them: " the men you recommend are not competent." Here is a case in point. I complained again t the appointment on the division of the Intercolonial in which my constituency is comprised of a man by the name of Bovard who had been dismissed from the Transcontinental because he could not speak French. I remonstrated that we had no use for the man and that the position should have been given to a man from my district; I suggested two names; those two men were quite competent, with twenty years' experience, being qualified even to be superintendents; but my recommendation was turned down, without the men being known or being examined; I believe the Minister himself wrote to me: "Your men are not competent". It is the stereotyped answer when French-Canadians apply for positions of some importance. I submit those facts to the House, and especially to the attention of the Minister of Railways, if he cares in the least to deal fairly by the people of the Province of Quebec.

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (St. John): Mr. Speaker, in the resolution which the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Boulay) has presented to the House there is a great deal that is deserving of support. From what I have heard of the hon. gentleman's administration of the patronage of his county, as well as in adjoining counties, I do not wonder that the Minister of Railways sometimes feels rather reluctant to agree to his recommendations, and I can well understand that the minister may sometimes do an injustice to people along the line of the Intercolonial railway

4 p.m. just because of the persistent and sometimes unfair pressure brought to bear on him by the hon. gentleman I say this particularly because I know the activities of the hon gentleman have not been confined to his own constituency, but that on more than one occasion he has come down into the province of New Brunswick and tried to take away from men who may fairly be entitled to some voice with the minister any influence they may have. The hon. gentleman's influence extends through the county of Rimouski and into the county of Madawaska, and I do not know, without knowledge of all the circumstances, that I can very much blame the Minister of Railways for not paying special attention to the representations of the hon. gentleman who has moved this motion; but at the same time, I think the Minister of Railways ought to give some consideration to the special question raised by this resolution. Although I do not quite agree with its terms, with the spirit of it I entirely agree. The resolution states:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the employees on the Government railway should be promoted to official positions on that line before allowing the General Manager to employ strangers.

In the management of any large business, whether it is the business of a railway or a commercial or manufacturing business, that is a principle which might well be adhered to. Take for instance the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which perhaps ought to be the model for railway management, although it may not be just and proper to put that railway company ahead of the Grand Trunk, because the management of the Grand Trunk has been exceedingly good; I understand it is a principle on those railroads that when a young man enters one of their offices, even in a humble capacity, he can, if he attends to his duties, look forward to the time when he may occupy the position of superintendent of the line or even a higher position. The same is true in the United States in the case of great manufacturing companies like the Bethlehem Steel, where some forty thousand people are employed. A boy who enters the employment of that company merely as a messenger boy can look forward with hope and confidence to the time when he

may occupy a position of great responsibility. It is the same with the Armours, who employ between thirty and forty thousand people, and with other big concerns in the United States, and that is the only way to ensure loyalty on the part of the employees of any great company. In the case of the Intercolonial Railway, however, since this Government have come into office, the heads of the employees have been cut off almost indiscriminately. First it is the Board of Management who are deprived of their positions; then it is the engineer of permanent way, a splendid official, one who has given years of service to the Intercolonial, but who, without reason, is dismissed, and a gentleman from another railroad, who had never before been connected with the Intercolonial, is brought in to take his place. The same is true with regard to the general traffic manager. Although he had given satisfaction to the public and discharged his duties faithfully, he is dismissed by this Government and another gentleman is brought in from another railroad to fill his position. So you might take the cases of gentlemen occupying positions of responsibility in which they had served the public and the country well, who have been dismissed without rhyme or reason and strangers brought in to take their places. That is not the proper method of managing a great railroad. I am told by gentlemen who are familiar with the condition of affairs at Moncton that many of the old employees do not know to-day whether or not, when they wake up to-morrow, they will still be in the employ of the Intercolonial, there being no security of employment. The result is that the feeling of loyalty amongst the employees is destroyed, their ambition is crushed, they are prevented from giving the highest service which a man is capable of giving to his employer, and the consequence is that the service on the railroad is very much impaired. The Minister of Railways apparently trusts everything to Mr. Gutelius, but he ought to look into this matter himself. I have nothing to say against Mr. Gutelius, personally, but I claim that he is no better than the men who have been discharged to make room for him. I am told that he brought into the Intercolonial a number of American citizens, some men from Ontario, some from the Grand Trunk, and some from the Canadian Pacific. I am told that even typists and ordinary clerks are brought in from other railroads or other parts of the Dominion to take positions on the Intercolonial at Moncton, and instead of these positions being given to those who are already employed and who have given good service, the latter are passed over and others taken in to fill the places that properly belong to these older employees. Has the operation of the Intercolonial been such as to be approved by the public? I submit not. From my observations, I do not believe the management of the Intercolonial was ever so bad as it is to-day. During the past winter there was scarcely a week in which the newspapers had not an account of a wreck on the Intercolonial.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Scarcely a day.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What excuse is there for wrecks? Is not the reason that somebody has neglected his duty, that somebody has been guilty of an oversight or want of care? Is it not because there is not that devotion to duty amongst the employees of the Intercolonial which there would be if the same system that is pursued in regard to employment of officials on other railroads were pursued in regard to the employees of the Intercolonial? The history of the Intercolonial during the past winter has been a history of mismanagement, neglect, destruction of property and inconvenience to the travelling public. I cannot speak of what the roadbed is like in all the sections of the Dominion through which that railway passes, but I know that on quite a number of occasions trains have left the track on account of broken rails. The other day, within three miles of the city of St. John, a suburban train ran off the track and the passengers had to walk into the the city. That is only one instance of inconvenience to passengers which are occurring on the Intercolonial railroad and which are an evidence of want of care on the part of the management. These things would not occur with proper oversight and care, and it would almost seem as if under the management of the Intercolonial it is a question of balancing loss of life and accident to passengers and employees against the cost which will be incurred by managing the road efficiently and seeing that proper service is obtained from those who are employed on the line.

With regard to train accommodation, the Intercolonial has now been in operation for a great many years between Montreal, St. John, Halifax, the Sydneys and all parts of Nova Scotia, and I declare to you, Sir, that the service has never within my recollection been so unsatisfactory as it is now. In former years there was some en-

couragement given to travel between the great commercial city of St. John and points on the north shore of the province. The people of St. John were also encouraged to travel to Quebec and Montreal by the Intercolonial, with which road we had direct connection at Moncton. But to-day that is all done away with, and apparently no attention is paid to the comfort or convenience of people who wish to travel from St. John to the north shore of the province or to Quebec and Montreal. Any one leaving St. John for the north shore or for Quebec has to take a local train to Moncton, and wait there from one to three hours until he can catch a train going to the north or to Quebec, and the same thing applies on the return journey. No attention whatever is paid now to the comfort and convenience of the travelling public. Formerly we used to have a very good suburban service on the Intercolonial, but when I was down at St. John recently I found that that had all been changed, and to-day the suburban service from the country districts into the city of St. John is not much better than it was twenty years ago; it is certainly not as good as it was a couple of years ago, or even last year. These changes for the worse seem to have been made without any reason. I do not intend to take up any time in elaborating these just grounds for public complaint, as other hon. gentlemen will no doubt speak on this motion, and my hon. friend from Moncton will be able to speak of conditions in his district with more knowledge than I. I am simply voicing the complaints which are made in the portion of the province from which I come, and pointing out that the universal sentiment of the people is that there is no excuse for the want of accommodation, no excuse for the lack of regard to the comfort and convenience of the travelling public, and no excuse for the many disastrous wrecks that have occurred during the past year. I do not blame the minister for that, except in this sense; he ought to give personal attention to these matters. That is what a minister is for, it seems to me, to give personal attention to the management of the great interests which are confided to his care. I do not know whether the Minister of Railways gives these matters his personal attention or not. If he does, and still allows these things to go on, he is greatly to blame, and if he does not, he is to blame for leaving the management so entirely in the hands of the General Manager of the Intercolonial. I am going to support this motion of my hon. friend from Rimouski (Mr. Boulay) because the spirit of it is good, though I would alter two or three words if I had the amending of it. But perhaps the minister will agree to an amendment himself, which will meet with the views of the House. This is a resolution which ought to be passed. The people of this country have a right to expect the Intercolonial to be managed just as any great railway company is managing its railway. It should be managed in such a way as to secure loyalty and the best possible service from its employees, and to prevent the gross injustice which has been done to the employees of this great railroad system in the past few years under the management of the present Minister of Railways and the gentleman whom he brought in from outside to occupy the responsible position of General Manager.

Mr. JOHN STANFIELD (Colchester): My name has been before the public more or less during the last few months in connection with this matter, and I wish to correct certain statements that have appeared in the newspapers of the country. I am sorry to say that the papers that are supposed to be friendly to me have magnified the incident in which my name was mentioned, and have made statements that were incorrect. A statement was sent out to the press from this House last Thursday or Friday night in connection with what the Minister of Railways had said in regard to some remarks made by my brother in the local House, and, according to this report, the Minister of Railways said that he did not know and did not care. I have consulted Hansard, and have spoken to the members who were sitting next to the minister when he was speaking, and I find that this newspaper report is absolutely false.

Mr. CARVELL: Stand by the minister.

Mr. STANFIELD: I will stand by what is fair and square, but will oppose him or any one else when I think it is right to do so. What I wish to say is this: Some hon. members on this side of the House, as well as on the other, were under the impression that I was trying to dictate to the Minister of Railways and the General Manager of Government Railways that a certain man should be promoted to a vacancy on the Intercolonial. I do not think that I have any right to dictate; I might suggest whom they might promote. But I say that we have as good men in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick as can be obtained anywhere else; they have proved themselves to be so.

All I need do is to point to Mr. McDougall, General Manager of the Dominion Coal Company, who has been promoted step by step from boy to general manager, and has made good. In his speech yesterday, the junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) referred to a constituency in Nova Scotia as to which he said the people did not know whether it was represented in this Parliament or not. If he was alluding to the county of Colchester, I can tell him that the people of that county are well satisfied with the way they are being represented, and they do know that they are being represented here at the present moment. I am not saying this boastfully; I am simply stating what I know to be a fact.

Before taking my seat I should like to correct the statement of the hon member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), who said that this passenger agent was discharged. He was not discharged, but superannuated, and Mr. Malanson, Assistant Passenger Agent, was appointed in his place and has made good. I will say this for Mr. Hayes of the Intercolonial Railway: as far as I know, he has not brought in a single man from another road to fill a vacancy on the Intercolonial, but has promoted men from the ranks, and I am sure that if Mr Gutelius will follow the same policy in his management of the road, and will promote the men we have in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, a better spirit will prevail amongst the employees of the road.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Were not the Chief Engineer and the General Traffic Manager both brought in from outside?

Mr. STANFIELD: Yes. I would support this motion if after the word "railway" were inserted the words "when qualified."

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.): I do not know whether to congratulate the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) or the Minister of Railways on the rapprochement that has taken place between them. They are both gentlemen for whom hon. members on this side of the House have a very high regard. I know I am speaking the sentiments of my colleagues around me when I say we are delighted to see that the hatchet has been buried, and that they are now able to live together in peace and harmony, and the Chief Whip of the Conservative party resuming the place he has filled so worthily for the past five years. But I am at a loss to know exactly where he stands. His conclusions are all right, however. He could vote for this motion provided a reasonable amendment were added, and I hope he will vote for it. But I must say I am rather disappointed in the hon member for Colchester, that he takes so much back water as he does. I thought he would make a stronger fight.

Mr. PUGSLEY: He is somewhat subdued.

Mr. CARVELL: He is getting along fairly well, but I must say he is not measuring up to the standard he at first set for himself, he is not fulfilling the expectations formed of him by the people generally. He made a start some months ago, and was determined to show up the mismanagement of the Intrercolonial. Well, it was a good start anyway.

If it is necessary to go to Ontario, or to the West, or to the United States, to find a man to act as superintendent or head of a department of the Intercolonial, the conclusion seems inevitable that there is not much brains left among the employees of the Intercolonial. But there is hardly a railway in Canada that has not in its employ men who were trained on the Intercolonial and who are making good. Go to the United States, go to Western Canada, and you will find former Intercolonial men engaged in all departments of the great railways, and making good everywhere.

The great trouble with the Intercolonial is that it is being run on no principle whatever. The Minister of Railways, I think, would like to run it on something like business principles. He hands over the direction of affairs to his General Manager, giving that gentleman the widest powers which he exercises like—well, I will not say what I was going to say, but, let us say, as a man from Berlin would exercise them. He has no regard for the feelings of anybody, but simply says: I am the Almighty so far as the Intercolonial is concerned, and I will do as I have a mind to so long as the minister will stand behind me. And he does things in that way, until it comes to the ordinary work of the railway, and then the politician steps in. And that is what the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Boulay) is finding fault with. The whole thing is honeycombed with politics. A man cannot get a position on the Intercolonial—except the big men whom Mr. Gutelius employs—otherwise than by going through the Conservative patronage committee. I informed the Minister of Railways privately yesterday of a case to which I will not refer now at length, the case of

a man who could not even get a siding except through the patronage committee. Afterwards, he got his siding and paid for it, but as the Tory patronage committee did not want it, in three weeks it was taken up, and now he has to have the produce in which he deals teamed a quarter of a mile to and from his warehouse. This siding was absolutely taken up because the politicians of that part of the province did not want it.

Mr. COPP: Worse than that they are competitors in business.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes. I gave the minister the details, and he has promised to investigate, so I shall have nothing further to say about the matter now. We see the result of this political management of the Intercolonial in the operation of the trains. I was foolish enough to make two trips on the Intercolonial last winter, and I got just what I might have expected. I got tied up in each case, and was from six to ten hours late. In one case I got behind a wreck, fifty or sixty miles east of Lévis, about five o'clock on Saturday afternoon, and we did not get out of there until two o'clock on Sunday morning. I was informed that there were only two cars off the track, and on the Canadian Pacific railway or any other similar road the track would have been cleared in two hours. As well as we could find out, there was only one wrecking train in that portion of the country, and it was down on the Transcontinental, and apparently there was nobody who knew or cared or could do anything about it. I do not think I have been on the Intercolonial once within the last two years when I have not been from two to ten hours late. There is no need for that. The thing is badly managed in some way—and, I think, in every way.

I had not intended to speak on this motion, but I think it is not only the privilege but the duty of every member from the Maritime Provinces to tell the people something of the way the Intercolonial is managed. There have been wrecks, not one a week but practically one a day, during the whole winter. And I am told by men who have seen it that the trains seem to run pretty much at haphazard. A train goes along, apparently, until they think it time to boil the kettle, and then they get out and have a picnic. Then, if they escape a pitch-in from the rear, they resume the trip when it suits them and finish according as may be. Possibly, this is putting it rather strong, but it is the current talk about the Intercolonial. We are looking to the Minister of Railways to improve these things; and if Mr. Gutelius cannot run the road any better, then let the minister employ somebody at less than $20,000 a year, and perhaps he will get better results. It is possible to pay a man too much, and sometimes I wonder if that is not the case in the operation of the Government railways of Canada. In my judgment, the difficulty would be in great part met if this resolution were carried into effect and party patronage were eliminated from the operation of the road. Then the men who have grown up on the system could be promoted instead of allowing outsiders to come in and take from these people the positions that they have fairly earned. How can you expect efficiency in a business, or a Government, or any other activity, if there is no possibility of promotion beyond a certain point? A man on the Intercolonial is apt to say: What is the use of my working and becoming efficient?—I cannot get beyond the position of conductor or engineer; if somebody is wanted as superintendent or assistant superintendent, a politician will be brought in from some other part of the country. Let the minister adopt the spirit of this resolution and instruct the superintendent to promote the men on the Intercolonial—and there are hundreds of them who are fit to be promoted—and thus assure these employees that if they make themselves efficient they will be rewarded. In the employees of the Intercolonial the minister has a class of people who are just as capable as those on the Canadian Pacific. Yet, let any man travel in the province of New Brunswick on the Intercolonial and on the Canadian Pacific, and even though he has his eyes shut or is blindfolded, he will be able to determine before going five miles on which road he is travelling. One does not need to be told that he has left one system and gone to the other—he knows it by the operation of the road. He knows it because the Intercolonial railway is being operated so much less efficiently than the Canadian Pacific—that is patent to every man who can look and to every man who cannot look. Therefore, I hope this resolution will pass. Then, I hope that the minister will carry out the real spirit of the proposals, and try and eliminate some of the politics which are running rampant on the Government system of railways in Canada.

Mr. CHARLES A. GAUVREAU (Temiscouta) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I am not very much in sympathy with the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Boulay); but I must say that I give my hearty support to his resolution as drafted. Of course I am aware that his intention in bringing the matter before the House is to create an opportunity of calling attention to the treatment meted out to him by his political associates. The motion may be double-edged, but as the intention is to help the men on the Intercolonial, my hon. friend is entitled to support from this side of the House. When I hear such criticisms levelled at the management of the Government railway, I wish to recall to the hon. member that before 1911 there was a good board of management, to which the Liberal Government had appointed a French-Canadian, Mr. Caron, from whom his compatriots could expect fair treatment. The friends of the hon. gentleman from Rimouski were barely secure on the Treasury benches, when he himself, who had a vengeance to wreak, as well as the hon. member for l'Islet (Dr. Paquet) for well-known motives, were clamouring for the abolition of the Board, knowing full-well that the disappearance of the Board meant the dismissal of Mr. Caron. A General Manager was then appointed; his name sounds a good deal like that of a "Boche" and his methods have something of the Prussian about them. At any rate, the grievances exist, the employees on the Intercolonial are treated unfairly; we are here to protect them, and we must take every means to obtain redress.

The member for Rimouski, in an effort to prove that his party was not solely responsible for the present situation, states that the Liberals had imported men who had never been employed on the Intercolonial. When called upon to give specific instances, he mentioned a certain Mr. Russell. I remember his appointment. He has been made superintendent as a kind of experiment, but complaints were made all along the line, and justly so, so that after ten months Russell was dismissed.

I wish to observe en passant, that the Minister of Railways may be doing his best, but even taking into account his noted stoicism, I fail to see why he leaves the absolute management of the most valuable property of the country in the hands of Mr. Gutelius. In his office the minister is always courteous and even amiable, and ready, I believe, to do his best by French-Canadians. That is why I fail to understand why Mr. Gutelius is allowed the upper hand. The mere fact that there is general dissatisfaction would justify the Minister of Railways, were he like some politicians I know, in depriving Mr. Gutelius of a position which he exploits, not only to the detriment of the road and the men, but even against the friends of the Government. Thus, not long ago, at the time of the New Brunswick elections, which caused much rejoicing in the Liberal camp, I read in a newspaper published in that province the reply of a Conservative leader, who was asked to what he attributed the defeat of his party: "If you wish said he, to explain the defeat of the Government of New Brunswick, look at Mr. Gutelius." Of course, the hon. member for Rimouski finds little satisfaction in such facts, and if I mention them it is to obtain for the men on the Intercolonial some measure of freedom—not by shooting holes in the British flag—but the freedom of men who have a right to be treated fairly. That is the case to such an extent, that formerly the trades unions of the Intercolonial were a kind of shelter for the railwaymen. If a man were in trouble, if he were destitute or had been dismissed for or without cause, he found among the members of the trades unions help and protection. Now men who are dismissed, sometimes through mere personal spite, appeal in vain to his fellow members of the union for redress: the officers of the union are in fear of the General Manager.

Quite possibly the minister who has been ill and had to travel extensively for his health is not aware of what is going on on the Intercolonial. I must bear witness to his kindness because when I appealed to him in the name of humanity on behalf of employees in destitute circumstances, I was always well received. For that only, I should forgive him many of his political sins in the past.

If things are going far from smoothly on the Intercolonial it is because the minister places too much confidence in Mr. Gutelius and will not be undeceived. The day his eyes are opened, he will get rid of that gentleman and appoint another manager at a smaller salary; or he will take in his own hands the management of the road and I think the province of Quebec and the whole country will feel there has been an improvement.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Rimouski will rally to his motion the unanimous support of the House. He simply requests after all that the manage-

ment of the railway be not left entirely under the control of Mr. Gutelius. Mr. Speaker, when a minister has charge of the most valuable property of the Government and knows the large number of men employed in connection with it, should not the mere fact that a general discontent exists, that the employees are provoked to the point of rising as one man to vote against the Government, make him realize the extent of the grievance and prompt him to eradicate it. And should he find that Mr. Gutelius is at the bottom of the general unrest, ought he not to order his dismissal? There is no lack of men in the Maritime Provinces, in Quebec or elsewhere who could be appointed General Manager.

The hon. member for Rimouski must be congratulated; his resolution is timely and will have good results. If he could suggest a scheme to operate the road, that would best fit conditions like those that prevailed last winter, he would deserve the thanks of this House and of his electors. Never has a railway been so badly managed as was the Intercolonial last winter. In fact accidents were far too frequent, and so much has their number increased that one does not feel safe when he travels on that road. Mr. Speaker, if this resolution has no other effect than to bring the Minister of Railways to realize that he must enquire for himself and dispense with the services of Mr. Gutelius, he will have earned the gratitude not only of his electors but of the whole province of Quebec.

Hon. J. D. REID: Mr. Speaker, I see no reason for not accepting the resolution because, so far as I know, the policy enunciated in it has been carried out, so far as it could be, on the Government railway system. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) said a few minutes ago that they had as good men in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, with as much brains as in any other part of the Dominion.

Mr. CARVELL: Sure I said that.

Mr. REID: I agree to every word of that. But let me say that from 1891 until 1896, when the Conservative party were in power, the Intercolonial was operated under the management of Mr. Pottinger who had been manager for many years and who had, so far as I know, carried on the operation of the railway successfully. I have nothing but words of praise to utter, in so far as Mr. Pottinger is concerned. Yet, during all that time, hon. gentlemen opposite criticised the management of the Intercolonial just as they are doing now. Mr. Pottinger was not fit to run the road, according to them everything was run politically.

Mr. GRAHAM: Mr. Boulay is not on this side of the House; Mr. Boulay is on that side of the House.

Mr. REID: By the support of Mr. Boulay's resolution I think all the hon. members opposite are coming over to this side.

Mr. GRAHAM: Soon.

Mr. REID: No, as supporters of ours.

Mr. GRAHAM: Oh, no.

Mr. REID: Oh, yes. I was going to say—

Mr. GRAHAM: It is kind of in the air, like.

Mr. REID: I was going to say that when the Liberals came into power they at once decided to make a change. Mr. Pottinger was not considered by them to be qualified to run the road. Although there are in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia men with as much brains as in any other part of Canada, although there were men on the Intercolonial who had served from boyhood up, yet, instead of taking a man with brains from Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, they went to the Grand Trunk and took Mr. Harris as general manager of the Intercolonial. Where were the men with brains from Nova Scotia or New Brunswick at that time? The Liberals then showed that, so far as they were concerned, they had to go outside of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to get a man to operate the Intercolonial, and they went to the Grand Trunk railway. They were not satisfied with Mr. Harris and they put back Mr. Pottinger whom they had been condemning for fifteen or twenty years. But again Mr. Pottinger was not satisfactory. Why? Because they wanted to run the road politically. Then they wanted some more men with brains. Did they go to Nova Scotia or New Brunswick? They came right up to Ontario and went to the Canadian Pacific Railway and took Mr. Brady off the Canadian Pacific and made him superintendent of the Intercolonial. Although the hon. member for Carleton stated a few moments ago that they could produce men in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick who had been serving on the Intercolonial for many years and who were competent to act as superintendent, they went to the Canadian Pacific Railway and took Mr. Brady.

Mr. COPP: Did you approve of Mr. Brady at that time?

Mr. REID: That is not the question I am discussing. They went further, they came here to Ottawa and formed a Board. How many men did they take from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick for that Board? The first man was Mr. Campbell, the deputy minister, who is from the province of Ontario. They wanted another man. Did they go to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick? They took Mr. Caron from the city of Ottawa, who had never run a railway in his life. They wanted another man to make up the Board. Did they go to the Intercolonial? Did they take an operating man? No, they went to the Grand Trunk and took Mr. Tiffin.

Mr. GRAHAM: No, Mr. Tiffin was on the Intercolonial at the time and had been for years.

Mr. REID: Mr. Tiffin was taken from the Grand Trunk and put on the Intercolonial by the Liberal party.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not on that Board.

Mr. REID: He was taken from the Grand Trunk and put on the Intercolonial as an employee.

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister is getting excited. He was going along at a pretty good gait and has got into deep water. His memory has failed him. Mr. Tiffin was an old employee in charge of the traffic on the Intercolonial when he was placed on this Board. In addition to that, Mr. Pottinger was placed on this Board. This Board was modelled on the lines of the management of the Pennsylvania railway, and the heads of the several departments composed it. In deference to the French-speaking people living along the Intercolonial, the Liberal Government did what had never been done before; they placed a French-speaking man on that Board to have something to say as to how the road should be managed. That was Mr. Caron, formerly of the province of Quebec, latterly of Ottawa. As connecting link between the Government and the Board, the deputy minister was placed on it as chairman, because the late Government never shirked its responsibility in the management of the Intercolonial. So they made the deputy minister the connecting link with the Government in the management of the road.

Mr. GAUVREAU: And they were all British subjects.

Mr. REID: I am not finding fault with the men appointed. What I am endeavouring to prove is that Mr. Tiffin was an employee of another railway, from which he was taken and put on the Intercolonial. He was not promoted from the Intercolonial, except that when the Board was formed he was then made a member of the Board. Thus that very prominent position into which Mr. Tiffin was placed at first could have been filled, if the hon. members opposite are correct, by a promotion from the Intercolonial. But that was not done. Mr. Caron was put on because he was a French-Canadian. There is no objection to that; that is perfectly right. But does the hon. member mean to say, when he interjects that remark, that along the Intercolonial from Montreal to Sydney, where there are hundreds, yes thousands, of French-Canadian employees who have served the road from boyhood up, there was not a man on the Intercolonial qualified to sit on that Board, and that it was necessary to go to the province of Ontario and take a man from the city of Ottawa?

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend's memory is at fault again. He means well, but he overlooks the chief fact. At that time the law was changed; what had never been done before was done then. An Act was passed allowing claimants against the Intercolonial up to a certain amount to sue the Government without going through the Exchequer Court. Mr. Caron, being a lawyer, was placed on the Board for the purpose of managing these cases at short range instead of at long range. Every employee on the Intercolonial could not have done that.

Mr. CROTHERS: Could you not have found a French-Canadian lawyer down there?

Mr. GRAHAM: I shall not answer my hon. friend; this is not a labour problem.

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes, it is; you are labouring very hard over it.

Mr. GRAHAM: For me it is not a labour problem. The names of many legal gentlemen were submitted. I do not hesitate to say that I consulted the members along the Intercolonial, because the Intercolonial is owned by the people and not by any general manager. Several names which had been presented were submitted to the men interested and Mr. Caron was unanimously selected. He was a good man, and it was a mistake to put him off the Board.

Mr. REID: I am not finding fault with Mr. Caron. What I find fault with is this: although members of the Bar of French descent were practising between Montreal and Sydney and had been doing business for the Government for many years in connection with the Intercolonial, you came to the province of Ontario and got for the position in question a man who was not at that time a qualified practitioner in the province of Quebec. I have in mind the reason why Mr. Caron was put on there.

Mr. GRAHAM: Of course it is only a suspicion.

Mr. REID: It is only a suspicion, but there is no harm in mentioning it. Mr. Caron was a good politician, and it was an awfully good thing to have a good politician on that board You could not get a better man than Mr. Caron; he is a fine man.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am glad that you agree.

Mr. REID: Yes, he had a lot of experience in this House and in other ways so far as politics are concerned. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House say that the Intercolonial is honeycombed with politics. I agree with them to this extent: it was honeycombed with politics prior to our coming into power. So long as the hon. member for South Renfrew was operating the Intercolonial Railway, I am satisfied that there was no possible chance for the promotion of any Tory between Montreal and Sydney. There were no Tories on the Intercolonial Railway who had any brains at that time for promotion— 5 p.m.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon friend surely does not mean to say that there were no Tories with brains on the Intercolonial?

Mr. REID: I mean in the opinion of the hon. member for South Renfrew. There was no chance for any good Tory at that time, so far as the Intercolonial railway was concerned.

Mr. CARVELL: There are lots of them now.

Mr. REID: Of course there are, because we have been giving them their rights since we came into power. During the fifteen years that we were in opposition many men on the Intercolonial railway who should have been promoted did not get their rights, and many of them, because of their having received no promotion during fifteen years, since reached the age limit and could not get the promotion to which they were entitled.

Hon. gentlemen have complained that there were wrecks on the Intercolonial railway. I submit that the Intercolonial railway is in the same position as any other railway with regard to wrecks; you cannot operate a railway without wrecks occurring. In my opinion, however, there have been fewer wrecks on the Intercolonial, proportionately speaking, than on any other railroad in Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. REID: As to the service on the Intercolonial railway, I have it from highest officials of the department, as well as from other railways, that the service is equal to if not better than that of any of the other Canadian systems—and the Intercolonial railway has been in this position ever since war broke out in August, 1914. The Intercolonial railway is practically the only outlet to Halifax for the traffic over the other railways; consequently it has really been overloaded. An enormous amount of equipment has been added to the Intercolonial during the last two or three years and this railway was able last year, when not hampered on account of storms, to transport traffic much quicker than other roads. The Intercolonial railway, upon the order of the Board of Railway Commissioners, took up the question of cutting down the passenger traffic on account of the enormous amount of foodstuffs and munitions that had to be transported. As on other railroads, passenger trains were taken off. The people were, of course, inconvenienced by this, but aside from the few discussions I have heard in this House, it is evident that the general public of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec, through which this road runs, were willing, on account of the necessity of transporting materials necessary in connection with the war, to bear with that inconvenience. There has been very little grumbling. I do not think that the Intercolonial is deserving of censure in that respect; as a matter of fact, I think it is putting on its passenger trains earlier than the other railways.

As to the suburban services at St. John and Halifax, new cars and new engines, if I remember rightly, have been put on by the Minister of Railways and Canals and they have a splendid service; since the minister put on this new equipment I have not heard one word of complaint. I have

no doubt that the Minister of Railways and Canals will put more cars and engines on the railway as fast as he can supply them. From the remarks made by hon. gentlemen opposite, the people might come to the conclusion, if the matter were not properly explained, that under Liberal adminstration any brains that were required in the Intercolonial railway were obtained by the promotion of officials of the railway. I think, however, I have shown that during the fifteen long years that my hon. friends were in power, when they wanted brains for the permanent positions, instead of taking the brains on the Intercolonial, they simply came to Ontario and secured the brains here for the management of that railway.

Mr. MACDONALD: I trust the minister will not forget to tell us how many men during the past year were taken from other roads to fill positions under the general management.

Mr. REID: I would be very glad to give my hon. friend that information if I had it before me. As regards the taking of employees from other roads, when some experienced men were required, owing to the fact that promotions had not been made from time to time as they should have been made during those fifteen long years of Liberal rule, the older men were not dismissed, as stated by the hon. member, but were superannuated and new officials taken on. Take the case of Mr. Hayes. There should have been an official on the Intercolonial trained up to fill that position, but as during those fifteen long years the late Government had not allowed a man on the Intercolonial to be trained up to fill it, this Government had to take from outside a man who had the experience.

Mr. CARVELL: Does the minister mean to say that because Conservatives had not been promoted, the Government were compelled to take a Liberal, or to go outside and select a new man, and that they went outside and selected a new man? Is that the argument the minister makes?

Mr. REID: I repeat what I have already said. When the Liberals were in power for fifteen long years, I had not heard of any case in which the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell), we shall say, urged the Minister of Railways to promote an official on the Intercolonial to the position to which he would properly be entitled on account of his experience.

Mr. CARVELL: For fifteen long years I supported that Government which the minister speaks about, and at the end of the fifteen years we went out of power. I had but one constituent employed on the Intercolonial railway. A few weeks after the Liberal Government went out of power, the present Government dismissed him, and I think they were quite right in doing so. I did not urge upon the Minister of Railways to promote any one.

Mr. REID: In the interest of the employees who had joined this railway, I think it was the duty of the hon. member to stand up in the House then as he has done to-day and tell the Government of that day: "These men are employees of the Intercolonial; they are there working on the road; give them promotion; do not bring in Mr. Harris from Montreal."

Mr. CARVELL: Will the minister please come back to my question? Did he refuse to appoint Liberals, and was that the reason why he brought in outsiders?

Mr. REID: In every case where we could find an employee qualified to fill a vacancy we promoted him. The policy of the Intercolonial and the policy of the Minister of Railways, to my knowledge, is that whenever there is a man with the knowledge requisite for a vacant position, he is to be promoted. That is the policy which has been followed by the Conservative party since we have been in power, and that is the policy which the Minister of Railways is trying to follow now, and as that is the purport of the resolution now before the House, so far as I am concerned, I see no reason why we should not support it.

Mr. A. B. COPP (Westmorland): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the people of the Maritime Provinces, generally, and the employees of the Intercolonial particularly will feel gratified when they read in the public press the statement made by the Minister of Customs, and thus learn that they have been deceiving themselves for the past two years in regard to the management of that railway. I have listened with some degree of interest to the arguments on the resolution now before the House. I have the privilege of living near the Intercolonial railway centre and I know something about what is in the minds of the people in that vicinity in regard to the operation of that railway during the past few years. The minister has given

rather a vague historical sketch of the operation of the Intercolonial for the past twenty-one years. My hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) has drawn his attention to the fact that his memory has failed on several points. It has not only failed him in regard to the matters drawn to his attention by that hon. member, but it has failed him in other matters to which I shall direct him to. I have had some experience of the Intercolonial for years past, and this is the first time I have heard that Mr. Pottinger was dismissed from the Intercolonial by the former Government and Mr. Harris made General Manager in his stead. I was not aware that that ever took place, and I think it is another lapse of memory on the part of the minister. So far as I can remember, Mr. Pottinger was General Manager of the Intercolonial prior to the defeat of the Government in 1896. He remained in that position until a Board of Management, of which he was a member, was organized; in fact, he acted as deputy chairman of the board up to the defeat of the Government in 1911. Mr. Harris was brought from Montreal to Moncton to take charge of a certain branch of the Intercolonial, but he was weighed in the balance and found wanting, and he was soon sent back to Montreal, or somewhere else entirely removed from the operation of the Intercolonial.

The resolution submitted by the hon. member for Rimouski is very important and I sincerely trust that it will have the hearty support and co-operation not only of hon. members on this side of the House, because this should not be a political question, but of hon. members on the other side. The principle embodied in the resolution must appeal to every intelligent citizen who knows anything about the operation of the Intercolonial railway, and anything of the employees of that road. I was surprised that the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) did not take a stronger stand in support of the hon. member who introduced the resolution. The very strongest arguments that I have heard in favour of the principle of this resolution have appeared in newspapers supporting the hon. member for Colchester; in fact, if my information is correct, they have appeared in a paper owned by the hon. gentleman himself, together with a criticism of the Minister of Railways for not promoting men employed on the Intercolonial to important positions on that road. I am sure the hon. member for Colchester took a proper stand at that time in regard to that very matter, and I regret, on behalf of the employees of the Intercolonial railway in the Maritime Provinces in particular, the statement he has made this afternoon, and the action he has taken in practically withdrawing the support he gave during the time this matter was before the public in the newspapers. He has apparently withdrawn his support from the employees of the Intercolonial in the Maritime Provinces.

With regard to the operation of the Intercolonial the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) would have us believe that the poor service is entirely due to the trains and motive power being used for the transport of troops and munitions, but I can tell him that the statement made by my hon. friend from Carleton as to the operation of the road is perfectly true. On one occasion last winter, wishing to go from one station on the Intercolonial to another, I telephoned to the station to find out what train I could catch, and what information do you suppose I got? They said, "Yesterday's Maritime express will be here today on Ocean Limited's time, running three and one-half hours late." The Minister of Customs would have us believe that no complaints are being made in regard to the service, and he says that if the travelling public are inconvenienced in any way, it is because the trains are required for the transport of troops and war supplies. I should like to mention one little incident in this connection. The railway men of Moncton have been trying for years to get a special train to take them from Moncton to Shediac at five o'clock when the day's work is done, but all their requests were turned down. Strange to say, in February last, although the road was then very busy carrying munitions of war, this train was put on from Moncton to Shediac.

Mr. CARVELL: An election was coming on down there in two weeks.

Mr. COPP: The election was on then. This new train was started on February 10, and was kept on for fourteen days, and on the 25th it was withdrawn because forsooth, they had no motive power to haul the train!

Mr. CARVELL: The election was on the 24th. No politics in that?

Mr. COPP: For the Minister of Customs to say that the road is being run in the interests of the people of the Maritime

Provinces, and that there is no dissatisfaction with the service, is to talk nonsense. I could not follow the arguments of my hon. friend from Rimouski very well, and perhaps they were not on exactly the same line as mine, but I think I am voicing the sentiments of every person in the Maritime Provinces when I say that promotions on the Intercolonial should be made from the ranks of the employees. The men who have worked for years on the road, and gained the necessary experience, should be the first to be considered when a vacancy arises. My hon. friend (Mr. Reid) says that many men have been promoted in the last six years. Well, I can tell him that in that period more men still have been promoted out of the service, dismissed by politicians. That is what is going on.

The principle of this resolution has my very hearty support. Though I would not go so far as to say that the manager of the railway should be debarred from employing expert help for special purposes, I am thoroughly in favour of the general principle that the men who have gained their experience on the Intercolonial are just as capable, if not more so, of filling the higher positions than men brought in from outside.

In answer to a question I put on the Order Paper last session, I was told, if I remember correctly, that about twenty-three men had been brought in from outside to work on the Intercolonial. If there is any position on the Intercolonial that Intercolonial employees cannot fill, it is all right to get men from outside, but I know of cases without number where properly qualified men in the service have been passed over when a vacancy occurred. Some men who have been forced out of the service have through sheer ability made good with other railways, and others have taken positions in an entirely different line of work, and made good. Now, if these men had been promoted on the Intercolonial as they should have been, who can doubt that they would have made good there, after their many years experience on the road? A case came to my knowledge within the past week where a man who had practically given the best years of his life to the Intercolonial, had been discharged from the service without a moment's notice, and without a single charge being laid against him in any shape, manner or form. And yet my hon. friend would have us believe that there are no politics in the promotions and dismissals on the Intercolonial. As one hon. gentleman has said, the Intercolonial is simply honeycombed with politics, and it is becoming more honeycombed year after year. Hon. gentlemen opposite have given the manager of the road carte blanche. Now, I would be the last one to say a word against Mr. Gutelius's reputation as an engineer or as Manager of the Intercolonial, but I do know this, that down in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick we have men with a little horse sense, and if the manager of the road has the vast experience and the great ability that hon. gentlemen opposite would have us believe, he certainly is not applying it in his management of the road when the train from St. John to Halifax to connect with the Maritime Express from Montreal, day after day runs from twenty-four to thirty-six and even seventy-two hours late; and that is not the only case I could give. I sincerely trust that we have succeeded in bringing home to the Minister of Railways the many short-comings in the service, and the inconvenience and discomfort that the people of the Maritime Provinces have to put up with at the present time owing to the unsatisfactory operation of the road.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways): There is no objection to the passing of this resolution. It goes without saying that the Minister of Railways must be responsible to the public for the appointment of officials and for the management of the road. I have been more than amazed at many of the exaggerated statements that have been made in this debate, particularly those of my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) and my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Copp). I do not think there has been a single case in which the Maritime express was seventy-two hours late.

Mr. COPP: Not only seventy-two hours late, but cancelled altogether.

Mr. COCHRANE: Probably there is not a road in Canada that has to contend with such snow difficulties as has the Intercolonial. We have had, without exaggeration, at least fifty feet of snow at places between Mont Joli and Montreal. The handling of the snow this season has cost us over $100,000 more than for any former season in the history of the Intercolonial. I am always glad to get recommendations and advice from hon. members residing in the territory served by the Intercolonial. Of course, I cannot promise always to accept these suggestions; in fact, if I did, there would soon be a great muddle and

the road could not be run at all. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) stated that we had dismissed the Engineer of Maintenance on the Intercolonial. Without criticising or finding fault with my predecessor in office, I may explain that when a Bridge Engineer was appointed on the Intercolonial—an officer which the road had never had before—we had to run wrecking trains to several bridges, because though the locomotives had been increased in weight the bridges had not been strengthened, and examination showed that in many cases the rivets were withdrawn, the heads having been pulled off, so it was a miracle that we had not had more wrecks and greater loss of life than actually occurred. As to dismissals from the Intercolonial, I make the statement without fear of contradiction that I have not dismissed one-tenth as many during my whole term of office as hon. gentlemen opposite dismissed in the first six years of the control of the road. There is an arrangement with the different organizations under which there must be investigation before a man can be dismissed. I have adhered to this in every case, and I defy any one to show where a single man has been dismissed for political reasons without an investigation, or any case in which that investigation did not show that his dismissal was warranted.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I can give the minister a case in my own riding.

Mr. COCHRANE: The different organizations would not stand for it.

Mr. GAUVREAU: On the contrary.

Mr. COCHRANE: If in any case a mistake has been made, the man has been restored to his position, and paid. As to patronage, I am satisfied that I cannot fairly be accused of running the railway in that interest. The criticism of the people on my own side of the House is that I give no weight to such considerations. I have certainly tried to run the railroad in a business way, and in the interests of the whole people. I feel that as Minister of Railways I am not representing the Conservative party alone but have in charge the interests of the whole people, and I have acted accordingly.

Certain remarks were made about Mr. Gutelius. I could not follow very well the remarks made in the French language, but I believe there was an insinuation that Mr. Gutelius was a German. He is not a German, and never was. He was born in the United States, where his people have lived for generations. He is a naturalized Canadian, and has been in Canada for nearly twenty years.

Mr. CARVELL: Is it not a fact that he was not naturalized until he was appointed to the management of the road?

Mr. COCHRANE: I think so. But he had lived in Canada long before that and had been engaged in the operation of Canadian railways.

Mr. GAUVREAU: We have lots of Germans of whom the same can be said.

Mr. COCHRANE: We have not lots of Germans on the Intercolonial. I think it should be borne in mind that since I took hold of the railway we have taken over the operation of more than two thousand miles of new line and a great number of those employed in the operation of the Intercolonial have been put on those added railways. I am willing, and pleased, and proud, to promote men on the Intercolonial, and I am glad to have any member of this House, Grit or Tory, recommend a man for promotion. Our promotions on the Intercolonial have not by any means been of Tories only; many of those promoted have been Grits. We choose the men who stand out among their fellows as being worthy of promotion.

A remark was made concerning Mr. Caron which my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) answered very well. But I may add, in answer to some of our French representatives, that Mr. Mathieu was appointed two or three years ago as counsel for the Intercolonial. I realize that the French population has a right to have proper representation not only among the officials but in the management of the road. I am glad at any time to get the names of those who are thought to be fit for promotion, because we still want assistant superintendents and superintendents. I do not think any of the gentlemen who have made remarks this afternoon—some very harsh and very exaggerated remarks—can name a man in the employ of the Intercolonial whom they would appoint to the position of general manager, if they had the power. I shall be glad to get the names if they care to give them.

Mr. COPP: Will you take the recommendation?

Mr. COCHRANE: I have to be the judge of that; but I shall be very glad to get the names. The hon. gentleman has not given any name.

Mr. COPP: I am afraid the minister would not take my recommendation.

Mr. COCHRANE: Perhaps not. I do not think we should take everybody's recommendation, for after all, as I have said, we are responsible for the running of the road. Complaint has been made about accidents. We have carried seven million passengers this year, the largest number in the history of the road, and we have not killed one passenger—not one. I am willing to leave it to any competent railway man to judge whether our management has not been an improvement upon any that went before.

With regard to taking off trains, we did not do anything other than what was done on every road in Ontario, by the direction of the Railway Commission, in order to help out the transportation question. I am surprised at the statements with regard to trains being late. There is not a train running into Ottawa or Montreal which is not late time and time again. I do not expect that if our Saviour were running the Intercolonial railway He would satisfy a great number of the people down there anyway. I do not expect at all to satisfy them no matter how long I run the road, but I intend to do what I think is right no matter whom it pleases or whom it does not.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) is an interesting psychological study. Hearing the hon. gentleman this afternoon speaking as he did with apparent candour in reference to the way the Intercolonial has been operated, one would fancy that my hon. friend was absolutely sincere in the statements he made and actually believed that in the operation of the road he was doing exactly the proper thing. The real fact of the matter is that either my hon. friend is sincere in his assumptions or he is being deceived. We are bound to assume that my hon. friend is sincere in the statements which he has made to the House. If he is sincere he is being grossly deceived in regard to the information that comes to him as to the operation of the Intercolonial. It may be that my hon. friend, psychologically speaking, is not in a position to grasp the theory of the people living along the Intercolonial with regard to the method of administration. If, as is stated in the country sometimes, it is the intention of this Government to inaugurate a broad system of government ownership of railways, they will have absolutely no support or sympathy from the people of that part of the Dominion if what they are doing is any indication of what they will do on a larger scale.

My hon. friend suggests that he is under the impression that the Intercolonial is being run satisfactorily. It may be that my hon. friend does not understand the people of the Maritime Provinces. I think that is the real fact of the matter. He does not understand their aspirations, but trusts entirely to subordinates and accepts what they say to him on the supposition that their statements represent the facts. That is the most generous and sympathetic attitude to adopt in regard to my hon. friend. To say that during the last two years there was the slightest appreciation of the conditions that existed in the Maritime Provinces by the men who were running the Intercolonial would be to make an absolutely mistaken statement. If one takes a train on that railway at any season of the year, or connects from any of the railways operating in any other part of Canada, one at once sees that the whole system has fallen down. When anything is said they say: The Intercolonial has to haul all the troops that are sailing from Halifax in winter and therefore you should excuse all these imperfections. But the whole trouble in regard to the management of the Intercolonial in reference to that phase of the situation was that, although this war has lasted for nearly three years, although the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) and myself, a year ago, on the 4th of May, said to the then Acting Minister of Railways that the provision at that time in regard to the supply of cars, both for passenger and freight service, was wholly inadequate, and that they ought to have proceeded long before that in order to prepare for the conditions created by the war, it was only at a late day that my hon. friend undertook to deal with the question at all. Embargos were placed on freight coming from the Maritime Provinces in 1915 by those who were in control of the railway and the business interests of those provinces suffered in a tremendous degree on account of the lack of foresight of the management. Notwithstanding all that was brought to the attention of the Acting Minister of Railways, totally inadequate provision was made to meet the condition which arose. It was

necessary to have a thousand extra freight cars to deal with that situation in an effective way. But, during last winter, the business interests of the Maritime Provinces were tied up again, the whole of the passenger service was dislocated and the conditions, as described by hon. gentlemen who have spoken before me this afternoon, were not in any degree exaggerated. The business men of those provinces could not deal with business men west of Montreal. They were told that the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk refused to give cars to the Intercolonial, because, when they got them down there, they never brought them back. It was impossible to get freight west of Montreal. The same condition existed, by reason of some difference that arose between the management of the Intercolonial and the Canadian Pacific, with reference to the passenger connection at St. John. This was due to a misunderstanding between the men who are operating the Intercolonial and those in charge of connecting roads. Day by day business men came to St. John from the United States or upper Canada to find that the Canadian Pacific train had left half an hour before they arrived, simply because the Intercolonial management would not deal with these roads in what they thought was a proper way.

Mr. COCHRANE: The freight embargo was put on by the Grand Trunk in Montreal. Under an arrangement, made by the late Government—I do not say it was a bad arrangement—they were unable to handle freight, and therefore we had to bring 49 engines and vans up in order to keep the overseas stuff moving. We could not move freight west simply because the Grand Trunk could not accept it.

Mr. MACDONALD: What about the Canadian Pacific?

Mr. COCHRANE: There was an arrangement made by Act of Parliament, but they got the stuff there or at Ste. Rosalie junction.

Mr. MACDONALD: Not the Canadian Pacific. There is no arrangement by Act of Parliament with the Canadian Pacific.

Mr. COCHRANE: If a shipper bills freight from Pictou to Toronto over the Canadian Pacific, we have no right to have it billed by the Grand Trunk.

Mr. MACDONALD: We were speaking about freight going east, and my hon. friend's remarks apply to freight going west. If my hon. friend had the cars that the ex-Minister of Railways had pleaded with the acting minister to get in ample quantities, and if he had got the engines that he was asked to get and which he could have got, we would not have had that blockade.

Mr. COCHRANE: We are not responsible for the blockade. They would not accept a car from us.

Mr. MACDONALD: You could have taken the cars from them if they would not take the cars from you. All you had to do was to supply engines to take the cars that were tied up at these connecting points.

Mr. COCHRANE: The Canadian Pacific embargoed stuff going from Montreal. They would not take any freight except for overseas business.

Mr. MACDONALD: The management of the Intercolonial created these conditions both in regard to passengers and freight, and it is that same kind of management that has caused hon. gentlemen to complain about the conditions to-day. Then, I come to the question, which is the particular subject of this motion, of the promotion of men in the service. The Minister of Customs went off to give us some ancient history in regard to the matter, but my hon. friend did not venture to deal with the proposal, which is the subject of this motion, in regard to promotion of men who are in the service. That is something that is bitterly complained of. It is the thing that caused the former whip of the Conservative party to send his resignation as a member of this House to the chairman of the executive of the party in his county and to resign his position as whip in this House, and which caused his brother, a member of the Legislature for the county of Colchester, to send his resignation as a member to the Chairman of the Conservative organization in that county; and also, according to his own statement, to decline to take his seat in the Legislature until, as he said, the Minister of Railways came down. Take, for instance, the man who is now Superintendent of the Intercolonial from Saint John to Truro, a man named Devenish. This man was first heard from in connection with railroading as an engineer on the Transcontinental, and it is said that he was very useful to Mr. Gutelius in connection with the preparation of the partisan report which he made upon the construction of that railway. Let me give an illustration of the extent to which the public are inconvenienced under the

administration of this man. Three weeks ago a through passenger train left St. John on time at two o'clock. At Coldbrook it was held up for ten minutes awaiting the arrival of a suburban train running from Rothesay. Imagine a through train with connections from Boston and New York being held up at a side station for a suburban train on a very short line. Farther along the road they came to Painsec, where they were held up for half an hour waiting to cross another train from the east, when they could have reached Sackville in ten minutes. At McCurdy's siding they were held up to overtake a freight train on a small siding and to wait for another freight train which had left Truro ten minutes before, with the result that the three trains were tied up at this little inconsequential siding three miles out of Truro for nearly an hour. Forty-five passengers going to Prince Edward Island arrived at Truro two hours late by reason of the magnificent superintendence of this gentleman, Mr. Devenish, who was brought to the Intercolonial by the minister and Mr. Gutelius. One passenger said to an official: "This is very queer train dispatching." The official said: "Train dispatching! This is not train dispatching, this is train detaining." Here is this gentleman, Mr. Devenish, who was not brought up on the Intercolonial, placed in control of that section of the road, without any knowledge of local conditions, and under such circumstances that to-day there is not a business man or a patron of the road from Truro to Saint John who does not condemn my hon. friend for having placed that gentleman there. Why was he put there? Does my hon. friend mean to say that there were not men on the Intercolonial, conductors of long experience, men of intelligence and capacity, who were fit to superintend that division of the road? Does he mean to say that there was no man on that railway who could have done that superintending and could not do it to-day better than Mr. Devenish? My hon. friend must recognize these conditions. If he is sincere in the position he takes, for his own good I would advise him to get some information as to exactly what is going on down there. Take, for instance, the case of my hon. friend for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) and his brother. It is all very well for the Minister of Railways to-day to say that he is in favour of the general principle of promotion on the Intercolonial. Why did he, in the year 1915, import twenty-three men from outside on the Intercolonial? My hon. friend himself gave us the information last winter. On the 26th of April, in answer to the question of my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Copp), the then Acting-Minister of Railways, told this House that down to Dec. 31, 1915, twenty-three outside men were appointed. In the engineering department there was one man at $500 a month, one at $110 a month, two at $100 a month, one at $165 a month and so on. Some of these men in different departments were brought in at salaries of from $6,000 to $8,000. In regard to every one of those appointments to positions of a subordinate character under the general manager, there is not a man on the Intercolonial, Liberal or Conservative, who does not know that there are men on the road who could do that work as well as these men. The minister will have to give us in a few days a list of the men he has employed since December, 1915, from outside the Intercolonial, so that we will have this list brought up to date. I presume he will be willing to produce that list. We will then be able to get at the facts in connection with the objections raised by the hon. member for Colchester. My hon. friend says his policy has always been to promote men from the railway staff rather than to take men from outside. That is a remarkable statement in view of the fact that he took on twenty-three outside men, as he said, last year; and I do not know how many he has taken since. I have here what the brother of the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield), who is the member for Colchester in the Provincial House, said. It is just as well that the House should understand, since we are on this question, just what the feeling of the people down there is. Men on the Intercolonial and in the Maritime Provinces are opposed to this Government on account of the way they and the public have been treated. That is the reason why Mr. Stanfield, the member of the local legislature for Colchester, did not take his seat in the House of Assembly. This is what he says:

> As you are aware, I did not take my seat in this House until Wednesday last. I represent a county in which a large number of employees of the Canadian Government Railway reside. These employees I consider to be as efficient as any railway men in the world. As a public man, I naturally come into contact with a great many railway men. As a business man, representing large commercial interests, I have constant business dealings with the railway. Questions arose in regard to promotion of employees. I took the ground that the rail-

way management had not sufficiently recognized in this respect the merits and the rights of the men. I contended that the principle should be adopted and clearly understood that all promotions to higher positions on the C.G.R. should be given to employees of the said railway.

To emphasize my position in this matter, I deemed it to be advisable to refrain from taking my seat in this House until I obtained assurances in regard to the principle for which I contended.

He does not mention here that in addition to refusing to take his seat in the House he sent his resignation to the Chairman of his party, or that he got his brother, the member of this House for the same county, to send his resignation to the Chairman of the Convention in the county and to resign his position as whip of the Conservative party in this House.

Mr. CARVELL: Does he say what pledges he received?

Mr. MACDONALD: I am coming to that. It is all very well for the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Railways to say that they have recognized in the past the principle of promotion on the Intercolonial. But if that was so, what was the meaning of the Stanfield brothers acting as they did in this matter of resigning their seats and refusing to continue their positions in the Conservative party, and calling on their party to accept their resignations? Mr. Stanfield goes on:

I am now pleased to be able to make it known to the employees of the Canadian Government Railway system, and to this House, that the management agrees to the general principle of promotion within the ranks, which I claimed to be only fair and just.

What does that mean? That the Minister of Railways had declined to take this position until Mr. Stanfield and his brother had made this threat, and having made the threat they now absolutely say to the people and the Legislature of Nova Scotia that the Minister of Railways now agrees to the general principle of promotion within the ranks, and that he succeeded in this matter. He goes on:

I consider, therefore, that having succeeded in this matter and having, as I believe, vindicated the fair and reasonable rights of the men of the Canadian Government Railway, I am better able to serve their interests and the interests of the public, by being sworn in as a member of this House to which I was elected last June by the votes of the people of the County of Colchester.

What does that mean? Either that we are to believe the statement of these two members of the Government to-day that they have always recognized the principle of promotion, and we are bound to believe them, and that the brothers Stanfield have been, as I have said, in common parlance making a grand stand play for the benefit of their constituents and the railway employees—either that is the situation, or Messrs. Stanfield are telling the truth; that it was necessary for them to threaten to resign their seats and to take the position which one of them in the Legislature of Nova Scotia said it was necessary for him to take before the Government or the Minister of Railways would recognize the principle which is contained in this resolution.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MACDONALD: Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, we were on the point of considering the statement made by Mr Stanfield, the local member for Colchester, in regard to the difference of opinion he had with the Minister of Railways respecting a certain appointment, and I gave the House what Mr. Stanfield had said in the provincial legislature on the subject and pointed out that, as a result of his statement, either the minister was entirely mistaken in the assumption that he has given to the House that in the past he has been in the habit of promoting employees of the Intercolonial to fill the different positions, or Mr. Stanfield is mistaken. This is the statement given by the minister in answer to the questions asked him by the hon. member for Guysboro, as reported in Hansard, page 692:

Mr. SINCLAIR: . . . Would the minister be good enough to tell us if he has really changed his policy in that regard, and if we may expect that appointments on the eastern division will be made in a different manner in the future?

Mr. COCHRANE: I have made no change in policy. My policy is to appoint the best man. If it is possible to find him on the road we certainly take him. It has been my policy ever since I took charge of the department to promote men when I knew they were capable of filling the vacant position.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The minister did not promise to make any change—is that what we are to understand?

The minister very delicately sidestepped that straight question and answered:

Mr. COCHRANE: I have said exactly what I mean.

In other words, he had said what he had said, and he proposed to leave it a mystery

to the speculation of an admiring public as to whether Mr. Stanfield had stampeded him or he had stampeded Mr. Stanfield. I recall that under the regime of the old Empress of China (a regime which has now disappeared, to be superseded by a republic), the admiration of the diplomatic world was always extended to the state documents that were in vogue in those days, because of the marvellous art displayed in all of those documents of what was known in diplomatic circles as "saving their face." It was that marvellous quality which caused the American humorist to say:

> For ways that are dark
> And tricks that are vain,
> The heathen Chinee is peculiar.

Whether it is my hon. friend the minister or the Stanfield family that has resorted to this Oriental system of deceiving the public and throwing dust into their eyes, I am not sure, but certainly there was some development of that particular art, because we have these two absolutely distinct statements staring us in the face: on the one hand, the announcement to an admiring public by the self-sacrificing member of the local legislature that he had refrained from taking his seat as a representative of the people in the council halls of the province; that he had sent his resignation to the President of the Conservative Association in the riding by way of protest against the nefarious system which the Minister of Railways had established in the Intercolonial of ignoring the promotion of competent appointees, and on the other, the statement of the minister, reiterated to-day, that he had not in the slightest iota departed from his policy upon that question. These are two absolutely contradictory statements. Were it not for the fact that we have the real facts at our disposal and are able to give them to the House and to the people, members of Parliament would be left in wonderment at the Oriental adeptness of mind of these two gentlemen. The minister has the proud satisfaction now of having the former whip of the party state in the House that he was all right again—in somewhat abstruse language, I admit, but still that was the effect. What are the facts? There was the necessity of appointing an official in the city of Halifax to look after the terminals that were being established there. In spite of the pathetic appeals which the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) made in the House last year and which my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr Maclean reiterated yesterday, pointedly calling the attention of Parliament and the country to the fact that those appeals had fallen on unheeding ears, the Minister of Railways continued the old system of patronage on the Intercolonial; and so when this vacancy occurred, along came the Stanfield brothers who recommended to the General Manager or to the minister the appointment of a Mr. McNutt to have charge of those terminals. Mr. McNutt was a train despatcher on the Intercolonial, and a very estimable man as a train despatcher, but I am going to say this to the minister, that when the Stanfields came to him and wanted him to appoint a train despatcher to look after the terminals at Halifax, he very properly refused to appoint him, and in that respect he was correct. What did the Stanfields do? They immediately proceeded to declare that the principle of promotion of appointees had been violated by this terrible minister; they set on foot their organ, the Truro Citizen, to belabour the hon. gentleman, which it did in every mood and tense for months to the interest of the people of the Maritime Provinces. The minister, however, foolishly did a wrong thing. Instead of looking around amongst the employees of the Intercolonial and ascertaining whether or not there was a competent conductor or trainman who had experience in handling cars and trains to be found who could be placed in that position, and promoting such a man who would be competent whereas a train despatcher would not be, the minister deserted the Intercolonial altogether, and at the instigation no doubt of his general manager, he proceeded to appoint another man from somewhere else who had no connection with the Intercolonial. The result was that they were both wrong: the Stanfields were wrong because they were recommending a man whose line of training did not fit him for the position—

Mr. STANFIELD: I never recommended a man.

Mr. MACDONALD: Well, if my hon. friend did not recommend him, his brother did. It amounts to the same thing. They proceeded to ask the public to regard them with admiration because they had stood up for the interest of the men on the Intercolonial, while the minister proceeded to have his organs throughout Upper Canada, where the facts were not known, clothe him with a mantle of great virtue and

propriety as standing solidly against this nefarious system of patronage which the hon. member for Colchester was trying to impose upon him. That is the way the game was played.

Mr. COCHRANE: He was not recommended by a member at all.

Mr. MACDONALD: Who recommended him?

Mr. COCHRANE: A railway man, capable of knowing, recommended him.

Mr. MACDONALD: Recommended whom?

Mr. COCHRANE: The man my hon. friend is speaking about.

Mr. MACDONALD: Which man?

Mr. COCHRANE: The assistant superintendent at Halifax.

Mr. MACDONALD: The one the minister appointed?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD: I did not say that he was recommended by a member. I said that the minister went to another part of the country to get him. The man recommended by the member for Colchester was Mr. McNutt, a train despatcher of Truro. That was the first act. What was the next? The next act was that Mr. Stanfield, the member of the provincial legislature, proceeded to write a letter to the president of the Conservative Association in his county, who happens to be a brother of the man whom he had recommended for the position. Mr. Stanfield became rather jealous of the adulation which was being extended to the Minister of Railways for having withstood the onslaught of these patronage hunters in Nova Scotia, and he thought he was entitled to some kudos. He immediately started the theory that he was not so particular about McNutt as he was concerning the principle of the promotion of employees and his newspaper sedulously cultivated that idea. Therefore, he sent his resignation to Mr. McNutt the president of the association, and the hon. member for Colchester in this House followed that up by sending in his resignation also. But all the while the minister stands grim and glum behind the great reputation for political virtue that he has gathered to himself as the result of standing against the onslaught of the gentleman from Colchester. Then came the third act of the drama. An impasse occurred. The member for Colchester in the provincial legislature could not take his seat in the face of those conditions. His brother in this House also was troubled as to what his attitude should be. In the interim, after the adjournment of this House had taken place, these two doughty forces which had been battling so sturdily decided to get together. They made a compromise, and the minister created a new job altogether, viz. Inspector of Train Despatchers.

Mr. STANFIELD: It is not a new job.

Mr. MACDONALD: How was the vacancy created?

Mr. STANFIELD: I forget the gentleman's name who occupied it previously, but he was given another position.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend's explanation is worse than his denial.

Mr. GRAHAM: Like the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), he is trying to explain the inexplicable.

Mr. MACDONALD: The situation could not last. The member for Colchester in the legislature was faced with the alternative of resigning, and the embarrassment here had also to be removed, so Mr. McNutt was made Inspector of Train Despatchers. Then came the fourth act, and we are now approaching the final scene. The appointment of Mr. McNutt as Inspector of Train Despatchers saved the face of the member for Colchester in the provincial legislature and he returned to the House, and in a statement which I read this afternoon announced to an admiring country that the principle of promotion for employees of the road for which he had contended was vindicated notwithstanding the opposition of the Minister of Railways, and consequently he might be allowed to take his seat. But now, the Minister of Railways tells us that he stands to-day where he always stood, immovable as a rock; that the principle of promotion of employees, except when he wants to appoint somebody else, is to be maintained as firmly as ever. So the curtain rings down on the scene with the member for Colchester having succeeded in getting his man appointed to an equally good position, while the minister goes on with the same old system of patronage on the Intercolonial, without the principle having been settled at all. It is rather difficult to tell at this stage if my hon. friend from Rimouski (Mr. Boulay) is playing a minor part in this

drama or not. He is a doughty warrior at long distance. He has threatened the Minister of Railways, and his reputation as a threatener and as a patronage dispenser has extended beyond the bounds of his own province. Whether his appearance to-day with this resolution is for the purpose of enabling these warriors in the play to make their exits gracefully, I am unable to determine. But no matter whether this resolution is agreed to by hon. gentlemen or not, the same old game will go on, notwithstanding the declaration of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and not a man will be employed on the Intercolonial, whether a returned soldier or not, unless he is recommended by the man who has the patronage. That is the situation.

In all frankness I would say to the minister that the complaints which have been made with regard to the operation of the Intercolonial during the last two winters are founded upon absolutely justifiable grounds. We urged last winter, during the absence of the minister, that some prescience, some capacity to look ahead, should be shown by the management. In that marvelous utterance of President Wilson, when he addressed Congress the other day on the duty of the nation in the war, one of the things he laid particular stress upon was the necessity for the transportation companies to use all their efforts, and, by looking ahead, to prepare for the condition which would ensue if war was declared. The obligation which President Wilson sought to impress upon the transportation companies of the United States rested equally upon this Government from the very beginning of the war in regard to the Government Railway. The Government knew that it would be necessary to transport our troops and war materials to the eastern part of Canada over that road, and it was the bounden duty of the management of the Intercolonial the moment war was declared to order such an excess of equipment over what would be required in normal times, both cars and locomotives, that there would be no danger of holding up the transportation of troops or war material. We asked them in this House to do that, but they never moved. Instead of giving orders to all the car shops in Canada to prepare for the condition which has existed in every one of the last three winters, and which will exist again next winter, unless the war should fortunately end before, the Government proceeded to buy some second-hand cars in the United States, with the result that there have been endless stoppages, tie-ups and vexatious delays, and the common talk in the Maritime Provinces is that it is due wholly and solely to the absolute lack of foresight displayed by the management of the Intercolonial.

My hon. friend said that the General Manager of the Intercolonial was a Canadian citizen. Rightly or wrongly, the people of the Maritime Provinces view the General Manager with some suspicion. It is true he is an American citizen, but the United States is filled with German-American citizens. The General Manager of the Intercolonial came to Canada about 1897, and worked with different railways here until he was employed as one of the investigating commissioners on the Transcontinental. Although he conducted that inquiry with Senator Staunton, he never took the oath of allegiance to His Majesty King George V, and it was not until after the report had been laid on the table of the House and was under discussion here, and after the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) had asked whether Mr. Gutelius was a Canadian citizen or not, that he proceeded to take the oath of allegiance. One of the men that Mr. Gutelius brought in from outside was a man named Ruhl, who was also said to come from the United States. He was employed at $200 a month as engineer. In the autumn of 1915 there appeared on the eastern portion of the Intercolonial, in the employment of Mr. Ruhl, a man who was unquestionably a German. He had been in Germany until after the war began, and when he came on the Intercolonial he was employed in some out-of-the-way place with some Austrians and Germans. When he came to my town the gang of men with whom he was going to work discovered who he was and refused to work a day longer if he was employed. The man then disappeared. This was in the year 1915. Mr. Ruhl, who had been employed as engineer on the eastern portion of the Intercolonial, went away too, and I do not know whether he is employed on the railway now or not. These are facts about which there is no manner of doubt, and they add to the sense of insecurity and suspicion with which the people of the Maritime Provinces view the management of the Intercolonial.

And when you see everything tied up, as has been the case for the last two or three winters, with trains delayed and lack of connection, and freight impossible to be moved, is it any wonder that there is com-

plaint. This resolution gives us an opportunity to voice the deep feeling that unquestionably exists in the Maritime Provinces with regard to the management of the Intercolonial at this time. The minister has told us that he stands where he has always stood with regard to appointments. On the other hand, we have the statement by a prominent public man supporting the minister that he has compelled the minister to recede from the position he formerly held on that question. To-day the minister accepts the motion of his follower from Rimouski (Mr. Boulay), but I am afraid that there will be little result from that resolution and the present debate upon it. The minister will go on enforcing, as he has always done, the principle of patronage ot the fullest degree. He tells us with pride that he has not made dismissals, and says that with regard to dismissals an arrangement exists with the brotherhoods. That arrangement was made by the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham), and of course, it must be carried out. But the fact remains that for employees on the road there is a system of demerits, and if an employee is not satisfactory to the person who directs the patronage of the district, every small fault of which he may be guilty will be charged against him in full. I think the minister does not know what goes on in this regard,—I am bound to say I believe that fully. But the present discussion will enlighten him, and I hope that the result of this discussion and of the acceptance of the resolution will be to enable him to carry into effect that which he says he wishes to carry into effect, due promotion of the men who are employed on the Intercolonial.

Mr. COCHRANE: Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) name a man on the Intercolonial whom, if he were the minister, he would appoint as manager?

Mr. MACDONALD: I should be glad to confer with my hon. friend and give him a suggestion on that point.

Mr. COCHRANE: Name one now.

Mr. MACDONALD: I could name two or three.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.): This discussion has taken a much wider range than I had expected it would in view of the terms of the resolution. But the minister has told us that he is glad to have suggestions and advice from members of the House or from anybody who has advice to give. I take advantage of the opportunity thus afforded to call his attention to certain matters relating to that portion of the Government Railways system known as the Prince Edward Island Railway. That line has deteriorated very considerably during the last couple of years. The minister smiles—

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes, I do.

Mr. HUGHES: I am satisfied he has had representations made to him about this deterioration.

Mr. COCHRANE: No.

Mr. HUGHES: Let me give the minister some facts within my personal knowledge. The road-bed has deteriorated, because few ties have been supplied within recent years, and many of the ties are rotten, in fact so soft that they will not hold the spikes. The consequence is that trains run off the track. There must be records of these things in the department. I personally have seen the wrecks.

Mr. COCHRANE: Does the hon. gentleman know of a railway that does not have wrecks?

Mr. HUGHES: It is not good management to have ties so rotten and so soft that the rails spread because the spikes do not hold. I myself saw cars that had been wrecked, and their contents destroyed or damaged, the railway being put to a considerable loss. It would be a penny-wise-and-pound-foolish policy to continue this neglect. Again, the rolling stock has deteriorated. I know personally that engines going out to haul trains have not been able to take them to their destination, and other engines have to be sent out to do the work. Many of the engines are leaky. There is a shortage of box cars on the road. Every business man in Prince Edward Island knows that. I do some business in the produce line, and I know that every man who applied for cars last fall had to wait a considerable time before he got them. I should have thought that the minister would have this information, but he does not seem to have it. I understood that the Board of Trade in Charlottetown had made representations to the department on these points, and I presume that the members supporting the Government have also made representations on the same line to the minister. If they have not done so, I think they have been remiss in their duty. I hope the minister will be able to assure me that this condition of affairs will be improved. If the ties have not been pre-

pared this winter to replace those that have rotted, the minister will have many wrecks in the fall when the produce is moving. And he will not be able to meet the trade conditions unless more engines and more box cars are provided for the railway. There are capital machine shops in Charlottetown, built several years ago, at which, I should think, a good deal of work could be done. I am confident that the members from Prince Edward Island who support the Government will tell the minister exactly what I have told him. I should be very glad to have his assurance that the conditions will be improved.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): As I am one of those residing in the country served by the Intercolonial railway, I suppose it is in order for me to speak of the management of the road, as we see it in the island of Cape Breton from which I come. If this is to be regarded as an occasion for imparting information to the minister, then, however great his capacity, I think enough has been given him to make it unnecessary for me to impose further in the same direction. I do not intend to make severe criticism of the management, for I think that, if criticism can produce results in this case, sufficient has already been given to assure us of all we desire. When I read this resolution, I thought it would not cover a criticism of the management, as it relates to promotions to positions as these fall vacant and the men in the service of the road prove fit to fill them.

That phase of the subject was dealt with very fully and satisfactorily by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and the necessity of such a policy was so clearly established by him that it would be superfluous on my part to touch upon it any further. I think we must recognize, however, that if there is a management, either by the minister or a board of management, they must take the responsibility of managing the road. While we may suggest to them the way in which this shall be done, the final responsibility is with the minister and his officers and the people will hold the minister responsible for the way in which the road is managed. While the Intercolonial, or any other road owned by the Government, is so held and possessed, no minister need hope to escape criticism. No matter whether there is a general manager, or a board of management, the people of this country through this House will criticise that management and the responsible minister must have a seat on the floor of this House and answer to such criticism. Of course, the minister, whether or not he is in fault directly in connection with this mismanagement, if mismanagement there be, must, as a matter of course, take the full responsibility and be answerable to this House.

The minister and the hon. gentlemen from Quebec, Ontario and farther west hardly appreciate the situation in Nova Scotia in so far as the Intercolonial is concerned. Ontario is a regular gridiron of railways and if you do not get satisfaction from one road you will get it from another. New Brunswick is in much the same position. In Nova Scotia we have to rely practically on one road. We have the Intercolonial extending through the length of the province from Amherst to Sydney and no other competing road for passengers or freight. It must therefore be understood that it is of the highest importance to the public in Nova Scotia that proper management should prevail in connection with that road. For that reason, we are always bound, in doing our duty to the people we represent, to bring any grievances we have to the notice of the minister.

He has had a great many attacks made upon him lately in connection with this matter. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has explained the various stages of the very interesting drama which was played with some degree of manoeuvring between the minister and two hon. gentlemen, one in the local House and the other an honoured and respected member of this House. I have sat in this House for some years since the minister came here, and also before, I have watched his conduct, and no matter what the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) may say, I am disposed to think that the hon. gentleman is in the place in which he was before this row began and that it was up to the hon. member for Colchester to make the most of it and let himself down as gracefully as possible. The play between these hon. gentlemen reminds me of a story that was told me by a little Micmac pupil who was going to school in my part of the country. He related to me that one day he had had a falling out with the teacher and I asked him what the trouble was. He said: He always makes me sweep house, draw water, chop wood and put on the fire. One day we made up our minds that we would not

do these things. The teacher said: Why did you not haul the water, why did you not make the fire, why did you not chop the wood, why did you not sweep house? We said: We won't do it. Then, there was an awful row. The little Indian boy was willing to stop there without telling me anything more of the story: I asked: What happened, and he replied: We had to draw the water, we had to sweep house, we had to chop the wood, we had to put on the fire, and we all got licked. I believe the minister was the teacher in this case and that the hon. member for Colchester had to haul the water, chop the wood, sweep house, put on the fire and that they all got a licking. No matter how they may tell this to the people of Colchester and of Nova Scotia, I believe that the gentlemen from Colchester climbed down and that the minister is in the same condition that he was in before this row began.

I am sorry that he has found it so very difficult to manage the people of Nova Scotia in connection with this railway. I wish to assure the minister that he would never come across a more kindly people than the people of Cape Breton, a people so easily pleased, or who will appreciate so much anything that is done for them by a magnate such as the minister. But he tells us that he is going to give up and he suggests that our "saviour" should try to manage the road down there. I am glad that he is generous enough to say that we could get a manager who is not available in the province of Ontario. But I hope he will be able to make another try himself and not put us to the necessity of going out of Ontario looking for such a high and sacred management as he suggested this afternoon.

There are a few things in respect to this management that I would like to bring to the notice of the minister. This is a straight question of management, small in itself, but important to the people of Cape Breton. The minister is aware that under Conservative rule, when the road was built into the island of Cape Breton, about 1890, an hotel was built at the Grand Narrows by a gentleman who then occupied a seat in this House, supporting the Government of the late Sir John A. Macdonald. That hotel was built, and encouraged to be built, for the accommodation of people travelling on the Intercolonial. It has always been a stopping place for refreshments in the evening on the return of the train arriving at the Grand Narrows about six o'clock. Later on a restaurant was built there and the public has been accommodated for the last twenty-six or twenty-seven years by the train stopping at this station and allowing the public to patronize these two places. Money has been invested in the hotel and in the restaurant. But, to the consternation of the men who have invested their money in these enterprises, an order was issued preventing the train from stopping at these places, and they have been given the go-by. The result of it is that these men are put out of business. That may appear a very small matter to the Government and to the minister, but it is everything to these two men who have put their money into these enterprises, enterprises which have a vested right, having existed in this country for over thirty years. I submit to the minister that by a stroke of the pen he should not put these men out of business in that way. The fact that this hotel and this restaurant were there was a great accommodation to the public. The train stopped for twenty minutes and people were enabled to go to the hotel and the restaurant and get such food as they required. What happens now? You get to the Grand Narrows about six o'clock, and two hours, or two hours and a half, after that you get to Sydney or North Sydney—that is, about eight o'clock—when all the hotels are cleared up and when no food is supplied unless for extraordinary purposes and on extraordinary occasions. The result will be that people will have to go without food; even although they are travelling with small children they must go to bed hungry or else rove around hunting for a restaurant simply because for some freak or other the management of the Intercolonial thought proper to run by this place and not afford the former opportunity of obtaining food at the customary place. It may be said that passengers can get a meal on the train. A person gets for twenty-five cents or fifty cents all he needs at a restaurant or hotel, but in the dining car he cannot get anything worthy of the name of a meal for less than $1 50 or $2. People cannot afford that, and the result is that they have to go hungry. The hotel is a splendid hotel, well kept, and a commodious building. It is run by a Mr. McNeill, who caters to the public with excellent taste, and is willing on all occasions to do what he can to meet the demands of the public. Those in charge of the restaurant also do what they can to meet the demands of the travelling public. Grand Narrows is one of the beauty spots of the Bras d'Or lakes, and people are always glad to

have an opportunity to rest at that hotel. If conditions continue as they have been since January, there will be no hotel, as it could not be kept up without the railway business. This means so much to the travelling public that, as it involves no additional expense to the railway and does not incommode anybody, this request should certainly be granted. The train must stop there for five minutes for water and the additonal fifteen minutes would not be missed. I do not wish to make any harsh criticism of the minister, whom I have always found willing and obliging so far as I am concerned. I must say that so far as railway building in Cape Breton is concerned he has done nothing for us, and I hope that he will not throw any obstacles in the way of further development in railway matters in the island of Cape Breton if the opportunity should come his way. But for the present I am not dealing with that subject. I believe that the minister is just where he was on the management of the Intercolonial. There is no triumph, so far as the member for Colchester is concerned, and I feel that the minister will keep the management himself instead of getting any outside divine aid; and I hope that he will have the trains stop at Grand Narrows as before.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT (Calgary): Mr. Speaker, during the few years I have been in this Parliament I have been accustomed year after year to hear members discuss the Intercolonial as though it were a property in which the people of the lower provinces alone were interested. No more fatal misapprehension, it seems to me, could prevail than that. I claim, as one who was born in the lower provinces and who now lives in Western Canada, to have as great an interest, in fact, if not a greater interest in the Intercolonial than the gentlemen who now represent constituencies in the Maritime Provinces. The Intercolonial railway is not in any sense a Maritime Province project only. It is a railway system in the operation of which the whole of Canada is vitally concerned. It is a railway system whose terminals must serve Western Canada if we are to maintain national ports. It is a railway system over which must be carried in winter the major part of the traffic which must give it revenue, and upon the success of the West and the ability of our people to produce traffic for that road, to no small extent depends not only its prosperity but the future of the great ports of Halifax and St. John. I regret very greatly to hear gentlemen in this House year after year discuss Intercolonial questions as though they affected individuals only in the counties in which they live.

For a single moment look at the history of that road. It was built as part of the Confederation compact. It was built away from the frontier in order that it might serve a great military purpose, and in order, if occasion necessitated and conditions warranted, that troops might be moved from the East without traversing foreign territory. The wisdom, if you will, of the choice of route has to some extent been vindicated by recent events, and that road, whose construction was part of the Confederation compact or agreement, has, in the largest, the truest and the best sense, served this nation and this Empire since 1914 as has no other piece of track within it.

I should like to remind my friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley)—who, with his usual sophistry, has endeavoured to blame where he should have praised—that no single track in Canada has discharged greater duties, carried more freight and passengers safely, than has the Intercolonial since the beginning of this war. Let me say that a number of the difficulties under which the Intercolonial is now suffering may be directly traced to observations such as this House has listened to this afternoon. Might I ask my friends, especially my friends from the Maritime Provinces, in the light of the history to which I have referred, to think of the hundreds of millions of dollars of Canadian money that has been poured into that enterprise, conceived as a term of Confederation, and built under very difficult conditions.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hundreds of millions, does the hon. gentleman say?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Hundreds of millions into the Intercolonial.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Oh, no.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: From first to last?

Mr. PUGSLEY: No.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: If I had the blue book at hand I could give the figures.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hundreds of millions is a pretty broad term.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Certainly it is.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not think it is correct.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Perhaps the hon. member for Pictou will send across the blue book containing the figures. I have them in my head, but my memory may be inaccurate. That investment is a charge against the people of Canada as a whole, not against the Maritime Provinces. It is an investment upon which interest is being paid by the people of this Dominion, the man in Western Canada as well as the man in Eastern Canada. We must look upon the Intercolonial Railway as a vast national enterprise. It was for that reason that the late Mr. Blair extended it into the city of Montreal. Every one who remembers the conditions under which that road was being operated to Levis will remember the policy upon which hon. gentlemen opposite extended it into Montreal. It was that in fact and in deed it might become a national enterprise. This being a national enterprise touching our only two ocean winter ports, St. John and Halifax, we find that from year to year it had a long series of deficits which were charged against the people of Canada as a whole and had to be paid by the taxpayer of British Columbia as well as by the taxpayer of Nova Scotia. Better business management was demanded. When the Railway Act was revised and the Railway Commission created, there was a strong movement on the part of many thoughtful public men in Canada to bring the Intercolonial Railway under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. But, unfortunately, for political reasons, Mr. Blair was not able to do it. Only yesterday I heard the hon. member for St. John City say that he could never quite understand why the Intercolonial and Government roads were not brought under the Commission—and I quite agree. I agree that the time has come when the Intercolonial Railway should be under the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada; when freight and passenger charges should be regulated not by political considerations, but by the nature and character of the services rendered. I hope that before the minister has concluded the revision of the Railway Act it will be found possible to bring that road under the Railway Commission. The hon. member for St. John City agreed with that view when he was speaking yesterday in the Railway Committee. I should like as a western man to say this to the House: If we who live upon the plains could enjoy the same freight rates as you who live along the Intercolonial, we would be the most joyous and happy people you ever heard or dreamed of. I wonder if this House realizes that the rates prevailing on the Intercolonial Railway in the province of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island are all the way from 25 to 78 per cent less than those we pay upon the plains for the same services.

9 p.m.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: They correspond with the rates generally in force in the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: They correspond with the rates in the Maritime Provinces, the hon. gentleman says: But we have it on the authority of the hon. member for North Cape Breton, who has just taken his seat, that there are no other lines there.

Mr. HUGHES: As far as the Canadian Pacific Railway goes.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The Canadian Pacific Railway does not go beyond St. John with its own rails. The lines that are operated in Nova Scotia other than those of the Government have their own rates, because we have not competition within that territory, as my hon. friend knows. In Prince Edward Island the only line is the Government road.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have the figures here to which my hon. friend was referring a moment ago. So far from being several hundred millions, the total cost of the Intercolonial railway and connected railways is given on page 88 of the Public Accounts as $106,291,552.

Mr. REID: Does that include equipment?

Mr. PUGSLEY: It says: "Intercolonial and connected railways."

Mr. REID: But not equipment.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The amount for canals is $98,000,000. The expenses of canals and the expenses of the Intercolonial railway run pretty nearly together.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The hon. member for St. John city is quite right. He said it was less than $100,000,000; I said over.

Mr. PUGSLEY: You said several hundred millions.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I was wrong in that, because I was including the Transcontinental railway, now being operated as a Government road. Those were the figures I had in mind.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Transcontinental is a different road altogether.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The figures I had in mind were those applicable to roads now operated by the Government. That is why I may have confused the figures for the moment.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Transcontinental was so unimportant that it was forgotten.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: No, it is such a monument to the incapacity of hon. gentlemen opposite that I did not care to refer to it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: We appreciate the hon. gentleman's consideration.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I thank my hon. friend from St. John for appreciating my consideration, but I do not think the epitaph has yet been wholly written.

Having referred to these deficits and to the efforts of ministers to remedy them, let us look the facts fairly in the eye.

When this Government came into power I happened to know the policy of the present Minister of Railways. Having been born, as I have said, in New Brunswick, I took a considerable interest in the Intercolonial railway. It suffered and has suffered from the evil of political patronage, and it will suffer from that evil just so long as it is not under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. There never was a more perfect political machine anywhere than the Intercolonial railway in the time of Hon. Mr. Emmerson. A more perfect political machine could not be conceived, devised and operated than the Intercolonial during the last five years of the fifteen years of Liberal administration. I do not blame them; they were merely improving on conditions as they found them—that is all. I remember discussing the question of the Intercolonial with the Minister of Railways and Canals when the present Administration came into power. He had in his mind two fixed ideas. The first was that the principle of public ownership might be vindicated and the Intercolonial railway saved to the people of Canada. For be it known that the late Minister of Railways and Canals had agreed to hand over the Intercolonial railway to the Canadian Northern interests if the then Government would be sustained in the coming general election. I did not get that second-hand from any one; I have it first hand from the people themselves. The present Minister of Railways did not believe that the road should be handed over to a private corporation, be it the Canadian Pacific or the Canadian Northern. What he did was to endeavour, with what success I shall presently relate, to bring about such a condition as would vindicate the principle of public ownership of that utility. How did he endeavour to do that? He endeavoured to do it first of all by business management, and, secondly, by the corollary of that, the elimination of patronage. So far as the first point is concerned, what he did was this: he asked the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the best railway manager they could give him, and they suggested Mr. Gutelius. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company had had Mr. Gutelius in their employ for many years. The hon. member for Pictou suggested here this evening that he was a German. Mr. Gutelius is a Dutchman by descent and not a German.

Mr. MACDONALD: I did not say that he was German; I said that he had lived in Canada for fifteen years without having taken out Canadian citizenship.

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend said that he was of German extraction; I took the words down at the time.

Mr. MACDONALD: I said that he was a German-American.

Mr. BENNETT: He is not a German-American, and never was. The ancestors of Mr. Gutelius lived in the United States and have lived upon the American continent for a longer period of years than the ancestors of the distinguished gentleman from Pictou. They have been on this continent something like three hundred years, I am advised. Well, not that long; 250 or thereabouts.

Mr. MACDONALD: Take another hundred or two off.

Mr. McKENZIE: He must be Indian.

Mr. BENNETT: No, but he is not German. The hon. member for Pictou suggested here this evening by inference that the accidents on the Intercolonial, the difficulties of transport and the need of engines were due to the German-American origin of Mr. Gutelius.

This inference he has left in the minds of the people of Canada to-day. Such an inference is unworthy of any member of Parliament; it is unworthy of the hon. member for Pictou; it is unworthy of any man occupying a public position or filling a public

trust to insinuate by inference that a man who has taken the oath of allegiance to our Sovereign, whose ancestors have lived on the American continent for over two hundred years, and who never was a German-American, privily or by negligence agreed to become or became a party to the failure of the Intercolonial to discharge the obligations cast upon it by reason of the movement of our troops and supplies to the sea. I want to go further.

Having conceived the idea of a business manager and having obtained the services of Mr. Gutelius, the Minister of Railways did what any business man would do; he said: "I am not an expert on traffic matters"—and I was very much taken with what my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) said in a more moderate manner than he usually does, when he said that there is bound to be criticism of a public-owned railway directly administered by the Government. But the criticism of the minister in this case must ultimately be the criticism of the instrument he has chosen for the purpose of discharging that duty. The minister sought the advice of the best transportation men in Canada, and that advice brought Mr. Gutelius into the position of General Manager of the Intercolonial. If Mr. Gutelius has failed to discharge his duties and obligations he must be answerable to the Government which appointed him and to the minister under whose control he is. But up to the moment, so far as I have been able to understand, the minister has held Mr. Gutelius responsible for operations as being a first class transportation expert, and he has not undertaken himself to endeavour to say what he thinks should be done or should not be done, but has left it to the expert who is fitted for that purpose and who is supposed to know because he was so recommended. That is the position. Is that not the position that the president of any railway company would take, that he would hold the general manager responsible for the operation of the railway? The president of a railway company is not always an expert on transportation, but presidents hold their general managers responsible for the administration of the trust and for the manner in which they operate their facilities. That is what has been done in this case, and I should like to say to hon. gentlemen from the lower provinces that, knowing something of the administration of roads in other parts of Canada, having passed over the Intercolonial two or three times during the past two or three months, sometimes during the depth of winter; knowing that during the last session there were as many as fifty feet of snow that had to be handled first and last—

Mr. PUGSLEY: Fifty feet?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Fifty feet of snow.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Was that on the level?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: That was not on the level. According to hon. gentlemen opposite, one would never expect to find anything on the level so far as the Intercolonial is concerned. But the climatic conditions under which that road has to be operated in northern New Brunswick and Quebec makes it most difficult, and no gentleman knows better than the hon. member for St. John what those difficulties are. The general manager has during the last year been operating his system under exceptional difficulties. First of all, he has had cast upon his line a greater burden than any single line was ever expected to carry. Now that the United States is in the war, our troops and war supplies can be carried by the Canadian Pacific Railway through the state of Maine; prior to that time, however, they could not be, and thus there was thrust upon the Intercolonial a greater burden than any single line ever carried before except some lines west of Lake Superior in the wheat season in the fall of the year. The Intercolonial has discharged that duty fairly well. I have it from the words of an important transportation man in this country that what has been done by Mr. Gutelius since the outbreak of the war in relation to the management to the Intercolonial has been most commendable, and should merit the commendation of thoughtful Canadians who know the conditions. It is so easy to criticise. The hon. member for North Cape Breton has been fair about that. As long as the road is operated in the way it is, I suppose it will be criticised, but there is no appreciation on the part of the people of the enormous volume of traffic that road has handled.

The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) spoke this afternoon about the suburban trains being taken off and there not being the same service. I should like to remind him that on the Canadian Pacific, the Grand Trunk, and the Canadian Northern, by order of the Board of Railway Commissioners last fall, their train services were curtailed, because it was necessary in the public interest that it should

be so. If that be so, and Mr. Gutelius has followed that practice on the Intercolonial, who is this high-souled and high-minded patriot who has spoken this afternoon in order to make a little political capital? If the hon. gentleman seeks to know what is the matter with the Intercolonial, one of the difficulties it suffers from to-day is that there is no appreciation on the part of members of Parliament and others throughout the territory which it covers of the enormous difficulties it has had to overcome in the matter of handling the business of the country during the last eighteen months. How many hon. members have visited Halifax and seen the freight handled by the Intercolonial there? How many have seen what that road has done in relation to traffic handled since the war broke out? Let them ask the representatives of the British transport system what they think of it. I prefer their judgment to that of the hon. member for St. John who, for a little cheap clap-trap political capital, has spoken in this House to-day—and he is not one of those who do not know. He has eyes, but he sees not, and ears but he hears not, lest seeing or hearing he might be converted by the truth. We listened this afternoon to the speech of that hon. gentleman condemning the service and in that calm way of his talking of wrecks—he did not talk of wars, but of wrecks; he did not talk of the sawdust wharves of by-gone days, but he said there was bad track. It was not the Leary wharf, but bad track. When I hear an hon. gentleman of the years, experience, training, and knowledge of the hon. member for St. John, in a deliberative assembly like the House of Commons of Canada, condemn a railway because there is a wreck, I know that one of two things has happened: either he has a false perspective or he is lacking in the essential elements of patriotism to his country. It is either one of the two things. In this case it is both. With a lack of perspective that is not what I would expect of him in the days that I knew him, he speaks of wrecks as indicating negligence on the part of the Minister of Railways. The Pennsylvania railroad lost in killed and injured 55 passengers the other day, the first they have lost for many years, although they have steel equipment, 90 pound rails and the finest locomotives in the world, because in the last analysis you have to depend upon the human equation, and humanity is frail; it may fail in relation to up-keep or to the handling of the locomotive; it may fail in any way. Appliances may fail. Therefore, a man, who, for the sake of cheap political capital, will endeavour to make the people believe, especially in the middle of a great war, that he is speaking in their behalf when he criticises the operations of a railway which has handled hundreds of thousands of his fellow Canadians without the loss of one, and millions of tons of freight for the Allies, is unworthy the name of a Canadian ex-minister of the Crown. He says that the public service has failed. If there has been a lessening of the public service, why should there not be? If the Canadian Pacific, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Northern are ordered by Sir Henry Drayton to cut down their service, why should the general manager of the Intercolonial not cut down his service. Speaking for my constituents, I voice their protest with my own when I say that we object to pay unnecessary deficits to keep up the service on the Intercolonial in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. The hon. member is criticising the service because it may influence a small vote in some suburban neighbourhood round about the city of St. John, and the voters may think, how great and glorious is my hon. friend. That is false perspective and false patriotism.

One word more and I shall have concluded. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) was interested in a family quarrel, as he called it. He was more interested in the house of Stanfield than in the house of George, and he was much more interested in the change in the fortunes of the house of Stanfield than he was in the administration of a great public utility. As one hon. gentleman beside me says, he was much more interested in the unshrinkables than in the dye-hards. I do not know just what that means. Now I put it to my hon. friend, who after all is a fair-minded Scotchman—some of my hon. friends doubt whether he is fair-minded, but I can assure them that beneath that somewhat rough exterior there beats a very kindly heart; he can be fair-minded although he does not always show it. I should like to ask my hon. friend from Pictou if he does not believe that the Intercolonial during the last twenty-four months has discharged very great public duties in a manner of which any Canadian might well be proud?

Mr. MACDONALD: I know a great deal more about the Intercolonial than my hon.

friend does, for he has only travelled over it once or twice, and I would say in all seriousness that the Intercolonial has absolutely failed to perform its national duty in this the greatest crisis in our history.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: And the hon. gentleman beside him (Mr. Pugsley) applauds. It fills him with great glee to think that a public utility operated by this Government is not discharging its duty. He rejoices in it. Let me ask my hon. friend from Pictou what he has done for the Intercolonial? What word of encouragement has he spoken to the men toiling eighteen hours a day to make it successful? What word of comfort has he offered to the general manager whom he has vilified and slandered to-night? What effort has he made in the public weal to make the Intercolonial a greater national asset than it has been? That is the question. What constructive suggestions have we heard from him this evening? We have heard a long tirade of criticism and violent denunciation of the nationalities of the men charged with high responsibilities, but we have not heard a word of constructive suggestion, or of help or comfort for those who have toiled in season and out of season to enable the road to carry 300,000 of our fellow-citizens to the sea.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend will find that in the session of 1915-1916, standing in my place in Parliament, I called the attention of the railway officials to the extra duty that would be imposed upon them in connection with the war, and pleaded with them to provide in advance the necessary equipment to meet the conditions; but they absolutely failed to do so.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The equipment was ordered. But a single track railway cannot do the impossible, and you cannot double-track the Intercolonial railway in war time. But if we had had the rails and the money that have been uselessly sunk between Quebec and Moncton on the National Transcontinental—

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question? Does he deny what I state as a fact, that a very large proportion of the traffic properly belonging to the Intercolonial has been carried over the Transcontinental between Moncton and Quebec?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman states it as a fact, and his statement of a fact is always entitled to the consideration it deserves.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Minister of Railways also knows it to be a fact.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: That will make a difference, but he has not so told me.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is this a double-track road between those points?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I wish it were a double-track road, because a double-track road means that traffic going in one direction travels on one line, and traffic in the other direction on the other.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is how the through traffic is operated.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: My hon. friend knows much better than I that the operation of the National Transcontinental between Quebec and Moncton has not paid its operating costs.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If my hon. friend will make inquiry he will find that every day during the past year a large number of trains containing fifty, sixty and sometimes seventy cars, pass over the Transcontinental.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The more trains the greater the deficit on that line.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The grade is twice as low as on the Intercolonial.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I thought my hon. friend knew enough about railway matters to know that the greater the number of trains on that section of the Transcontinental the greater the deficit. It is through traffic, and all it gets is its proportion of the through rate, and the through rate has to be so low that the carriage of the traffic over that road means a deficit every time a wheel is turned.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is my hon. friend not aware that the reason why the Intercolonial authorities have carried such an enormous proportion of the traffic over the Transcontinental is because of its low grades? One locomotive can haul so many more cars than on the Intercolonial.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: That is the lowest-grade argument I have heard for a long time. My hon. friend is mistaken.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will my hon. friend answer my question?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Yes I will, promptly. It is not so.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is so.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: And the hon. member for St. John knows that on that portion of the Transcontinental between Quebec and Moncton the traffic has not paid the operating costs, outside altogether of a single cent of interest on the enormous investment made, and that in the opinion of the best railway experts on the American continent this country would be well served is that there has been no politics in the In-another part of Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does the hon. gentleman deny that vast quantities of freight have been carried by the Intercolonial authorities of the Transcontinental?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I say this, and I desire to say it as strongly as I can, that to the extent to which that line could be used, it has been used to keep the rails from rusting; that is the position.

Mr. CARVELL: The hon. member had better go over that road once, and he would then change his opinion.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The road travels through territory served by that distinguished servant of the State, the hon. member from Carleton, and so it must be a good one.

Mr. CARVELL: I have seen trains on the Transcontinental pulling seventy-five loaded cars, and as many as ten such trains a day. On the Intercolonial you cannot pull thirty cars with the best engine you have.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I am sorry the hon. gentleman can count so well on the Transcontinental, and that his vision is so obscured on the Intercolonial.

Mr. CARVELL: Go over the road and find out for yourself. You don't know now.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I have seen trains on the Intercolonial with more than thirty or fifty cars. But of course one has a double vision when the traffic is travelling upon one's own pet railway, and a little political capital can be made out of it. The hon. member for Carleton knows as well as any man living, that the road has not justified its existence, in view of the capital expenditure involved in its construction, and never will so far as the present generation is concerned, and that the best masters of American transporation declare not only that the rails should never have been laid, but that they should now be taken up and laid somewhere else where they could be used profitably.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

One word about political patronage. As an humble member of the Conservative party ever since the day I was able to think, I go down to the lower provinces occasionally, and the one bitter complaint I have always heard since the year 1911 when the present Government took charge, is that there has been no politics in the intercolonial.

It is the old game on the part of the Liberal party—to charge political administration of the Intercolonial and thus draw a red herring across the trail, while they keep their friends in office on the road. It is so everywhere. It has been so since this war began. They denounce the Tories for putting Tories into office, but when you analyze the facts you will find that the Grits have the jobs, and their friends seek to keep them there by denouncing the Tories for using patronage. It is one of the cleverest schemes of hon. gentlemen opposite. But, on the other hand, you find Tories condemning the management of the Intercolonial for leaving the Liberals in their positions. Down in Moncton and in Westmorland how did they vote? Did they vote condemnation of the Government? No. They voted because they were Liberals left over from 1911.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is not what the people of Moncton and the railway employees there will tell you. They will tell you that there is no justification for the conduct of the officials of the Intercolonial in the treatment of the men.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) has raised a second point to which I wish to refer. The first point was patronage, and the second the low rates. No road in Canada, and with one exception, none on the American continent, has as low freight rates as the Intercolonial. I challenge any hon. gentleman to contravert that statement. Give us in Western Canada the rates that are charged on the Intercolonial and our people will add enormously to their returns. These rates are maintained at the cost of the whole people of Canada, and we have the right to demand efficient administration of the road. But under the devilish patronage system which grew up prior to 1911, and of which there is no greater disciple than the hon. gentleman from Carleton—

Mr. CARVELL: Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. B. Bennett) ever hear about the train that was put on between Moncton and Shediac two weeks before the election and was taken off the day after it?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Yes, it was a replacement of a train that used to be there and which had been taken off for efficiency, but the politicians demanded that it should be put back again.

Mr. CARVELL: Taken off five years ago.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: No, only five months ago, and put back again at the demand of politicians, Tory politicians—and I denounce the Tory politicians for that as much as I do the men whom they feebly imitate.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I thought the hon. gentleman said that there was no patronage, yet he admits that a train was put on a couple of weeks before an election and then, they having lost the election, it was taken off the day after.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman did not follow me. I said that the minister endeavoured to conduct the Intercolonial without patronage, but that our own people have not accepted his position but have bitterly complained and criticized him. Yet the principle for which he contended, the principle of Government ownership of that public utility, depends upon a non-political, efficient, business administration. The minister entrusted it to the hands of the general manager, and that general manager, free from political control, might have been able to carry that principle into full effect. But heirs of all the ages though we be, beneficiaries of all the past with regard to the Intercolonial, it was not possible wholly to divorce the administration of the road from politics in a single moment, and the result has been that the minister has been subject to criticism on the part of his own friends. And hon. gentlemen opposite, instead of assisting to maintain and vindicate the principle of public ownership, have taken every opportunity in their power to stimulate criticism and stir the antipathies of the people, in order to make them believe that they are ill-used, although the Government was making a supreme effort to manage this road, not for the people of the Maritime Provinces alone, but for all the people, against the control of a private corporation to which it was to be handed over.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does that explain the putting on of election trains?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Certainly. Because in the days of the last election, it was not one election train but a whole series of them, with free tickets handed out by political workers with a view to securing votes. I know this, for I was down there shortly afterwards.

I see that my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has the following notice of motion on the Order Paper:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the prevailing system of party patronage constitutes a menace to honest and efficient government, incites to great waste of resources and extravagance, in its application to expenditures and appointments for military purposes, greatly injures the proper fulfilment of our duty to the nation, tends inevitably to corrupt and lower the tone of public morals and should forthwith be eliminated from our Federal administration.

Noble words! High sentiments! Lofty aspirations! But my hon. friend from Pictou and my hon. friend from St. John believe in these things in the abstract. The resolution is put there as a means of throwing dust in the eyes of the people, as the hon. gentleman says the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) has been doing. But if hon. gentlemen opposite were sincere, they would have practiced something of these virtues which they profess in opposition.

I do feel that the members of this House should look upon the Intercolonial railway as something more than two lines of steel owned by the people of the lower provinces. My hon. friend from Kings, Prince Edward Island (Mr. J. J. Hughes) failed to tell the House, when he talked of lack of equipment, that he was speaking of a narrow-gauge road, one in which standard equipment cannot be used.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: We had that information thirty years ago.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I did not know that the hon. gentleman had received it yet, and one would not have supposed that he had it from the way he spoke. I am glad that his constituents had the information thirty years ago, and that he has discovered it to-night. But, in fairness, he should have stated the fact to the House. It is not to be expected that the facilities of a narrow gauge road can be maintained in as high a state of efficiency as those of a standard road. Speaking as one from Western Canada who is interested in the Intercolonial and the work it does, interested in the vast terminals being completed at St. John and Halifax—

Mr. PUGSLEY: Whereabouts at St. John?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Then, when my hon. friend ran an election in 1896 on the cry of better terms for St. John he was merely bluffing because St. John is without all these better facilities yet.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The work is stopped.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The work is stopped in the midst of the war and I dare say some revenue is stopped a bit also. But it may be that in the midst of war you have to stop some work. That shows the insincerity of my hon. friend when he asks the Government to stop some public undertakings in the midst of the war. If it should happen that the undertakings are near home it is all bad; if it should happen that they are near some other person's home it is all right. That may be politics but it is not statecraft in the middle of a great war. This House has a right to ask that the Intercolonial shall be so operated, conducted and managed as to show no deficits but to maintain an equilibrum between revenue and expenditure so that the axiom, or the principle, upon which transportation facilities are provided, may be maintained. What is the principle?—that they who use must pay. With reference to transportation, if the facilities do not pay for themselves in revenue, the rate should be so raised as to enable the revenue to pay the expenditures. The people of the lower provinces objected so strongly a few months ago when the management increased the rates upon the road that the rates had to be reduced again. Under a railway commission that would not happen. I say once more that I have no interest in the Intercolonial except the large interest that every man has who lives in Canada, no interest except to see that it properly serves the great ports of Halifax and St. John. St. John is served, it is true, by the Canadian Pacific, but Halifax is served only by the Intercolonial. I hope, Sir, to see the day when great ships crossing the Atlantic, as the Mauretania did in 90 hours, may be able to land passengers at Halifax at the splendid terminals there, swinging in alongside of the dock without tugs, without having to turn the vessel to come in to that magnificent terminal, and being able to embark passengers at the dock head and setting them down in Chicago two days sooner than they could arrive by way of New York. That is one of the things we should contemplate the possibility of and if we are true to the vast and matchless opportunities that lie before us, by reason of the great harbour at Halifax for passengers, by reason of the harbour at St. John for freight traffic, and by reason of this Intercolonial railway, that has been built up with the revenues of the people of Canada, we will be able to discharge some of the duties that we owe alike to Canadians and to the people of the other parts of the Empire, and in addition, we will be able to make this a country of which all men shall be proud. The hon. member for St. John stands here in the midst of a great war, denounces the management of the Intercolonial and tries to make us believe that the men in charge of that road are inefficient, that men should be elevated to high positions whether they are qualified or not as long as seniority or something else is observed, that men should be promoted without regard to fitness or to the fact that they are bringing discredit on their own country by not giving assistance to those who are labouring to promote the success of the operation of that great road.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I desire to make a correction of the hon. gentleman. Neither I nor any member on this side of the House said that men should be promoted regardless of fitness. What we do claim is that the Intercolonial has had for years many men fitted to take higher positions in connection with the management of the railway.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Does my hon. friend not know that in the administration of the Canadian Pacific, the Pennsylvania and every other great railway system they have regard to one thing only, and that is fitness?

Mr. PUGSLEY: And promotion.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: In order that a road might be 100 per cent efficient a man of 25, possessing the qualifications, might be placed over a man of 45 or 65. In the administration of a great public trust, such as the Intercolonial is, that road must ultimately depend upon, first of all, an efficient general manager, and, secondly, he, on his part, must have a free hand to select the instruments to carry out his directions from the standpoint of efficiency without regard to political considerations. On that principle and for that purpose this House will lend its assistance to the Minister of Railways and Canals, who has endeavoured to follow that line, although he has not received that great measure of assistance he should have received even from his own

people. I believe that in the end it will be found that the Intercolonial has entered upon an era of prosperity based upon business management that will reflect credit not only upon the Government, or the set of men who may devise policies and who have the courage to carry them forward regardless of party consideration, but upon the Canadian people who are endeavouring and who are willing and anxious to make out of their public facilities and their transportation system a success comparable to that of any privately-owned enterprise.

Mr. O. TURGEON (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, before the debate closes, I wish to make a few remarks. I do not rise with the intention of answering the eloquent remarks of the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett). He has made an appeal to the sense of the Canadian people and he has told us that the Intercolonial railway is not merely the property of the people of the Maritime Provinces and that it is not merely for the interest of the people of that part of Canada. If my hon. friend had been here twelve or fifteen years ago he might have heard many of us, including myself, declare in this House that the construction of the Intercolonial railway was not for the especial benefit of the Maritime Provinces but that it was built as a national enterprise for the benefit of the provinces of the west as they grow, and as they will grow in the future, as much as for the benefit of the Maritime Provinces themselves. The pact of Confederation was not made with the intention of keeping apart the Maritime Provinces from the provinces of the west. It was made with the intention of making one race, one nationality, with a great future before it, and possessing great industries and commercial interests. My hon. friend has told us that if the deficits continue on the Intercolonial the rest of the people will not be prepared to stand by those deficits. That is not a national, or a Canadian utterance, in my judgment. What would the hon. member for Calgary say if I were to tell him that I, as a member from the Maritime Provinces, will not stand by the expenditures for the construction and maintenance of the canals of Ontario from which we have no direct benefit? The canals of Ontario are national enterprises in the same sense as the Intercolonial, or any other railway to which our support may be extended, is. We do not come here for the purpose of pleading. I believe myself as broadminded a Canadian as any member of this House or as any man in this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific. My interests are in the west as much as in the east, but at the same time, how can we expect that we should not be allowed to claim on the part of the people we represent what we look for from the administration of any department of Government. The administration of the Intercolonial is in the hands of the Department of Railways and Canals. We have the same minister in charge of the canals and the Intercolonial railway. I do not speak for the Maritime Provinces with the intention of making apologies to the western part of Canada. We have come into Confederation and although we have not come with all the natural resources possessed by Ontario or Quebec we have come with vast harbours planted along our coasts, We have vast harbours planted along our coast, as Joseph Howe said, by the hand of Providence, not merely for the use and advantage of the Maritime Provinces, but more particularly for the use and advantage of the western provinces. Without the ports of Saint John and Halifax, without the advantage of the coast of the Maritime Provinces, the people of Ontario and the West to-day would be at the mercy of the collectors of customs of Boston and New York, and there would be no Confederation and no Canada. When we ask for improvements in the management of the Intercolonial, we do not come as beggars from any other portion of Canada, but simply exercise our right, as has been done by my hon. friend from Calgary to-day.

I rose merely to discharge my duty as a member for a constituency traversed by the Intercolonial, and to express my sympathy with the principle involved in the motion now before the House. I shall not attempt to vouch for all the statements he has given to the House, but shall leave it to the minister to ascertain their correctness. The hon. member for Calgary intimated that the members on this side of the House desired promotions to be made irrespective of ability or qualification. I heard no such suggestion this afternoon, and I am sure that the intention of the resolution is that such promotion should be made only among officials who have shown the capacity, the adaptability and the ability to fill the positions to which they may be called. It is in the general interest of the nation that such promotions should be made. The hon. member for Calgary suggested that the Intercolonial

should be placed on the same level as a corporation railway. Every corporation railway, in the interests of its service, seeks to give promotion to its employees as they develop and show ability for better employment. That is the best security they can give to the public.

My hon. friend has spoken of the deficits on the Intercolonial under the Liberal Administration. Every one knew at the time of Confederation that the Intercolonial for many years would have to meet annual deficits, but it was felt that the great advantages which would flow from the operation of the railroad in linking together the portions of this great country would far exceed the small amounts that we would have to pay from year to year until we attained the development of this country foreseen by the fathers of Confederation as brightly as any one of us sees it to-day. I am not attacking any deficit that may occur under the administration of my hon. friend. It may be that this year, owing to war conditions and the exceptionally unfavourable climatic conditions, a deficit will be unavoidable. I do not object to that; we will have to pay what is necessary for the maintenance of a good national road that will develop the interests of the country. It has been reported that this year a great many accidents have occurred on the Intercolonial, more perhaps than on any other road; but the conditions have been most extraordinary. Not for many years have we had a winter in Eastern Canada which made the operation of railroads so difficult. But, of course, in former years we have had hard winters and have had to compete with them, and the ministers of former days encountered the same difficulties that have confronted my hon. friend this year.

Returning to the main motion, I desire to support a suggestion made by my hon. friend from Rimouski (Mr. Boulay) as to a division between Campbellton and Rimouski, the division lying between the provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick. I do this not because I should like to see a division of the people of the provinces; but because conditions have changed in the last few years, and the change has impressed itself on me as one living in the northern district of New Brunswick, not a long distance from the province of Quebec. Conditions have changed in this respect, that the officials of the section Moncton-Ste. Flavie have been given during the past few years a greatly extended line to manage. They have been given the Fredericton railway from Newcastle to Fredericton and, a year ago, the International railway, which has been taken over by the Railway Department. Both of these roads have been given to the same officials at Campbellton. It may therefore be that that district would have sufficient work in the development of the trade which is bound to accrue more particularly along the line of the International if that road is to be given a good service. I believe that more attention might be given to that road than it has received since the Intercolonial took it over. It might be that it would be better to make one division from Moncton to Campbellton and extend the division from Levis or Riviere du Loup to Campbellton. On that division it would perhaps be easier for the department and the Minister of Railways and Canals to have employees speaking both languages, French and English, as requested, naturally and rightly, by the people of the province of Quebec. The minister has said that he would consider any suggestions that might be made. I have all possible sympathy for the hon. minister, and when I refer to a particular incident I do not wish to hold him responsible for it. I may tell him, however, that there are many instances of political doings in the sections of the country traversed by the Intercolonial railway of which he may not be aware. This, perhaps, is due to the fact that the local politicians are using their influence in a way that the minister would condemn. I am sure that he will condemn this influence as represented in a particular case which I shall bring to his attention. In northern New Brunswick the local Conservative politicians have been very active during the past four or five years.

Mr. CARVELL: They are a bad lot.

Mr. TURGEON: So far as the Conservative politicians in my county are concerned, I adopt the expression of the hon. member for Carleton. They have been trying to use kaiserism in their administration of the political part of the Intercolonial Railway. If a man does not promise to vote for the Conservative party and to condemn everything done by the Liberal party, he will get no employment from these people either as workingman or section man. The case that I want to bring to the attention of the minister will astonish him, and will show that there exists a great deal of that partisanship which the hon. member for

Calgary condemned so forcibly a few moments ago. The man whose case I refer to has been in the employ of the Intercolonial Railway since 1900. I remember the day when he was appointed section man; he had been section foreman for seven years previous to that time on the Canadian Pacific railway and had come back to his native place, Petit Rocher, in the province of New Brunswick. The trouble arose not through a question of duty, but through a quarrel with his foreman. I should say, rather, that it was a family quarrel. His foreman was his brother-in-law, and, as very often happens in such cases, they disagreed. There were some heated words at dinner hour, the matter was investigated and the result was that the politician of the locality had a reason for saying that he should not be further employed. Not very long ago the Conservative politicians told this man that if he would sever his connection with the Liberal party and proclaim himself ready to do the bidding of the Conservative politicians, he would get his position again. They told him that if he would write a letter to that effect to the Conservative candidate, he would be once more installed in his position. When I heard of this I thought that I could easily afford to lose two or three votes in Gloucester county for the sake of justice, so I advised the man to make such a declaration and to send such a letter. He refused to do so, and he has not yet been reinstated in his position. This is the condition in the county of Gloucester to which I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals; most probably the same condition prevails in many of the other counties on the north shore of the province of New Brunswick. Certainly this man's dismissal was not based on good grounds; he lost his position simply because he happened to be a Liberal, and he is kept out of it because he does not wish to make a declaration of faith against his conscience or against his political principles. I am sure that the Minister of Railways and Canals feels as I do, that this man has been ill-treated. I have no criticism to offer to the minister himself, but if he will allow me, I shall make another suggestion. The minister has for some time past not enjoyed good health—to the sorrow of every member of this House and of the people of Canada. This year he seems to have more viltality and is willing, as usual, to give all the attention possible to the administration of the Government Railways. He has extended his system over the Transcontinental as far as Winnipeg. I will not stop to deny the accusations made by the member for Calgary concerning the construction of the Transcontinental. I shall do that upon some other occasion; it would require a special debate if we were to discuss that question. My hon. friend has given notice of a Bill concerning the construction of highways. I believe that he should withdraw that Bill and give his sole attention to the administration of the government railways. If he does this, he will be doing as much as his health will permit, and will have sufficient to occupy his time and attention.

10 p.m.

I hope that this motion will receive from the Minister of Railways and Canals the attention that it deserves and that promotions will be made among officials of the railway, not indiscriminately, but by the selection of men who have proved themselves worthy of promotion. Reference has been made by the Minister of Customs to Mr. Pottinger. The hon. gentleman said that the Liberals were condemning his political activity before they came into power. I do not know to what extent that may have been the case, but I do know that when the Liberal party came into power they retained the services of Mr. Pottinger and those services were appreciated more and more each year. He was given a prominent place on the commission appointed by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals with a view to putting an end to the deficits which the member for Calgary deplored so much this evening. If the present Minister of Railways and Canals, when he came into office, did not wish to retain the whole commission, he should at least have retained the services of Mr. Pottinger as head of the department. Had he done this he would not have subjected himself to the censure which has come from all parts of the country since that time. No man in Canada perhaps was better qualified than Mr. Pottinger to remain at the head of the administration of the Intercolonial and of the Government railways. His knowledge and experience were known and appreciated not only in Canada, but in the United States. When he met magnates and chief superintendents and managers of railroads, he had not always to listen to them, but they listened to him, and they had always a great deal to learn in their meetings with him.

As regards the case that I have cited, if the minister wishes me to give him the name of that section man, I shall be glad to do so to-morrow or the next day. I have spoken at greater length than I had anticipated, still my remarks have come from me spontaneously because I felt that the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) was not giving justice either to the Liberal party or to the country.

Mr. PIUS MICHAUD (Victoria, N.B.): Mr. Speaker, I desire to say just a few words with reference to the management of the Intercolonial railway, confining myself to the operation of the Transcontinental railway. I am aware of a great many facts, because I live by the side of this railway and I know what is going on. I can assure the Minister of Railways that during the last six months, not one week has passed without a wreck taking place on that line between Levis and Moncton. I know as a fact that one day there were three trains wrecked on the west side of Edmundston and two between Edmundston and Moncton. I am giving these facts because I am aware that the minister is not informed of what is going on so far as this particular branch of the Transcontinental is concerned, I am sorry that the hon. minister has not been properly informed in regard to the management of this railway during the last few months. The people in that section have refused to ship their goods along that line because they never reach their destination. Let me cite an example. Not very long ago a carload of wheat was shipped along that line. There was a big wreck between Moncton and Edmundston and eight cars went into the ditch; the car loaded with wheat opened up, and the wheat scattered all along the track. I have already drawn the attention of my hon. friend to the condition of the road-bed of this particular railroad, and I hope he will take my remarks into consideration, because in a few months from now this railroad will not be able to be operated. There are a great many people working as employees of that railroad between Moncton and Levis. We were accused this afternoon by the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Boulay) because people from New Brunswick were working in the province of Quebec. So far as the operation of the railroad is concerned, it is not only the people from one particular province who have the say in the matter; it is the people of Canada. I know a great many of our employees are from the province of Quebec and are now residing in the province of New Brunswick, but we find no fault except that we like to receive our proper share so far as the number of employees on the road is concerned. The Minister of Customs has said this afternoon that if we are short of good men we can go into the province of Ontario and get competent employees there. We have one good man from Ontario, that is the Minister of Railways. I am sorry he has not been well for the last year or two, but we are glad to see him back in good health. I trust he will see his way clear to appoint people from his own province if he cannot find men in the lower provinces, and that he will not go too often to the United States for employees, because I am sure Canada produces as good railway employees as any other country in the world.

I wish to draw the attention of the minister to the International railway connecting St. Leonard and Campbellton, in the province of New Brunswick. I happened to travel on that road last year and this year, and if I told my hon. friend what I saw in a day or two he would be very much surprised. There are water tanks all along that line of railway which have been frozen since last December, so that they cannot be used until the warmer weather comes, and in the meantime a pumping system has been installed. The men are digging holes along the brooks and rivers and connecting the engine by hose with the water in the brook or river and pumping it in. It takes about two hours to fill up an engine, and while the employees are not to blame because they are paid for their extra time, the travelling public have to suffer on account of the delay in filling up the engine with water. I would like the minister to take this matter into consideration. There are no dining cars and no sleepers on that train, and during last year it never arrived on time. It is due at St. Leonards at 4.20 p.m. to connect with the Canadian Pacific railway and the Transcontinental. The public are getting tired of the management because they have not the proper accommodation, and they are not getting their goods shipped to their points of destination. They have to travel by train because there are no highways between the two places I have mentioned, and they are punished by having to travel on that railroad. There is some talk about the Government taking over all the railways of Canada. From my experience during the last year or two, I think it would be the most unfortunate thing if the Dominion of Canada or the

Government were to take hold of any branch railway. I had a great admiration for the Minister of Railways some time ago, when he mentioned to me that it was his intention to buy out many branch lines of railway; he was sincere in his statement, but the people of New Brunswick are no longer anxious to see the Government operating any branch lines as feeders for the Intercolonial railway. We have had very bad management and we do not wish any more branch lines to be bought by the Government.

In conclusion, I hope my hon. friend will consider the operation of the International railway and of the Transcontinental between Levis and Moncton. The people along the line travel as little as they can because they never reach their destination at the proper time, the trains being slow in leaving and late in arriving at destination. I wish my hon. friend would take up the idea of running an express between St. Leonard and Campbellton some time next month. He should give us an opportunity to prove that if we had an express between these two places we could make it pay very well.

Mr. H. BOULAY (Rimouski): I had no idea that this motion would provide so much discussion, as I brought it up purely for the purpose of criticizing the management of the Intercolonial in the matter of promotions, but before dealing with that I will turn for a moment to the remarks that have been made by my hon. friend from Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Michaud) about the International railway. I corroborate everything he has said about the way the engines were compelled to take water last winter, but it was impossible for the management to do any better, and my hon. friend was certainly wrong in saying that the Government had not done a good service to the population scattered along that line, because if the Government had not taken over the road the people would have had no railway service at all. The road was already going to pieces when the Government took it over two years ago, and they could not have done better than they did last winter; we were very lucky indeed to get the service at all.

If I understood my hon. friend correctly, he suggested that an express train should be put on that branch. I agree with him. As soon as the road bed is good enough, I think it would be in the interests of the Intercolonial to have an express train on this branch. It would not only increase the passenger traffic, but would be an accommodation to the settlers scattered along the road, and would help greatly in settling this promising section of New Brunswick.

Coming back to my resolution, I divide it into two parts, the first referring to an injustice done to the old employees in the matter of promotions. In my remarks this afternoon I proved that the employees of the road had been passed by when vacancies occurred, and my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) pointed out that according to an answer he received last year the number of officials who were appointed to high positions on the Intercolonial from other roads was nearly thirty. In no case were these imported men any better than men who could have been chosen from the ranks of the Intercolonial. I have met a good many of these outside men, and so far from being as efficient as the old employees, they do not know the road at all at first, and have to serve a kind of apprenticeship before they can discharge their duties properly. I am not speaking of Mr. Gutelius, because I do not think the Minister of Railways could have selected a better man for the position, and I have never reflected on him in that respect in any of the speeches I have made on the Intercolonial. I repeat what I have said before, that he is a gentleman in every respect, a man of great ability, very polite, and he gives every employee from the highest to the lowest a chance to air any grievance he may have, and I am not aware of any instance where an employee has not got justice. Under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, Mr. Brady occupied that position and things were quite different. Not only were the employees not given the opportunity of bringing their cases before him, but even the business men, the patrons of the Intercolonial, could not approach him to discuss business matters. Mr. Gutelius is quite different and can be seen by any of the employees or patrons of the road. The only thing I complain of is that he goes outside in filling the higher positions on the road, and I think that charge is justified by the cases that have been cited this afternoon. I have mentioned the case of Mr. Devenish and the hon. member from Pictou also spoke of him. It was a great mystery to me why Mr. Devenish was brought to Canada to take the place of Mr. Price. I pleaded then with Mr. Gutelius and the Minister of Railways for justice for the province of Quebec. We had been run by the province

of New Brunswick for forty-five years, and that ninety-two mile section in the province of Quebec had never received its share of patronage in respect to high positions on the Intercolonial. Mr. Gutelius said that Mr. Devenish was there on a kind of an apprenticeship, and that when he was promoted to a higher position I should be able to appoint a superintendent, or at least an assistant-superintendent, from the province of Quebec. This did not satisfy our people in the province of Quebec, but I told them we would soon get justice. I waited, and what happened? Mr. Devenish proved a failure in his administration of the railway. It was clear that he had no capacity for operating that part of the road between Campbellton and Mont Joli, and Mr. Gutelius made him superintendent of a division somewhere near Moncton. Then, instead of giving us justice as he had promised, he appoinnted Mr. Fitzmaurice, against whom I have nothing personally, for he is a gentleman and knows something about the road; in fact, he was brought up on the Intercolonial, and I shall not say much about his promotion. We should have obtained what we were promised. The best way to give us that was to nominate an assistant superintendent. But this was not done. On this ground I criticise the administration of the road. Had I not suggested the name of the man to fill the position I should feel now that I had failed in my duty. But I was watching the game, and as soon as the job was open I suggested the names of three men, all men who had been on the Intercolonial from ten to twenty years and of whose competency for the position there could be no question. There was not the slightest reason to refuse all these and give the position to a man who had only had four or five years' experience, a switchman who knew nothing about running a road, who knew nothing of the population amidst whom his work was to be carried on, and who did not understand even a single word of French, though his work was to be amongst a population made up almost exclusively of French-Canadians. And this is the kind of thing that has been going on for forty-five years, ever since the road was built. The people of Nova Scotia do not like to have the part of the road that runs through their province administered by men from British Columbia. I know that, because I travel over the road. Nor do the people along the Intercolonial in Quebec want men from other provinces to occupy high positions in the service of the railway there. We want our own situations for our own men. If there were any difficulty about it, I would not grumble; if there were good reasons against it, I would not complain. But the road has everything to gain by giving us justice. In the first place, it will take away all the animosities that sometimes exist between the two races when they do not understand each other. If we had a superintendent to cover the whole system in the province of Quebec we should have nothing to do with the road in other provinces, and the employees would accomplish their duty much better and the relations of all the people would be a good deal more friendly.

The appointment of these strangers to administer the affairs of the Intercolonial is objectionable from another standpoint. The old employees, seeing these men come to take the places to which they might reasonably have expected to be promoted, instead of fulfilling their duties with enthusiasm, naturally tend to do their work in such a way as merely to avoid trouble. That is the reason why last year, in such a place as the Matapedia valley, the road was blocked for days and days, and twenty-five to thirty-five hours was occupied with a run that ordinarily takes seven hours. But if they had had a superintendent known to them, like Mr. Fitzmaurice, they would have done as they did last winter, when trains worked smoothly and not a single one was blocked.

I must add a few words in justice to Mr. Gutelius. During the last local election I happened to be in New Brunswick. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) does not like to see me interfering in New Brunswick affairs. But I may tell him that I have property in New Brunswick, that my county borders on that province, and that among the settlers along the Intercolonial railway in the county of Restigouche ten per cent come from the county of Rimouski. It is only natural on my part to look after their interest when they want to be helped. The population of Restigouche is about seventy per cent French, and consequently a French-Canadian feels pretty well at home when he gets into that county. I was there during the local election, and heard speeches made at a number of meetings. And one of the things I heard said with reference to Mr. Gutelius by a frined of hon. gentlemen opposite was this: If we ever get into power at Ottawa we know one thing for sure, and that is that the Intercolonial will not be run by a German. Now, that is not fair.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Did the hon. gentleman notice in the newspaper published in St. John a statement attributed to the former Attorney General stating that immediately upon the return of Sir Robert Borden from England, as a result of the defeat of the Conservatives in New Brunswick, an effort would be made to dismiss Mr. Gutelius.

Mr. BOULAY: I am sorry, but I was not able to understand what the hon. gentleman said. I am quoting what I heard with my own ears. The words were plain, and they were as I have stated them. I say such a statement is not fair, not only to the country, but also to a gentleman, as Mr. Gutelius is. I know by conversation with him that he is not a German, and I know that he has never acted as a German but as a business man who knows his business and wishes to be fair. He has fulfilled his duty to the best of his ability, and it is most unfair to attempt to create feeling against him. Of course, those to whom this statement about Mr. Gutelius was made did not hear the other side, and believing what they heard they would naturally support the side favoured by hon. gentlemen opposite.

I am sorry that my hon. friend from Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau) is not in his seat. He challenged me to give the names of men imported by the Liberal party to take the places of the old employees of the Intercolonial.

When I spoke this afternoon as to the example which was given by the Liberal party and when I said that they had exceeded anything which had been done by our own Administration, I was right. I shall quote several names from memory. There was Mr. Russell, who was general manager, Mr. McGovern, who was a track master right in my own district, Mr. Joughins, who is a general machinist, Mr. Brassard assistant superintendent at Rivière du Loup, Mr. Harris, Moncton, Mr. Tiffin who was brought from the Grand Trunk to Moncton, notwithstanding what the hon. member for St. John said about his being an Intercolonial man, Mr. Oulette, who was appointed superintendent from the outside and whom the Liberal party had to let go after three months trial, Mr. Dube, whom they also brought from the Grand Trunk and finally, and the best of them all, Mr. Brady, I hope my honourable friend from Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau) will take note of that and not interrupt me any more while I am telling the truth. Now, with regard to dismissals; this question has been discussed pretty fully during the last five or six years and it is not necessary for me to refer to it again at any very great length. But, I wish to point out that we have been a good deal more lenient than our friends opposite were. In my constituency from Campbellton to Levis we have made very few dismissals since we have been in power. We have only put out of office those that were too bad and this was not done without an investigation being given. Since I have been the representative of my county, I have recommended many Liberals to small positions such as brakemen and firemen and I have done all I could to help the people there without discrimination as to party.

My hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) and my hon. friend from St. John say that the management has been unsatisfactory with regard to the running of trains during the last two years. Any man who has a knowledge of railroading will admit that under the conditions trains could not be run more regularly. The running of the trains has been affected by the conditions and the critical times we are going through. I have looked into the matter very carefully and no man could do better than Mr. Gutelius in running the Intercolonial since the outbreak of war. As many trains as possible have been run. Instead of building the Transcontinental railway my hon. friends opposite should have doubletracked the Intercolonial. It would have been a good deal more profitable than to have wasted so many millions in constructing a railroad through a wilderness without any profit to the country.

While I am talking about the Transcontinental, I would like to give the House a bit of my own experience in connnection with that undertaking. I travelled over a part of the railway which has been built west of Quebec. I happened to go 300 miles west of Quebec, and I found on this part of the line evidence of the greatest scandals in the construction of the road. I would invite my hon. friends opposite to visit the Transcontinental west of Quebec, at least as far as Parent, and if they do they will agree with me that a great robbery has been committed in the construction of that road. On the division, covering 100 miles, between Fitzpatrick and Parent the removal of the stones that had fallen on the road, because the work had not been properly done in the first instance, cost the Government last year $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Clearing up the track for 100 miles cost $10,000?

Mr. BOULAY: It cost that to remove the stone that had fallen on the track over a distance of 100 miles, and one small stone of 10,000 pounds fell on a tender one day. That I know because I was told so by the employees.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What was the effect on the tender of this 10,000 pound stone?

Mr. BOULAY: I suppose it wrecked the train. It is not a cutting at all; it is just a hole that has been cut through the stones instead of the cuttings having been made as they should have been, and as they were certainly contracted for. The object seems to have been to construct the road in the quickest possible way, and now every year, until the work is made perfect, we will have to sustain a loss of thousands and thousands of dollars to remove the stone from the tracks that should have been removed at the time of construction.

Mr. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I would like to know what phase of the resolution the hon. gentleman is discussing now?

Mr. SPEAKER: I hesitate to call the hon. member for Rimouski to order because he is closing a debate that has taken a very wide range to-day, but the point of order taken by the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria is sound. The hon. gentleman, I think, is very far from the subject, and at this hour of the night it would be well to get back to it.

Mr. BOULAY: I think I have said enough to give an illustration of the bad administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. To conclude, I hope my remarks will be taken in good part by the Minister of Railways. I think he knows what we want in that part of the province of Quebec which I have the honour to represent. We do not want Mr. Gutelius to be taken away. He is a man of great ability, and he gives satisfaction generally to the people in his administration. What we want for the old employees is more encouragement, more promotions. The system of promotion that has been applied, as I have heard ministers say, in their own departments, should be applied to the Intercolonial railway. I hope that in future the people of the part of the province of Quebec in which I live will get justice so that we shall have no reason for criticism.

[Mr. Boulay.]

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Sir Thomas White, the House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

Thursday, April 26, 1917.

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

QUESTIONS.

Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES ACT.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

1. Was an application made by representatives of the United Mines Workmen of Nova Scotia asking for a Board under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act?
2. If so, what was the date of its receipt?
3. Was a Board granted?
4. If not, what was the reason of its refusal?

Mr. CROTHERS:

1. Yes.
2. March 10, 1917.
3. No.
4. The practice of the department in such cases was followed.

S. A. ARMSTRONG.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. What position does Mr. S. A. Armstrong occupy with the Military Hospitals Commission?
2. What are his duties and salary?
3. Is Mr. Armstrong also the Assistant Provincial Secretary of Ontario?
4. If so, does his salary in the latter capacity continue while he is employed by the Military Hospitals Commission?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. Director.
2. As set forth in the attached copy of Order in Council, P.C. No. 3412, dated 19th December, 1916.
3. Mr. Armstrong was loaned by the Provincial Government to the Commission.
4. No.

AID TO SHIPBUILDING.

Mr. MACDONALD:

Is it the intention of the Government to propose the granting of any bonus or aid to shipbuilding in Canada?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Government has under consideration the question of the best mode of aiding the extension of shipbuilding in Canada.

REPATRIATION OF CANADIANS.

Mr. PAQUET:

How many Canadians have been repatriated from the United States during the fiscal years 1913-14, 1914-15, 1915-16, 1916-17?

Mr. ROCHE: 1913-14, 17,638; 1914-15, 18,011; 1915-16, 11,084; 1916-17, 10,246.

EXAMINATION OF IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. In what seaports are immigrants examined?
2. How many medical inspectors are there in each port, and what are their names and salaries?
3. How many medical inspectors are there on the United States border line?
4. Where do their inspections take place?
5. How many immigration hospitals are there in Canada, and where are they situated?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Halifax, North Sydney, Sydney, Louisburg, St. John, Quebec, Montreal, Victoria, Vancouver, Prince Rupert, New York and Portland, Me.

2. Halifax, Dr. Edgar Douglas, $1,200, enlisted; Dr. F. A. R. Gow, $1,800, enlisted; Dr. John Rankine, $1,200, enlisted; Dr. A. McD. Morton, $1,200. St. John, N.B., Dr. W. L. Ellis, $1,600. Quebec, Dr. J. D. Page, $3,500; Dr. E. Nadeau, $2,400; Dr. H. Laurin, $2,000. Montreal, Dr. D. Gurd, $1,500; Dr. Geo. E. Beauchamp, $1,500, enlisted. North Sydney, Dr. M. T. MacLean, $1,000. Prince Rupert, Dr. N. M. McNeil, $1,500, enlisted. Victoria, Dr. G. L. Milne, $2,000; Dr. H. B. Rogers, $1,500, enlisted. Vancouver, Dr. A. S. Monro, $1,500. New York, Dr. R. T. Rutherford, $3,000, enlisted. Portland, Me., Dr. Geo. Elliott, $3,000.

3. None.

4. Where a border inspector considers medical advice necessary he may engage a local doctor, except in the case of ports contiguous to Montreal, when he accompanies the applicant for admission to Montreal and has applicant examined by departmental medical inspector.

5. Seven: Victoria, Vancouver, Winnipeg, Montreal, Quebec, St. John and Halifax.

IMMIGRATION IN 1916-17.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. How many immigrants were admitted into Canada during the fiscal year 1916-17?
2. How many immigrants did we get from the United Kingdom in the last fiscal year?
3. How many came from continental Europe during the last fiscal year?
4. How many from the United States?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. 75,395.
2. 8,282.
3. 2,935.
4. 61,389.

DEPORTATION AND REJECTION OF IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. How many immigrants have been deported during the last fiscal year?
2. How many were refused at the International boundary line?
3. How many were refused at seaports?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. 605.
2. 17,988.
3. 172.

[Mr. Paquet.]

QUEBEC AND SAGUENAY RAILWAY BONDS

Mr. GRAHAM:

Is the Canadian Bank of Commerce a holder of bonds of the Quebec and Saguenay Railway?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Government has no information.

RELEASE OF PRISONERS.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. As a result of his western trip, has the Solicitor General recommended the release of prisoners to assist in farm operations in the Prairie Provinces?
2. If so, how many are to be sent, respectively, into the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta?

Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. The trip in question was an inspection trip of western penitentiaries made with a view to acquiring personal knowledge of, and information concerning, applicants for parole, and particularly those seeking parole for the purpose of enlisting for overseas service. Prisoners have been released before and since for reasons, among others, that they expressed desire to assist in farm work, and were known to be capable of so doing. It has not been the practice to compel service of such men in any special province.

2. Answered by No. 1.

ALLEGED STONING OF TROOPS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. A. BEST (Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the Government to an article that appeared in the Ottawa Journal of Tuesday the 24th inst., part of which reads as follows:

Warned that the 204th had been stoned at Rivière du Loup, we turned out, officers and N.C.O's at that place and formed a cordon around the train. As it was night there were only a few loafers about, mostly bootleggers, and we kept them back from the train. Just as the train started a few stones were thrown, but did no damage.

The second section of our train was delayed at Chaudière, earlier in the day, and the men went for a route march. When the train pulled out again some of the crowd that had gathered started throwing things, and a brick went through a window of the officers' car. By good fortune no one was hit.

But I certainly never before appreciated how strongly treasonous is the feeling in some parts of Quebec. You have the feeling there of going through enemy country—excepting that in enemy country the populace would be kept better in hand, and confined to their homes after dark.

I think it is the duty of the Government to see whether this report is true or not, and if so, to see that the offenders are punished. If the hon. members of the Government, and also the hon. members of the Opposition were half as anxious to see that our soldiers were protected passing through Quebec, as at least one hon-member of the Government and two hon. members of the Opposition are in advising the Imperial Government on Home Rule—

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. gentleman reading an extract from a newspaper?

Mr. BEST: Yes, I was reading part of this.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not in order—

Mr. BEST: I have read this from an article that appeared in the Ottawa Journal of Tuesday, the 24th, down to "I think it is the duty of the Government to see whether this report is true or not." I think that is quite satisfactory to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: According to the custom which has prevailed in this House for sometime, it is in order at this stage to ask questions upon important topics of the day, but not to enter into any extended remarks. My object in rising was to ascertain clearly whether the hon. gentleman was making extended remarks or quoting an extract from a newspaper. I understand he has now concluded his question to the Government.

Mr. BEST: I wish to obey the rules of the Chair, but I think this is a serious affair; the troops passing through to defend the public—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

[Mr. Best.]

Mr. BEST: I would like to know what the Government is going to do in the matter.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I am ready to answer the hon. gentleman.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am sorry that I did not hear distinctly the wording of the report to which my hon. friend draws the attention of the Government. It had not previously come to my attention, but I shall be very glad, as it will appear on Hansard, to have it carefully looked into.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I hope this matter will not be allowed to rest where it is. There should be an investigation of the matter.

Mr. GAUVREAU: It is an awful lie.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The statement either is true or is not true.

Mr. GAUVREAU: We are getting used to that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If it is true, such conduct ought to be put down at once; if it is not true, it ought to be made known at once that it is not true.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Mr. Speaker, I myself saw—

Mr. SPEAKER: The matter has been submitted to the Government for consideration, and it would be unwise to enter into a discussion of it, particularly as there is no question before the Chair. Therefore, I respectfully ask the hon. minister to refrain from discussing it.

PRIVILEGE.

STATEMENT BY HON. GEORGE GRAHAM AS TO INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (South Renfrew): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I seldom do this, because I know that human nature is weak and that sometimes in moments of excitements things are said which, perhaps would not be said under conditions of ordinary calm and in the presence of the gentleman at whom they are aimed. But I find in Hansard this morning that the hon. member for Calgary, (Mr. R. B. Bennett) in very characteristic manner, made a statement last night concerning myself and public business which, I think, cannot go unchallenged. I was not in the House at the time. Particularly do I wish to speak of this because the hon. member for Cal-

gary occupies a very prominent position. He is supposed to be at least semi-independent and to be devoting his energies to the cause of Empire in the performance of certain work which has been committed to his hands. This hon. gentleman, occupying such a position, in which he is appealing to young men and young women, older men and older women of both parties throughout Canada, cannot escape with this statement uncontradicted. I read in Hansard these words uttered by the hon. member for Calgary:

For be it known that the late Minister of Railways and Canals had agreed to hand over the Intercolonial Railway to the Canadian Northern interests if the then Government would be sustained in the coming general election.

Mr. Speaker, this statement from beginning to end is devoid of the least vestige of truth. There was no such understanding, verbal or written; no agreement with the Canadian Northern, verbal or written, and no understanding to make such an agreement, either verbal or written. This morning I wired to the Canadian Northern people, and I received the following reply from Sir Donald Mann:

Hon. George Graham,
Ottawa.

I could not have made the statement that you had agreed to hand over Intercolonial to Canadian Northern for there never was such agreement or understanding.

Donald Mann.

So far as an agreement or understanding is concerned, I think I have made it clear to the country that absolutely no foundation, near or remote, exists for the lurid utterance of the member for Calgary. Let me read one other sentence from the speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett):

I did not get that second-hand from any one; I have it first hand from the people themselves.

One of the chief people says this statement is untrue. Now, all that is left of my hon. friend's statement is this: it is possible, though I do not give it credence, that some other member of the Canadian Northern Railway Company may have said something to the member for Calgary. I am not my brother's keeper so far as the language of a railway magnate or of the member for Calgary is concerned, and, as I stated a moment ago, I do not give that statement of the hon. member for Calgary credence. But if any member of the Canadian Northern Railway Company made that statement to the hon. member for Calgary, he uttered a falsehood and he knew it was a falsehood when he uttered it.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The hon. member—

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman rise to a question of privilege?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Purely a question of privilege, as to the observations of the former Minister of Railways and Canals. Language is used for the purpose either of disguising or of expressing thought. The meaning that it conveys depends upon the sense in which it is used by the person who means it as well as by the person who receives or understands it. If language is used for the purpose of conveying thought, not only did I correctly state the sense of what I heard and was told, but if the hon. gentleman will inquire further of the former Minister of Finance he will find that capital value had been fixed upon the Intercolonial, as well as the rate of interest that was to be paid upon the capital by way of rental and the term of years during which the lease was to run.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I merely wish to say that these are the facts upon which I based the statement which I made, and which I desire, so far as I am concerned, to repeat.

CANADIAN NAVAL AEROPLANE SERVICE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): Some time ago a statement appeared in the public press that young Canadians were to be instructed in the use of æroplanes or hydroplanes, which were to be utilized in connection with the Canadian Naval Service. I am informed on good authority that several æroplanes or hydroplanes have been brought into Canada with a view to beginning this service, and that an instructor has been sent from Great Britain. I am informed, also, that for some time the whole matter has been hung up, the idea being that the service should have been entered upon somewhere in the Maritime Provinces in connection with the Naval Services, where preparations were being made to that end. I would like to ask the leader of the House whether these preparations have been discontinued, and whether it is intended to go on with the establishment of an æroplane service in connection with the Canadian navy?

Hon. J. D. REID: As this matter comes under the jurisdiction of the Naval Service Department, and I am acting for the minis-

ter during his absence, I will draw the attention of the deputy minister to the remarks of the hon. gentleman, and to-morrow I will give him a reply.

SALE OF LIQUOR IN CANADIAN MILITARY CAMPS.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville) asked for leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the evils alleged to exist among our soldiers overseas arising out of the liquor traffic in camps and military centres.

And leave having been granted:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: Mr. Speaker, I hope to detain the House not more than five minutes, because I am told that my hon. friend the Solicitor General is going to address the House to-day on the Budget, and I do not want to intrude on his time. I think, however, the question I am bringing to the attention of the House deserves some special consideration. As long as the information which I intend to give to the House came only from private sources, I should certainly not have dared to give it any publicity; but now that the press in Canada and the old country has revealed some staggering facts in connection with the use or rather the abuse of liquor, in the camps where our boys are in England, I think it is my duty as a public man to call the attention of the Government and of Parliament to this very serious state of affairs. I am glad to see my good friend the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) in his seat, as I wish to pay some tribute to him. Much as I differ from him and much as I disagree with what I would call his failings or shortcomings, I am sure every one will admit that, as regards the discipline of our soldiers when they were under his control, the hon. gentleman followed a stern and unbending rule, and I wish that the same rule were observed by his successors. I must, of course, say at once that I do not charge my hon. friend, the present Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Edward Kemp), nor do I charge the Government with any lax conduct in this matter, because perhaps, so far as the matter stands now, it is beyond their power to intervene.

As I stated a moment ago, Sir, the question is now made public by the reference which has been made to it in the press, and that is the reason why I wish to call the attention of the Government and of Parliament to the very serious state of affairs which is alleged to exist in the camps where our soldiers are in England. Mr. Lloyd George, the present Prime Minister of Great Britain, some months ago stated, if I mistake not, that the soldiers of Great Britain or the soldiers of the Allies had two enemies to fight, the Germans and alcohol, and of the two he claimed that alcohol was the worst enemy to fight. I for one regret that when the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence had established the rule of a dry canteen in our military camps, that rule should not have been observed afterwards. I do not know how matters stand at present in our various camps in Ontario and the West, but at Valcartier, so far as I know, many serious blunders have been committed, and I unfortunately happen to know that at Valcartier there were certain very grave abuses arising out of the use of liquor by our soldiers. I am not going to speak about our own country because the remedy lies within our own power; that is to say, the local Governments can intervene, and I suppose the military authorities of the country can intervene, and make a very stringent rule that no wet canteen shall exist in the camps.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Did the hon. member say anything about liquor being used to any extent at Valcartier camp?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have under my hand an article referring to some very disgraceful incidents which took place at Valcartier camp. I was not speaking of the regime of my hon. friend. This happened lately.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does my hon. friend refer to the first camp or to the last camp?

Mr. LEMIEUX: The last camp. It would be too long to read the description of what happened there. There may be only a few individual cases, but the gentleman who has written about the matter gives a very ghastly picture of what has occurred. But my object in rising this afternoon is to call attention to what has been disclosed in the press as to what has happened in the various camps in England. First of all, every hon. member is aware of the very sad picture which was drawn a few weeks ago by Dr. Clarke, lately of the Toronto General Hospital, of the conditions in the camps in England; but as I have not under my hand Dr. Clarke's report, I shall not refer to it; I know that the revelations made at the time by him startled the coun-

try. What I wish to refer to this afternoon is an article which is published in a very substantial paper having a very wide circulation in Canada. I refer to the Financial Post of Canada, published at Toronto. In its issue of April 21, the Financial Post contains a long article of several pages, under the title "Evils in the army arising out of the liquor traffic; millions lost to Canada." Whilst on the whole the article is a plea for prohibition in Canada, yet there are facts which apply to particular cases in the camps in England. I will not read the whole of the article but just a few passages. For instance, the writer says:

One of the earliest as well as one of the most courageous and efficient of the acts of Sir Sam Hughes was to insist on a dry canteen for the Canadian Expeditionary Forces; and it has worked untold damage to Canada's soldiers that the Canadian regulation, whether by British military insistence or weak-kneed surrender on the part of some Canadian official overseas, was over-ridden, and a wet canteen started in full swing in every camp.

If there was one consolation for the parents of the soldiers as they marched out from Valcartier camp when it was under the direction of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia, it was the fact that they knew that under his unbending discipline the boys would not be faced by the liquor sellers. Unfortunately, as the writer says, the wet canteen has replaced the dry canteen, not only in Canada, but in Great Britain. This article is followed by a long letter written by one of our soldiers, Capt. Paul Goforth. I do not know if this officer is known by some of my fellow members in the House of Commons or not, but the letter is written very boldly by him in the columns of the Toronto Financial Post.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Did the hon. member say that the wet canteen is restored in Canada?

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is what the writer says.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does he give the date of its restoration?

Mr. LEMIEUX: No. I will not read the whole of the letter; I simply give some outstanding facts.

Mr. MORPHY: Is the letter signed by the writer?

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is signed by Capt. Paul Goforth.

Sir SAM HUGHES: He does not know what he is speaking about.

Mr. LEMIEUX: This letter is published in the Toronto Financial Post which has a wide circulation and is a highly respectable paper. This is what Captain Goforth says:

Some of the revelations I intend to make may be regarded as breaches of military discipline, bnt it is high time that some one in the army spoke out plainly to the people at home, and I accept the responsibility for what I have to say. I am speaking, not as an officer criticising my superiors in the service, but as a citizen of Canada and a British subject protesting against the continuance, in any form, of an unpatriotic and costly traffic which hampers the work of the army—

Mark those words!

—which hampers the work of the army at every turn and which has ruined and is ruining thousands of our best officers, non-commissioned officers, and men.

I need not dilate on this, for unfortunately it is substantiated in the report made by Dr. Bruce. I shall not refer to what everyone has in mind regarding the very serious condition that has arisen in some of the camps through the abuse of liquor. Now, I come to the facts. Captain Goforth states:

By the introduction of the wet canteen—

There would be seem to be no question at all about the introduction of the wet canteen.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Whereabouts?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I will read what he says:

By the introduction of the wet canteen the liquor traffic was officially recognized as a good thing and many a Canadian boy was led to take his first glass of beer.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Is that in England?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I suppose so. He goes on:

That was one time that we should have stood on our own feet and been true to Canadian sentiment and Canadian ideals instead of pandering to a time-honored custom of the British army—"a custom more honored in the breach than the observance." The wet canteen was introduced primarily "to prevent our men getting harder liquor elsewhere"; but that excuse is a mockery, as every one knows who has seen the "underground railway" of the liquor traffic at work. This enemy in our midst has made it fearfully easy for men to get more of the poison which is drawing them down to the dust.

My hon. friend asks whether this is taking place in England. Of course it is, and I appeal to my hon. friend as a gentleman with the interest of the boys at heart, and perhaps with some relatives at the front, is there not some way of restricting the use of liquor in our camps in England,

where our Canadian soldiers are being trained to fight for King and country. I may be told that the moment our soldiers enter Britain they come under the control of the British officers and under British Army regulations; that is quite true. But considering the wonderful effort that Canada has made for the flag, is it not possible for the Canadian Government to assert themselves in such a righteous cause as I am presenting this afternoon, and say that our boys in England and in France shall not have the use of liquor in England or at the front any more than they had in our camps in Canada? Let me remind the Minister of Militia and Defence of what has been done in Russia. We are all aware that the liquor traffic has been abolished in that country; vodka is not distilled in Russia to-day. We all know too that Russian soldiers have been sent in large numbers to France to fight alongside their French comrades; and although the troops are fighting side by side, and the French soldiers are allowed to use wine, everybody knows that it is forbidden under very severe penalties to serve liquor to the Russian soldiers. Now, if it is possible for France and Russia to arrange for Russia to maintain this control over her troops in France, would it not be a far easier thing to arrange as between France and England.

I now come to the facts in Captain Goforth's letter.

> At Bustard Camp one evening after "lights out," some drunken sergeants were making so much noise that the men in the lines near by could not get to sleep. I was present as orderly officer of the day when Capt. A———, the captain of the week, went to the sergeants' mess to stop the noise. The Regimental Sergeant-Major was befuddled with drink; and one sergeant under the influence of liquor, rushed forward and attempted to assault Capt. A———.

Does it make for discipline, I ask, to see an officer or sergeant befuddled with drink in the presence of the rank and file. Why the very mention of the fact is sufficient, it seems to me, to stir the Minister of Militia and Defence to doing his duty in the matter. Captain Goforth goes on:

> Again at Sling Plantation Camp, the muddiest of them all, I was obliged, as orderly officer, to place under arrest a man who was drunk and disorderly and who was resisting arrest with a drawn bayonet. He came at me with blood in his eye; and before his hand was seized from behind by the sergeant of the guard, he had brought his bayonet within a foot of my face. No sober man in the Canadian army would have acted as he did. The tolerance of the liquor traffic is more than a question of discipline; it is a question of our firmness or feebleness of purpose in prosecuting this war.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

> At Tidworth Barracks, Capt. ——— and another of our officers were broken through drink. The General Officer Commanding having no further use for their services, they were "permitted to resign their commissions in the Canadian Expeditionary Force".
>
> At the Canadian Base Depot, Havre, France, where I spent eight months, the problem was the same. More or less kindly French civilians could not be kept away; and those of our men who wanted more than they could get at the wet canteen had no difficulty in securing cheap whiskey, wine, and brandy.
>
> At Pond Farm Camp on Salisbury Plains, our mess caterer, a civilian, took enough whiskey to send him into delirium tremens, and then became so violent that he had to be tied hand and foot and kept in the guard tent all night, while his screams kept the camp awake.

Further on he says:

> The degrading effect of liquor on character is its crowning infamy. The terrible temptations which are inseparable from the abnormal life of a soldier are but dimly understood by those who have always had a comfortable home; and, in the hour of temptation, even the strongest man needs all his faculties braced to resist.

I will not say anything further about the consequences to our men in the large camps and in the large cities. On that point we have before us the picture drawn by Dr. Bruce in his report.

I do not ask the Minister of Militia and Defence to dictate to the Imperial authorities. But it seems to me that the Canadian Government should respectfully ask the War Office to prevent liquor being served in the camps in England where Canadian soldiers are being trained. I have given the instance of the Russian soldiers in the trenches and camps in France. The Russian Government was able to prevent the sale of alcohol to the soldiers of that country in France, and surely it should be far more easy for the Canadian Government to insist with the War Office that no liquor shall be sold to our soldiers in the camps in England. In discussing this matter and speaking of it as I do, I do not mean to attack the Government. I simply wish to be the spokesman for the fathers and mothers whose boys are at the front and those whose boys are about to be sent to fight the battles of the Empire.

Sir SAM HUGHES: As the late Minister of Militia, possibly I can throw a little light on this matter. When the boys went to camp in Salisbury Plain, the dry canteen was established so far as they were concerned. Of course, there was nothing to prevent a soldier from going to an outlying town and getting hard liquor.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It was at the intervention of my hon. friend (Sir Sam Hughes) that the dry canteen was established?

Sir SAM HUGHES: They carried the good customs with them from here, and kept the most of them right through. While I was in England in 1914, I undertook to establish control over the canteens. The plan was to have battalion canteens, just as we have to-day throughout Canada and have had for a long time. The profits from these canteens—dry canteens—go to the battalions concerned. But I was politely informed that we had no control. That was the first intimation I had, and this is a matter to which I referred some time ago—

Mr. MACDONALD: Who gave that intimation?

Sir SAM HUGHES: It came from those in charge. General Alderson made some arrangement with the High Commissioner, and the matter was communicated from the High Commissioner to the Prime Minister, stating that it was their intention to establish dry canteens. I cannot agree with the statement of procedure as outlined by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). My position is that Canada should have full control of her troops in England; we need not doff our hat to anybody to ask what our troops shall have in the way of a canteen. Had my plan been carried out, we should have been in control of our troops in England. But that was not granted. Of course, if we go hat in hand, I suppose we can get what we ask for. General Alderson was notified from here, in response to his intimation that they purposed restoring the wet canteen—I do not know the details of the communication between the Prime Minister and him through Sir George Perley—but, at all events, the wet canteens were established by the authorities in England.

Mr. MACDONALD: How long ago?

Sir SAM HUGHES: In the camp at Salisbury Plain. This is a well-known instance. I took this as a personal insult from General Alderson. He made the announcement to the men. The first time he got the troops together—except when he assembled them to read some extracts from a little book he had got up to tell them how to win wars—he announced to them that he had assembled them to give them an important communication, to tell them that he would make them free men, and that they were to have wet canteens. He told them they were not to be tied to anybody's apron-strings but were to be free men, to drink as they chose. From that hour to this I have never had anything to do with it—never bothered about it at all. When they undertook to establish the canteen system, we were met with the same objection —that the canteens had been let to some corporation or parties and that these had control, and we had nothing to say.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron): Reference has been made to the wet canteen in the camps in Canada. I was for about four or five months in the largest artillery camp ever held in Canada; and, with one exception—that of a man who had been on leave and who was brought in under guard from North Bay—there was not one single man in that camp of five thousand men, to my knowledge—and I am around practically all the time—under the influence of liquor. Now, in reference to the camps in England, I am sorry that the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux)—

Sir SAM HUGHES: The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lewis) says that at Petawawa he was around all the time, under the influence of liquor?

Mr. LEWIS: No, sir, any one who knows me, knows different. I am sorry the hon. member for Rouville has seen fit to bring up this matter. I have no objection to his talking prohibition anywhere at the proper time. Temperate living is the right principle, as every right-thinking man will agree. But, when recruiting is at its present stage in Canada, to make statements in this House to go broadcast through the country, founded on erroneous statements which the hon. gentleman has received, I think is a mistake.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If the hon. gentleman will allow me, my statements were not based on facts received from private sources. I base them on an article in the Financial Post which is open to everybody to read. And I may say that I avoided reading the most serious statements contained in that article.

Mr. LEWIS: I notice that a reverend gentleman in London, Ontario, Mr. Flanders, made a statement two months ago on the platform, and letters came in from returned soldiers by the dozens absolutely refuting that statement. I believe I had exceptional opportunities while I was in England to have knowledge of the facts in reference to this matter. When I first reached there I was informed by the gen-

eral in charge of the division in which my battery was stationed, that, owing to my success in recruiting, I should get as much knowledge as I could in reference to the camps and the treatment of the Canadians in England and France, and should then return to Canada for the purpose of recruiting more men for the artillery, that more men was the great need. For that purpose I was there. I was at Aldershot and also for months in camp at Witley, Milford and Bramshott, at which are concentrated over 40,000 men. There were 30,000 at Witley, and I say on my honour as a member of this House that with one exception, and that was the same man that was brought back from North Bay to Petawawa, there was not a man under the influence of liquor to my knowledge there. I was in every Canadian division in France from Belgium to the Somme. I travelled to every large base hospital and every base of concentration; I was looking out all the time and was taking notes as to what I could say to the young men in Canada and to his father and mother as to the conditions there. With the exception of those poor chaps, and I am glad to say that there are not as many as people think, considering the great number we have there who have been injured at the front, there is not a young man or an older man who will not return to Canada better physically and mentally than when he left these shores. The same matter as that to which my hon. friend has referred, with regard to Russia, was brought up by this gentleman, the Rev. Mr. Flanders, and I am glad to say that the heads of the Methodist church, in selecting the pulpits to be occupied by members of their ministry, have moved Mr. Flanders to a far western situation, because I feel he should not have taken that stand on the information he had. When these letters appeared I was telegraphed to by the Battery officers, stating that they were going to do harm. I discussed the matter with one young man who had been wounded on the 16th of September on the Somme, and who had been nine months in the Canadian camps. I discussed it with dozens of other young men. They all stated that the assertion was absolutely untrue as to their officers being incapacitated through liquor. There is a point which the hon. gentleman has made which carries that out. He says that men have been broken for drinking. It is an unpardonable sin in the British army, or in the Canadian army in England, or at the front, to be under the influence of liquor. Occasionally you see the announcement that a court martial has been held and that a man has been discharged from the service. In the few cases in which a court martial is held it is to try a case in which a soldier has been charged with drunkenness and never to investigate an accusation of cowardice. I have the firm belief that the hon. gentleman wishes to fairly put the matter before the people, but I walked through the trenches in the Canadian division in Belgium and France and I asked the men who were there in the trenches and dugouts how they were getting along. That is what I was there for. At the great concentration camp at Havre I went through the whole camp on the parade and I said: Boys, how are you any complaints? I saw them last December in the dugouts at the front trenches and I am glad to say they were very comfortable. It was dry, although cold outside. I would say: How are you boys; are you getting lots to eat? They would say: Lots to eat but nothing to drink. I heard that repeatedly. It may have been a joke, but I believe it was true. They could not possibly get anything to drink there with the exception of the rum issue. I saw a letter the other day from a young man, written on the 31st March, and he said that no matter what clothes they had, the cold, damp wind bored through them. He was a boy who had never taken a drink in his life, but he said that if it were not for the tot of rum at two in the morning they would not be able to stand it. Does the hon. gentleman think of comparing the action of the Russians with that of the French or the English? Could our young men do what they have done if conditions were just as these letters assert? This whole country will be benefited in the future. The young men who return uninjured will be benefited mentally and physically by what they are experiencing there. As to any change in the camps in England, I believe there will not be any camps there in two or three months. The men will all be at the front, because, from the present state of recruiting, there will be no one to take their places. I am very sorry to differ from my hon. friend, but these are the facts to my own knowledge. There may have been some drinking going on that I did not know about, but I would just like to mention that the batteries of the 14th Brigade topped the score in England for shooting. Could they have done it under the influence of liquor? I submit, Sir, that the evidence that we have before us is absolutely against the

4 p.m.

statement that the hon. gentleman has made.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lewis) who has just sat down in an expression of regret that my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) has brought this question up, especially as he has done so absolutely on the authority of some letters to the newspapers, even if these letters are from officers who have possibly some very strong views upon the liquor question. It would have been very easy for any one who knew that the question was to be up to have brought strong testimony for the other side from officers who were also chaplains in the forces, and who have written to contradict the statements that have been read from by my hon. friend. I do not know whether my hon. friend said it or whether he read it from one of these letters, that men have been known to take their first drink since they went to the front. But, there are an awful lot of men who have taken their first drink who have never gone to the front. I know my hon. friend's biography pretty well, and I do not think that he, any more than myself, has ever been to war, but I should be surprised to learn that he is a life teetotaller. I do not, however, rise to go into the merits of the question at all; I rise to join with my hon. friend in his expression of regret. I know something about what goes on in the trenches at first hand. I know about the amount of drinking that is done there, and I know something about the amount of fighting that is done there. Personally, the last men I would want to dictate to as to their habits in this world are the officers and soldiers of France, Britain and Canada to-day. My hon. friend says the French soldiers get wine. Is he ashamed of what they did on the wine at Verdun? I know that a certain amount of rum is given to the British soldiers in the trenches. Are they not making a pretty good job of the business they have in hand? I, for one, have nothing but gratitude to these soldiers. I have no criticism to offer to them as to their personal habits, and they are the last men in the world that I would want to put in leading strings. They are going to lead the world to freedom and to victory before this war is over.

Mr. G. H. BRADBURY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, it seems fitting that at this moment I should rise to say a word on a question about which I ought to know something. I had the honour of taking a battalion from Western Canada to England. I took that battalion across the ocean, and trained it for four and a half months in different camps in England. I took a battalion across who did not all belong to Sunday school classes, who were men organized for the purpose of discharging the great duties they are discharging to-day, not only to their own credit but to the credit of the people of Canada. I had more trouble in Canada with a dry canteen than I ever had with my men in England with a wet canteen in the camp. The ex-minister (Sir Sam Hughes) asks me how I make that out. When the men got leave to go to the city of Winnipeg or other places in Canada they often came back to the camp under the influence of liquor and would be paraded, as they ought to be, before the commanding officer. I had more men paraded in my orderly room in Canada than I had in any camp in England. I say it is a slander on the men who are performing noble deeds for Canada and for Empire to insinuate that they are drunkards—because that is really what this matter means—on the other side of the water. I am surprised that my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) has taken his brief from this article without making sure that he was on solid ground. Even if he had been absolutely sure that it was correct I doubt the wisdom at this stage in the affairs of Canada of bringing a matter like this before the country. Is it calculated, I ask the hon. gentleman, to encourage recruiting all over Canada or is it calculated to discourage recruiting? Surely it cannot be the object of the hon. gentleman to discourage recruiting. If it was, he could not do anything better than what he has done to-day in bringing this matter before the House as he has. Let me read an article from a chaplain, Captain Daw. Captain Daw was canon of an English church in Hamilton and was a chaplain in England in one of these camps referred to. He knows the writer of the article the hon. gentleman has read and he makes a statement here in the Hamilton Herald of Tuesday, April 24. It is headed "Captain Daw is Champion of the Men Overseas." Should we not all be champions of the men overseas? "He refutes statements about them made by Captain Goforth." That is the gentleman from whom my hon. friend has his brief. The article is as follows:

In the person of Capt. (Rev.) Canon S. Daw recently returned from England where he served as chaplain af the 120th battalion, the Canadian soldiers in training in the old country

have a champion who will not sit dumbly by and hear evil spoken against their characters without making protest against what he calls the injustice and untruthfulness of such statements. Capt. Daw denies the charges of drunkenness and misconduct against the brave lads overseas.

This morning a Toronto paper published an editorial calling the wet canteens of England a national curse and citing extracts contributed by Capt. Goforth to the Financial Post, in which it is stated that Canadian troops in the old country are being debilitated and ruined for useful citizenship by these canteens and "the birds of prey who hang around the camps and give the soldiers loathsome diseases".

Speaking from his own experience and observations while in England Capt. Daw denied these charges absolutely when interviewed regarding the matter this morning. He said: "Capt. Goforth is a crank. That article he contributed to the Post was written three years ago when conditions were much different. Then there were some old soldiers in England who did do some things that were wrong, but not nearly as bad as he paints them; but now such conditions are as dead as the dodo in England, and it is not fair to publish that at this date about our Canadian soldiers.

"England believes in temperance and I believe that those wet canteens stand for temperance. They are run by the army and navy department, and controlled by the colonel of the battalion. They don't sell hard liquor. They sell mostly beer.

"The colonel of one battalion told me over and over again that they had less drunkenness in England than in Canada. I have seen in one night more cases of drunkenness in the streets between the Westinghouse and the central part of the city than I saw all the time I was in England."

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Is that the letter of a reverend gentleman?

Mr. BRADBURY: That is the letter of Rev. Captain Daw, chaplain of one of the Canadian battalions, who was in England. It is not necessary for me to add much to what I have already said. It is unfortunate that a gentleman occupying the prominent position that the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) occupies, knowing that his statement will go broadcast over Canada in the press of the country, should rise in his place and read an article such as he read before the House to-day—an article that, as stated here, is three years old, without making any investigation to find out whether or not the matter contained in it is correct. But, as I said, even if the statements were true, it is not in the interests of recruiting at the present moment that these statements should be made. I want to say, as a Colonel who had my own battalion to control and administer, that the statements regarding the conduct of Canadian soldiers in our camps are absolutely untrue. I was located in the Witley camp, where there were forty thousand men for three months.

The conditions are these: A great deal is made about the wet canteen. The wet canteen is under the control of the British Government. It is not the worst institution in the world, regardless of what some hon. gentlemen may think. It is far better, to my mind, to have a wet canteen in a camp in England than no canteen at all, or a dry canteen. I will tell you why. Every one of our camps is adjacent to small towns and every one of these towns has all kinds of public houses, and it is far better that our men should be able to get their beer under proper restrictions within our lines than that they should go downtown and get it to excess and get drunk in the pubs. Hard liquor is not sold in our canteen; but downtown the men can get all the hard liquor they want. If my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) had taken a battalion over himself, as I think he ought to have done, he would have been able to speak, as I am speaking, from personal touch and personal knowledge, and he would never have made the mistake that he has made to-day of bringing this question before the House. I am sure that no officer who has commanded a battalion in England will corroborate the statements made in the article read by my hon. friend this afternoon. I had very little trouble with my men in England, where there was a wet canteen. Out of 1,100 men I never had more than two or three brought before me in the morning because of their having taken too much beer the night before. Drunkenness on the part of soldiers is a crime that is dealt with severely by the commanding officers. One would almost think, after hearing the hon. member for Rouville, that the Canadian men across the water were a lot of children who are not able to take care of themselves. The men who have crossed the water, I say, to fight our battles are the flower of the young manhood of Canada, well able to take care of themselves, and of the enemy, too. These men do not need to be taught the lesson of restraint; they were taught that in their own Canadian homes and cities before they left. There never was a better behaved army in the world than the Canadian army and it is a slander on our men to bring matters like this before the House and to have it heralded throughout Canada and throughout the world that the Canadian boys are subject to temptations which they cannot resist. Any one who has visited England, whether as civilian or as soldier, knows the temptations that surround the men. Is a soldier any more likely to suc-

cumb to these temptations than the average man? Can the Canadian Government check what is going on over there? You might as well ask them to check what is going on in France. When this war is over and our men come back, few or many—God grant that it will be many—those who have taken the position taken to-day by my hon. friend will have to answer to these men. They will not soon forget the insult that has been hurled at them to-day across the floor of this House. I may be pardoned, Mr. Speaker, if I feel keenly on this matter. I had a very deep feeling of regret upon having to part with the men that I took across the water. I would not be here if it were possible for me to be with my men. I am here first on account of my health; next, on account of my age. But the men of my battalion and of hundreds of other battalions who are to-day in the firing line are as well-behaved as any class of citizens in Canada or anywhere else. Instead of casting aspersions on them, we ought to be doing all that we can to make them realize that we appreciate the great sacrifices they are making for their country and for the rest of us who are not performing the duties that we ought to perform.

I regret exceedingly that a gentleman of my hon. friend's parliamentary experience should have been so easily led into the error of bringing a matter like this before the House, upon the authority that he has read to the House. Last December I visited our men who are in the trenches—and a finer body of men I never saw in my life. I was anxious to find out just how the men were treated and just what the conditions were under which they lived. I questioned hundreds of privates as to how they were getting along, whether they were being well taken care of and well fed. I never heard a grouch from any one all the time I was in France except this: when I was going out of the Somme I was approached by four officers, and this remark was made: "Colonel, you are a member of the House of Commons. When you go back, tell the Minister of Militia to give us more rum." Why was this said? I walked along the trenches in the middle of December. During the whole of the twelve days that I was at the front ice was hanging from the trees and the whole country was covered with hoar frost. I never saw the sun; everything was frozen and wet. The men stand in the trenches from evening until almost daylight before they are relieved, sometimes almost perishing with cold, sometimes wet up to the knees. Under these circumstances, I hope that there are no hon. gentlemen in this House who would deny these men the little tot of rum they get to revive them and put life into them. Coming across on the boat I had with me Rev. Mr. Gordon (Ralph Connor), the noted novelist, who is known to every one in Canada. No stronger temperance man has lived in Canada than Ralph Connor; no man has preached the principles of temperance more energetically from pulpit and platform than he. I discussed the liquor question with the reverend gentleman, and he said to me: "Colonel, I would just about as soon take the rifle from a man as take his tot of rum from him in the morning in the trenches." That is a pretty strong assertion to come from a reverend gentleman who is such a stong temperance advocate.

If the hon. gentleman were just as anxious to send recruits across the water to defend the principles that these men are contending for, and for which they are willing to give their lives, as he is to bring forward a matter that reflects upon their honour, stability, and character, it would be a good thing for Canada. I say that it would be better for him to do that than to take the rather unpatriotic stand that he is taking to-day.

With all due respect to my hon. friend, I cannot help but feel that he has not played a very patriotic part in bringing this resolution before the House and in building up a case on information that is absolutely false, and that is nearly three years old according to the Rev. Captain Daw. For what purpose has he done this? For the purpose of trying to make the people of Canada believe that in some way this Government has neglected the interest of the men it has sent overseas. Surely there is no patriotism in an action of that kind. I regret that I have had to say one word on this question; but as one who has been across the water and has seen the conditions as they exist, I wish to give a most emphatic denial to the statement made by the gentleman who wrote that article, or to any gentleman in this House or out of it who states that the Canadian soldiers are drinking to excess in their camps, because that statement is absolutely untrue and unfounded.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, I certainly had no intention of taking any part in this debate;

but when I ventured to offer a remark to the effect that I did not wish to share altogether the view of my hon. friend he appealed to me direct, and I am glad to give him my answer at once. I cannot see that there was anything wrong in my hon. friend from Rouville bringing this matter up, because every one knows—and no one better than my hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury)—that for years back, before the war and since the war, there has been controversy in this House as to whether we should have wet canteens or dry canteens in our military camps. My hon. friend has heard this question discussed from both sides. Men there were—and I think he was one of them at the time—who believed we should have dry canteens and no liquor at all in the camps; men there were who believed there should be liquor in the camps, and when the war broke out the then Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) took the ground that no liquor should be allowed in any camp for Canadian troops whether in Canada or in Great Britain. I have no fault to find with the ground which he took, although I am not of his way of thinking. There are other men who believe that there should be liquor in the camps, and I understood from what he said that General Alderson and the present High Commissioner, de facto, had taken the ground that there should be liquor allowed. If liquor be allowed in any camp, there may be excesses. I shall not be shocked; I shall not be scandalized in that. Human nature is the same everywhere and I am prepared to believe, indeed I know, as every one knows, that the Canadian troops have been well behaved, indeed none better. We know what the Canadian troops have done in the field, and I believe they have done just as well in the camps as in the field. If, however, I am told to-day that there have been a few excesses amongst them, will any one think any less of them for that? Who will cast a stone at them? Not I. But my hon. friend knows that there are two sets of views in this country upon this question. There are men to-day who believe that no liquor should be allowed to the troops; there are others who take a different view. I am not prepared to say one way or the other. There is in this country a growing sentiment in favour of prohibition everywhere. You have legislation introduced into all the provinces to restrict the sale of liquor; you have it in Ontario; you have it in the western provinces; you have at the present time a contest under way on the other side of the river to prevent the sale of liquor in Hull. That is the prevailing sentiment amongst the people of Canada. My hon. friend tells me it would be cruel to the fighting men if they were not given rum while in the trenches. For my part I am prepared to take that view. I do not pose as a temperance man any more than my fellow-man; I do not pose as a prohibitionist; I am not. I do not pose as a teetotaller; I am not, but I claim to be a temperance man all the same. If, however, my hon. friend believes that the men should have their toddy I bow to his belief, but I may say to him that it is a moot question whether or not it is good for the men to have liquor even in the hard conditions under which they live in the trenches. I know that all the lumbermen of Ottawa, when they send their men into the camps, where they have to go through the rigours of winter, to spend months in the open, in the snow, in the wet, in the cold, suffering great hardships, do not allow any liquor in those camps. The opinion prevails amongst the lumbermen of Ottawa that the men are better without any liquor at all; that they are better if they use tea as a stimulant instead of liquor. To-day, however, there are two sets of views upon this question. There are men who believe that no liquor at all ought to be allowed in any camp; there are men who believe the contrary. But when my hon. friend from Rouville brings the attention of the House to the side of the case of those who believe there should be no liquor sold in the camps, and when he gives as a reason for his statements a letter under the signature of an officer, he has committed no wrong and he does no injury to anybody. It is a cheap way, I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury) of creating prejudices, to speak as he has just done. The ex-Minister of Militia thought one way, namely, that there should be no liquor in the camps. He has his good points and he has his faults, but every one must give him credit for having the courage of his opinion. He followed that policy. I understand that policy has been reversed. I am not here to criticise; I do not know whether the Government were right or wrong, but right or wrong I did not criticise them. I have, however, to say to my hon. friend that if, in this free Parliament, we are not permitted to debate questions that are discussed in the press that is not my understanding of British freedom.

Sir EDWARD KEMP (Minister of Militia and Defence): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take more than a moment of the time of

the House, because the ground has been already well covered. We have had cited the evidence of eye-witnesses, and, it seems to me, we have to accept such evidence as final. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) on Tuesday of this week asked me across the floor of the House if I would secure information regarding wet or dry canteens in England, and I promised him I would do so. In the latter part of March last I cabled to England asking for information in respect to wet or dry canteens in our camps there, and after my hon. friend spoke to me on Tuesday last I cabled again to England, but I have not yet received a reply. I have every reason to believe that when the report reaches us it will be quite satisfactory to every one in the House. I regret, as others have regretted, that my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) has brought this matter up in the way he has done. If he wished to bring the matter up, it would have been better if he had pursued the course taken by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) on Tuesday last. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), it seemed to me, was attempting to create the impression that wet canteens had been restored in Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No, in England. Am I right or wrong?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: In England? I am going to say very little on that point now because the report that is being prepared will show the exact condition of affairs in England.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If I did not make myself understood, I repeat that I have no fault to find at all with the judgment of the militia authorities on this point.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The wet canteen has been restored in England.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: My hon. friend from Rouville brought this matter up in the House this afternoon on the evidence of Captain Goforth, and in the first part of his remarks he led the House to believe, as I think my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) did also, that wet canteens had been restored in Canada. As has been stated, the dry canteen was introduced into military camps in this country under the regime of my predecessor. The dry canteen is in existence at our camps in Canada at the present time, and it will continue to exist. There is no intention whatever of making a change. I wish to state as emphatically as I can, that we have no intention of restoring a wet canteen in the camps in Canada. Such a thing has never been thought of. Indeed, would it not be ridiculous to reintroduce the wet canteen into Canada, if it ever did exist in this country, and I do not know as to that? But as prohibition has been carried in so many provinces of the Dominion, would it not be ridiculous for us to say that liquor shall be sold at the camps where our soldiers are? Such a thing would be intolerable, and public opinion I am sure would denounce it in no uncertain terms. So far as I am concerned, there is no danger whatever of the wet canteen being introduced in Canada. Prohibition has carried in practically every province except Quebec, and I hope Quebec will soon follow the example set by the other provinces. Soldiers, when they are leaving camp sometimes get a little liquor at the places along the road, but once Quebec follows the example of the other provinces, this will be no longer possible.

My hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) referred to Valcartier. I know nothing of the circumstances to which he alluded; I have never heard of any unseemly conduct because of the use of liquor in that camp.

With regard to the Canadian soldier in England, we know that Great Britain is not a prohibition country, and our camps over there are quite close to villages and towns where there are many public houses. With the little information I have on conditions over there, I think I may be permitted to say this: If they have what is called the wet canteen in England, would it not be better so far as our troops are concerned—and I submit this for the earnest consideration of every member of the House—would it not be better to allow light beers to be sold to our troops over there under our supervision, rather than have the soldiers go outside the camps to the public houses in the towns and villages nearby, where they can get hard liquor and stronger drink. I do not propose to go into the merits of the question of prohibition, which has been discussed this afternoon. Every one knows that the regulations of the British Army with regard to drunkenness are very severe. I know of some poor fellows who have been tried by court martial and been punished for being slightly intoxicated.

I want to endorse what the members of the House have said with reference to the splendid conduct of our troops in Great Britain and France. I do not think there has been any drinking to speak of amongst them. I was very glad to hear the hon. member from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) say that the conduct of our troops in England and France was even better than their conduct here in Canada. I need not take up the time of the House any longer. As soon as I receive the report which I have cabled for I shall be very glad to submit it to the House.

Mr. SAMUEL J. DONALDSON (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to have to rise and address the House for the first time on a matter of this kind, but owing to the position I have occupied in military affairs for the last year I feel compelled to say something in defence of the soldier who has gone to the front to defend the lives of the people of Canada and of the Mother Country. I am very sorry that this matter should have been brought up in the House to-day. Last year I took a battalion of 1,496 to Camp Hughes on the 6th of June, and on the 19th of October I landed in the County of Kent, England, in company with another battalion, and I can say positively that such a thing as hard liquor was never sold within my lines. If I had the records of my orderly room here I should be only too glad to show them to hon. gentlemen, to prove that I never had a case of drunkenness before me in practically four months. The fathers and the mothers, and the sisters and the brothers of the boys fighting at the front for the people here at home have enough anxiety reading the casualty lists every morning, without being troubled further by suggestions that our boys in the Old Country are being degraded through the use of liquor. The thing is absolutely ridiculous, and I am surprised that my hon. friend from Rouville should have brought the matter up. This talk about our men being degraded is absolutely false. He talks of more liquor; it is more recruits we want. That would have been a fitting subject for him to speak on, but he should not belittle the men who have gone over to fight for us.

Let me relate a little incident which will show the character of our men over there. A call was made on me for five hundred men to proceed to France within forty-eight hours. In order to provide for casualties I arranged with headquarters for six hundred men, and their last leave was cut down to three days. Now, any one who knows the geography of the Old Country knows that it takes more than three days to get to some parts of Ireland and Scotland. Some of the men, when they got their leave, took a chance and thought they would try to make it and get back. Every one of those men was back on the day their passes were cut, except twenty-five. Had these men been addicted to drink, what would have happened? Why, I should have had to use the hundred that I had allowed for casualties, and probably drawn on my battalion for another hundred. There is no use in beating about the bush in this matter, such a thing as strong drink ruining our young men in England is absolutely out of the question. I took over three sons, two sons-in-law and four nephews. And the mother of my boys was over there and saw what was going on, and she has no fear of leaving her boys over there. And those boys have as good a mother as has any man sitting on the other side of the House. I say it is a crime to bring up in the House a matter like this, with our boys probably dying by hundreds this very day. Get out and get some more men. That is what we want.

I do not know what object the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) has in bringing up this matter in the House. I am sure it is not going to get him very many votes from the temperance people. My experience is that when these people vote they vote party, anyway. But there is one thing sure—the Government should be proud, and the opposition should be proud also, of the class of men Canada has been sending to the front. They cannot be beaten anywhere in the world. If they were addicted to strong drink they would not be playing the part, the important part, that they are playing to-day in this great struggle. I have told you about the men I took over there. Those men went there to fight for their country; they did not go there to drink whiskey. Such a discussion as this is a hardship on the mothers and fathers, the brothers and sisters, of the boys at the front. Reading of it, they will be thinking that their dear ones run the risk not merely of being killed by bullet or shell, but of being ruined by drinking whiskey. I think the hon. gentleman who brought this matter forward will probably make up his mind that it was rather a mistake. My advice to him is, in future when such newspaper articles come to his attention—and this one happens to be

three years old—to make inquiries as to the facts. Had the hon. gentleman asked me about the conditions, I would gladly have told him; for I know what I am talking about, I know exactly the conditions. During the four months I was in the Old Country, I saw only two of our men under the influence of liquor, and that was on Christmas Day. The guard-room happened to be right in front of my hut. I heard somebody call, "Guard, turn out!" I went to the window to see what was going on, and these two chaps were coming down, and called the guard to turn out and salute.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough): I think that, as one who spent six months in England and a few days in France, I am called upon to say something on behalf of the soldiers. I certainly do not agree with St. Paul and my superior officers, that all things are not expedient. I think that we should discuss things like this in this House as well as elsewhere. I have yet to learn that it is unwise to discuss a matter which so intimately concerns our people. The case of the canteen is a very simple one. You believe in the dry canteen for Canada; those who believe in the wet canteen somewhere else may rise in their places. You cannot believe in both a dry canteen and a wet canteen at one and the same time. But I wish to say this very definitely—the Canadian soldier in England as in Canada is a sober man. Knowing humanity as I do—and I have lived quite a few years now; and I may tell you that I was connected with the 93rd Battalion from its inception and was with it in England until it was dispersed and sent to France —a more sober, orderly, upright, and thoroughly decent lot of men I never saw, even amongst the politicians. We have got to bear in mind that we are not in Heaven. And we have got to bear in mind that God Almighty is not a prohibitionist. But I have seen enough of humanity to lead me to believe that our restrictions must be of the strongest. We must put restrictions upon ourselves. Pray, what man is so confident of himself that he can give rein to himself and go where he likes and do what he likes? And what is true of each of us is true of humanity in the aggregate; we must do everything we can to narrow down and restrict the tendency of humanity to go astray. Therefore, it seems to me, the argument is rather academic than practical. And I cannot repeat too often that having seen a very large number of troops, both Canadians and Imperials, as they call those of Great Britain— and having been at the camps at Otterpool, East Sandling and West Sandling as well as elsewhere, and having heard the reports of others, the Canadian soldier is an upright, sober, decent man, as men go. When we went to France—and I may say for the benefit of those who take an interest in these things, that we paid our own expenses—we made inquiries there also. And it would be a splendid thing if all the members of this House were sent to England and France to investigate conditions. I was advocating that with the Minister of Finance the other day. They could do no greater service to Canada and the Canadian army than to go and look into these matters. It would be a good thing for Canada and a good thing for them.

When we investigated things in France we found that men were being called upon to exert themselves to the utmost not only physically, but nervously; that is, they had to draw upon their nerve power. We found that men, who, before, perhaps, had not been very great men, after they had gone to France, had become really great. They were able to stand the stress and storm, the horror and danger of war. We were right where it was going on. We were amidst the thunders of it and we saw these men bear themselves casually; they were not afraid. Was there drunkenness there? There was not. I have seen no less than one million soldiers since I left this country, and I must confess that I do not think that out of the 500,000 of them whom I saw frequently I beheld five men whom I would call the worse of liquor.

But there are other things that must engage our attention, because much of Canada will be in danger of disease if we do not look to it. There are things that we do not want to talk about, but it is not blinked in Britain, and it will go through this country as it will through the world generally if we do not take some means to counteract it. There were cases by the thousand in the hospitals. Liquor is not in it for one minute with venereal diseases. Statistics show that they are twenty-five times worse than alcohol ever was. We must look these things in the face, because we must protect our country. Ordinary contact, even indirect, in bad cases anybody who is at all acquainted with these matters knows, is almost as serious as the act itself. To shake hands with a person who has syphilis may give a person who is entirely innocent syphilis. That, as Scripture tells us, will go down to even the third and fourth generation. This country is in some danger. We

must exert ourselves in every way. Now let me say, with reference to a thing that I do know something about, that is, the liquor question, that the Canadian soldiers are not by any means drunken, but are, indeed, a most sober lot of men. Canada may well be proud of them and the mothers and fathers of this country need not fear if they send their sons to the front that they will be destroyed by license in drink.

Hon. Sir THOMAS WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I am reluctant to intervene in this debate, but it appears to me that having regard to the conditions at the front to-day, where we are confronted with the greatest events in the history of the world, and having regard to the conditions here when it is desirable that we should rally our man power to the utmost of our ability, it would be unfortunate if the statement brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) should be not only contradicted, but absolutely refuted. No question arises as to the right of the hon. member to bring forward this matter for discussion. It is clearly within the right of this House to discuss a matter of such great importance, but, personally, I would not like to assume the responsibility which he assumes to-day upon the strength of a letter appearing in a financial paper in the city of Toronto. I say that with all respect to my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) and believing that he was actuated by the best of intentions. But the effect of the statements which he has brought

5 p.m.

to the attention of the House is to create an impression, widespread throughout this country, that the evils in the army arising out of the liquor traffic are of a general and widespread character, among our troops at the front. The heading of this article to which my hon. friend has given sanction by bringing it to the attention of the House, and consequently to the attention of the public of Canada, is this:

> Wet Canteen is Ruining Countless Canadian Soldiers.

There are fathers and mothers, sisters and wives in this country who, in pursuance of the highest sense of patriotic duty, are sending forward daily those that are nearest and dearest to them to do battle for their country, for the Empire and for the great cause of humanity for which we are contending. It is desirable that if the statement made in this paper is not correct, is not accurate. is not well-founded, as I believe to be the fact, they should be made aware of it. I feel more inclined to speak because during November last I was in England and visited the front. One can estimate whether a body of men are being injured by drink or any other evil habit by seeing them, by living with them, by talking to them, by witnessing what they do and by knowing what they have done. I crossed on the Mauritania with 3,500 Canadian troops. One regiment was from British Columbia, one was from Glengarry and Stormont, and the third was from Toronto. I desire to say that in all my life —and I have mixed with all classes of people in my life—I have never known a more sober, self-respecting, God-fearing lot of men than those 3,500 whom I addressed in mid-Atlantic in the great dining room of the ship as she was flying before the storm on that trip to England. I can see their faces to-day and I never think of them without being moved by the recollection. When I looked into their faces I saw their mothers' faces. I saw, in their faces, women I have known when I was a boy in the country—for I was raised in the country—and in the villages and towns and cities of Canada—typical Canadians all and, as has been said by a previous speaker, they were absolutely the flower of the youth of Canada. Does any man mean to tell me that these men were addicted to the evils of liquor? Can any man make experienced men in this House believe that? I never saw a cleaner, a more self-respecting, a more God-fearing or a more physically fit lot of men in my life. Let me say another thing. We discuss many matters in this House from day to day, I think without full realization of the time in which we are living. One reason is that we are so far remote from the field of conflict. Three thousand miles of Atlantic separate us from the United Kingdom, and in addition to that this country is thirty-six hundred miles from Halifax to Vancouver; so that all of us are three thousand miles from the United Kingdom and some are four thousand, some are five thousand, and some are six thousand miles. To-day, when we are debating in this House, men are dying by the thousands and tens of thousands in the greatest battle in the history of the world. Do we realize it? I do not mean to say that we should not carry on the business of the country; I am the last man to say that. But do we realize it? None of us can realize it. If we could see what is going on at that front to-day, not in the eye of mind but with our physi-

cal eyes, would we not have a better sense of perspective or proportion than we have to-day as to the matters being discussed in this House? Why do I mention this? Because it is pertinent to the argument which I am making. I say that our soldiers who are going to the front are bound to be a self-respecting lot of men. Does any man suppose that these men can face death from day to day without becoming, in a sense they never experienced before, religious? Does anybody think that the voyage across the Atlantic can be undertaken lightly, that men are light-hearted even in the Mauritania? When a man steps on one of these transports filled with Canadian troops, fair game at that time because a ship of war, I tell you that every man on that ship, officers and men, feels intensely that he may be face to face with death. They are a serious-minded lot of men, they are not thinking of drink. And on Sunday, you go into their services and see their faces. I tell you that what makes a man religious is to look face to face with death or great danger. Those men are serious-minded men. I say to this House and to the people of Canada that I never saw a cleaner, a more physically fit, a more self-respecting and sober lot of men than these thirty-five hundred men that I accompanied across on the Mauritania. I take off my hat to those men. I say that I felt, Minister of the Crown as I was, a great sense of my own unworthiness when I considered the sacrifice that these men were making. Those men have given up their occupations, their callings, their hearths, and their homes. They have left their families, their fathers and their mothers, their wives, their sisters; they have gone forward under the inspiration of a great ideal. When in England I went to Witley Camp. I talked with General Meighen there and with all the other officers. I visited the hospitals. I mingled with the men; I talked to the men. I think I have a fair estimation of the character of men and their quality. From my experience I say the same thing with regard to the men at Witley Camp as I say of the men on the Mauritania—clean men, physically fit men, self-respecting men, officers imbued with the highest sense of their duty to the men—those are the men that I saw there and I came away with precisely the same feeling: all is well at the camps, all is well with our men, all is well with our officers, well fed, well looked after, camp well regulated, discipline good. All that I saw with my own eyes. I was in England and I saw many officers and men there. I never saw a drunken man from the time I left this country until I returned. I never saw a soldier under the influence of liquor in England or on the Continent.

Let me tell this House another thing, and I regard it as absolutely conclusive as to the physical condition of our men at the front. There is no man of higher standing in Montreal in the medical profession than Dr. Elder; the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) will agree to that. He is a surgeon of the highest standing. He was in charge of the McGill Hospital unit at Boulonge. That is one of the best hospital units in the world, a great credit to the great university that established it. Dr. Elder told me that up to that time thirty-five thousand men had passed through that hospital, had been treated in that hospital and sent across to Folkestone and to the other hospitals in England. He said that less than one-half of one per cent had been the rate of mortality among the thirty-five thousand men. I said: how do you account for it? Why, he said, it is very simple: the men are in the pink of condition. In civil life, he said, we operate and the operation is perfectly done, but some other conditions set up due to the age of the man or to disease of the kidneys or of the heart or of the liver; some complications set in and the patient dies notwithstanding that a perfect operation has been performed. That is well known to all medical men. But, he said, these men are precisely as if they were trained for the operating table. He told me some marvellous cases of operations. Why, he said, in civil life we would not think of such a thing, we would amputate the leg or the arm; but these men are in such perfect condition that they recover without amputation, septicemia does not set in. Does any man mean to tell me that of these thirty-five thousand men, the pick, from the physical standpoint, of all the men he had ever seen in his long experience—does any man mean to tell me that those men are suffering from addiction to drink? I went to the front and I saw those men behind the Canadian line at Vimy Ridge. I saw Vimy Ridge. The Canadians were in front of Vimy Ridge. And I want to tell this House that I said to General Byng: I do not see how you are ever going to take that ridge. He said: We will take that Ridge, the Canadians will take that ridge. Before us lay a plain where the year before 180,000 French

and 180,000 Germans had lost their lives or fallen in battle for Vimy Ridge. There, before Vimy Ridge, were three brigades of Canadians, the other brigade being on the Somme. I saw the life of these men. When they go into the trenches they sometimes stand in six inches or a foot of water and frequently they sleep leaning forward against the parapet. When they come back they go into hutments, not the warm camps of the lumber district referred to by my right hon. friend, but hutments, temporary structures, heated with oil stoves. You would see those men come in cased with mud, standing around the stoves. Talk about cold weather! We think this country is cold, but I give you my word that no one in this country knows what cold is until he has been in England or on the continent in November and December. The temperature is not so low; it is the dampness. I motored for three hours from Boulogne to a point behind the Canadian lines. I had on an ordinary heavy winter overcoat and a fur coat over that, and we were covered with rugs, but we were chilled to the bone when we reached our destination. The men were working under these conditions. When they came out of the trenches they changed their clothes and had a bath. They were well fed. I said to General Byng: "Have you any message for the people of Canada with regard to the Canadians? He said: "They are sound clean through; you may tell that to the people of Canada." General Byng is one of the best soldiers in the world; he is the man who had charge of the evacuation of Suvla Ray. He is proud of his Canadians and they are proud of him. Since I was there last fall these Canadians have achieved one of the most notable victories of the world at that same Vimy Ridge.

Now, let us see what this all amounts to. Here is a letter, written it is said, three years ago—I do not know whether it was or not—appearing in a financial journal in the city of Toronto; and on the strength of that, if the statement of my hon. friend had not been met and, I believe, refuted—

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does my hon. friend know the editor?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not, but whether I knew the editor or not I should have hesitated, if I had been in the position of my hon. friend, to give currency on the wings of the press to a statement as sweeping as that, upon the strength of a letter stated here to be three years old. I believe that if this statement had not been met in the way it has been met in this House, it would have done great damage to recruiting and would have been properly and justly resented by all the soldiers across the seas.

I apologize to the House if I appear to have been speaking feelingly. I do not challenge for one moment the right of the hon. member for Rouville to bring this matter up. I am glad, in one way, that it has come up, because I believe that the statements made here to-day will go far to reassure the people with regard to the facts. In one way it is unfortunate, regrettable; because even the bringing of it up is bound to do some harm at a time like this, when the minds of men and women are tortured with anxiety as to their loved ones overseas. I say that any statement of a sweeping character with regard to the soldiers overseas being addicted to strong drink is a slander upon them, and I believe that they will resent it, not only on their own accord, but because of the anxiety it will create in the minds of those they have left behind. Their fathers, their mothers and wives here are torn with anxiety about them, and they in turn are torn with anxiety about their wives and mothers and sisters at home. Will it make them any more comfortable at the front; will it make it any easier for them to perform the duties which they are performing there, to know that the impression is being created in this country among those they left behind that they are being demoralized by drink in England and at the front? Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely untrue.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): Some days ago I asked the Minister of Militia to give to this House some information with regard to the operation of the canteens in the camps in England. I asked that question for the purpose of getting an authoritative statement as to the conditions that existed there, and I assume that the minister will give me the information when he receives it. I did this in consequence of information that I had received as to the bad effects of the operation in certain camps in England of what is known in Canada as the wet canteen. I had intended, when this information should have been forthcoming, to direct the attention of the House to the subject; I was not aware that the hon. member for Rouville had intended to deal with it. I want to say to the Minister of Finance that the member for Rouville was properly within his rights and

privileges as a member of this House in directing the attention of Parliament to this question, and in what he said he was stating what is manifestly correct. My questioning on the subject and my hon. friend's discussion of it to-day were prompted solely by one desire, and that an honest and true one. Hon. gentlemen opposite, with assumed indignation, undertook to say that this gentleman, whose boy is going to the front, and all the rest of us who have boys at the front, have no right to discuss the manner in which the welfare of the men overseas is being had in regard by those who are responsible. One can make eloquent speeches in eulogy of the splendid deeds of the boys who have gone, but that is not necessary. There are those who hold in their hearts and minds thoughts which are far more eloquent than any uttered words in regard to the great mission of the men who have gone forth to fight. But it is not correct to say that we who are here at home have no right to assume that any question raised in the public press as to the welfare of those who have gone to the front is not a proper subject for consideration and deliberation by this Parliament.

Only one question is involved in this discussion. The Financial Post, a responsible paper published in the city of Toronto, in its issue of April 21, only five days ago, published the statement to which the member for Rouville has directed attention. I assume that every hon. member in this House received that paper. I did so, and I saw that other hon. gentlemen received it. To say that we must not discuss matters which are mentioned in the press for fear of hurting recruiting is to assume that we in this Parliament, the boys who have gone and those who have been left behind are a lot of children who cannot look the facts in the face.

Who first during this session brought before the House the question of a wet canteen? The ex-Minister of Militia and Defence, who discussed freely and frankly here in Parliament, on the 6th of February, the question of the wet canteen, and I hope that no one will feel that my hon. friend from Rouville had in his mind when he brought up this question any desire except the one which I am sure animates him, of endeavouring to obtain that which is best for those who are fighting for us, because no political advantage can be secured from such clap-trap as the statement that such a matter as this cannot be discussed here without slandering our boys at the front. Either a wet canteen in England is good for our boys, or it is not. That is the only issue. We are well aware that the ex-Minister of Militia inaugurated the dry canteen in Canada, and that during his regime as Minister of Militia there was a dry canteen in all the camps in Canada, and he himself told us in Parliament on the 6th of February that when he was in control as Minister of Militia he insisted on a dry canteen being in existence in Great Britain. He tells us that the reason that that dry canteen was changed into a wet canteen was because General Alderson, according to the ex-minister's statement, made a change under these conditions:

> General Alderson told the men with a great hurrah and bravado in the only speech he ever made except when he read to them a little book which he once published about how not to do things. He told them he was going to make them free men, and as a slap at the Minister of Militia in Canada, he said he was going to give them a wet canteen.

That is the way the wet canteen came into existence in the Canadian camps in England, and the ex-Minister of Militia said to-day, in dealing with this question, that this canteen was carried on by contractors who had contracts with the British Government and not with the Canadian military authorities, though these camps are under Canadian control. The result is that to-day and for some time past there has been a wet canteen in the Canadian camps in England, and the Financial Post, a responsible newspaper, five days ago asserted that the existence of the wet canteen was a serious menace to our boys overseas. Is that not a subject to be discussed in this House of Commons? Does any hon. gentleman want to take the position that in this free Parliament we cannot consider and deliberate as to whether or not a wet canteen is the proper thing to have on the other side in the interest of the boys who have gone overseas? Some hon. gentlemen seem to think that because you mention this matter you are slandering the boys. My hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Lewis) and my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) lamented, almost with tears in their eyes, that this question had been brought up, and that it was a slander on the boys at the front.

Mr. BRADBURY: It is a slander.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend who speaks about its being a slander does not know what he is saying. No one wants to

slander any boy who has gone overseas to fight. My hon. friend's assumed indignation, his deliberate misunderstanding of this question simply show that he is looking for a little notoriety, desiring to tell a story of his own doings and taking the opportunity of this discussion to do so. When he undertakes to lecture the hon. member for Rouville about his not raising a regiment I may tell him that my hon. friend's son is going to the front and going to France to fight, which is more than this hon. gentleman has done.

Mr. BRADBURY: The hon. gentleman has not much of a story to tell the House about what he has done for his country.

Mr. MACDONALD: My only son of military age, if he is not in France at this moment, will be there in a week to fight, and he will stay there. Although on this side of this House we are not as strong numerically as hon. members on the other side, we have more sons and brothers and friends at the front than have hon. gentlemen opposite. My hon. friend has been travelling around so long at the country's expense, garbed in an officer's uniform that he does not know certain things that have been going on in Canada. I resent the suggestion that, when any man in this free Parliament brings a question up for discussion, in the fair mood in which my hon. friend from Rouville has brought it up, not with any idea of creating any hostility or of arousing any feelings the hon. member who does so is said to be attacking the boys at the front. Every hon. gentleman with cool blood knew that there was no such idea in the mind of the hon. member for Rouville. My reason for speaking on this subject is because I know that the attempt will be made to circulate throughout this country the impression I have stated because my hon. friend happens to be a French-Canadian from the province of Quebec. In this war and in the part that we in this Parliament and the people of Canada are going to play in it, if with our hearts sore on behalf of those who have gone out to fight for us, we cannot here as representatives of the people sit down and consider what is best for the welfare of those boys without being told, when a discussion is commenced, as the hon. member for Rouville has commenced this one to-day, that we are slandering the boys, I say that such talk is worthy only of children and not of free men in this Parliament. What is the sole and only issue here? It is whether a wet canteen or a dry canteen in England is in the interest of the boys.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is the whole question.

Mr. MACDONALD: The ex-Minister of Militia says that a wet canteen is not in the interest of the boys. He tells us that the wet canteen was established by General Alderson—to use the minister's own words—as a direct insult upon himself personally. Is that true? If that statement of the ex-minister's is true, what do these other gentlemen who have been discussing this question to-day say? Nobody is attacking the soldiers. The Financial Post does not attack them; it suggests that wet canteens should be done away with because they are an injury to our boys. If they are an injury to the boys, then we want to know it, and I do not care what military exploits hon. gentlemen on the other side may have performed themselves, I want to know, and every father and mother in this country wants to know, whether a wet canteen is likely to contribute to the detriment or to the advancement of the boys who are overseas. For myself I purpose waiting for the information which the Minister of Militia has intimated he will bring down upon this question as to the number of these canteens, as to the regimental reports, and as to the men that have been brought before their commanding officers to be dealt with in regard to offences relating to this matter. The motion of my hon. friend is simply a motion of adjournment in order that the attention of the House may be called to this matter. If hon. members will look at the papers of yesterday they will find a despatch telling how Sir Hamar Greenwood deals with this question to which my hon. friend from West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) has referred—incidentally to discussing this question of the canteen. Sir Hamar Greenwood dealt with it in the frankest possible way, pointing out the regrettable number of our Canadian boys who were in the hospitals. If, over in Great Britain, Sir Hamar Greenwood can discuss, in the interest, as he alleges, of the Canadian people, this question and how best to deal with it, can it be said that in this Parliament we cannot discuss this question of a wet canteen or a dry canteen, like gentlemen and like men, knowing the seriousness of the issue at this time, with a full knowledge of the questions that are being fought out across the ocean, with all the

fateful influence that they will bring to Canada and to those who will come after us? If we in this House cannot discuss this question and find out what is best for our sons who are overseas, then I say that we occupy a very peculiar position. That is what my hon. friend from Rouville, with the best intentions and in a very proper spirit, sought to do, and I submit that he had the right to bring this matter before the attention of Parliament.

Mr. JOHN STANFIELD (Colchester): I shall occupy the time of the House for only a few minutes. I want to say this for the boys from Nova Scotia. At Aldershot camp, (Nova Scotia) they behaved splendidly. On the boat going over, there were 5,988 troops; four battalions from Nova Scotia, one from Toronto, and one from Prince Albert commanded by my hon. friend from Prince Albert (Mr. Donaldson). Captain Hayes told me that he had never had better-behaved men on his boat. The officers commanding the battalions had no trouble at all with the men. The four battalions went to Witley Camp, where a wet canteen was operated by the Imperial authorities. Personally, I think that when a man is in training he should do without strong drink, but of course when our soldiers get over to the other side, they come under British control. To prove how well the boys from Nova Scotia behaved at Witley Camp, when they were given fifty-fifty leave, that is, half of them going for six days' leave and then the other half, there were only seven absentees out of 4,000 men when the leave was up. The Provost-Marshal of London complimented the Highland Brigade from Nova Scotia on their splendid conduct while in the city. Owing to a severe operation I had met with, the medical officers considered that it would be unwise for me to go to France, even on a tour to see what was going on. I should have liked to go, but I took their advice and came home, so I cannot speak of conditions at the front. But I can say this for the boys from Nova Scotia and other parts of Canada in training at Witley Camp, that I never saw a drunken man the whole time I was there.

Mr. F. F. PARDEE (West Lambton): I think one of the most extraordinary propositions that I have ever heard has been laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite this afternoon. It was very proper that this question, which concerns the welfare of our troops in England, should be brought up by my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), and he has brought it before the House in a very fair and equitable manner. It is to Parliament that these matters must in the last analysis come, and it was only right that my hon. friend should direct the attention of Parliament to the condition of affairs which the correspondent of a reputable newspaper describes as existing in Canadian camps in England. No sooner had my hon. friend sat down than one hon. gentleman opposite got up and said that even if the allegations were true, the subject was one that ought never to have been discussed on the floor of the House. That was a most remarkable thing to say. When it is alleged that a grievance exists, and that grievance is brought to the attention of Parliament and substantiated by an hon. member of this House, all hon. gentlemen opposite can do is to fall back on the old time-worn argument that it will hurt recruiting. The truth is, recruiting is not hurt by criticism, the object of which is to secure better health and better conditions for our troops. Recruiting cannot be hurt by criticism of that kind. But this Government, which has been so utterly lacking in giving a lead to recruiting, the moment criticism is made falls back on the old argument: Do not criticise, it will hurt recruiting. The whole question in a nut shell is this: Is the dry or the wet canteen the better for our men?

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is the whole question.

Mr. PARDEE: We had a long peroration from the Minister of Finance describing his trip abroad and his utterances there, but what I should have liked to hear from him as leader of the House, is a declaration as to whether the Government is in favour of a dry or a wet canteen. If the wet canteen was not a good thing in Canada, is it any better for being in England? If it is not a good thing, and I am not expressing an opinion one way or the other, let the Government consider the representations that have been made here this afternoon, with a view to finding out what will be in the best interests of the troops. But for hon. gentlemen opposite to impute disloyalty to us, and hint that we are trying to hurt recruiting, when we are simply making an honest criticism of conditions in England and at the front, is to my mind carrying an absurdity altogether too far, and hon. gentlemen opposite know it.

In conclusion, I would just like to say this: I think the people of this country will think it a very strange thing for the Government, from the Minister of Finance

down, to deprecate criticism of conditions which vitally affect the welfare of our troops at the front, saying that even if the allegations are true we have no right to discuss them because, forsooth, the discussion will hurt recruiting. If the time has come when the Government is not prepared to face the facts as they are, and endeavour in their wisdom to right them, then the sooner the Government and this whole House of Commons gets out and lets another set of men in, the better for the whole country. Somebody may say: "You are finding fault because the men get a tot of rum." The hon. member for Rouville never hinted at such a thing. He brought the conditions to the attention of Parliament in order that they may be righted. Let the Government drop once for all this silly cry of hurting recruiting, and be men enough to say whether these allegations are true or false.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel): I am sure the people of the country will realize that hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to make political capital out of this discussion. Any man who listened to the speech of my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) could reach no other conclusion. He was eager to discuss every other branch of military affairs but the matter now before the House. He charges the Government with lack of leadership in recruiting. I should like to know what that has to do with the question before the House, and whether a charge of that kind is not intended to injure the Government. My hon. friend seems to forget that he belongs to a party which promised to give the Government whole hearted support during this war until victory was won. For my part I do not think the Government can be charged with maintaining a wet canteen. I do not wish to discuss this matter politically, but the party of hon. gentlemen opposite was in power for fifteen years, and, as their right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has stated——

Mr. PARDEE: Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) dispute the word of the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) when he says that General Alderson, through Sir George Perley, established the wet canteen?

Mr. BLAIN: I do not propose to discuss that part of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BLAIN: My hon. friend is ambitious to make this a broader discussion than you, Mr. Speaker, I am sure, would allow under this resolution. I was saying: The party of the hon. gentlemen opposite was in power for fifteen years, and this question of the wet or dry canteen was under discussion for all that time. Yet they took no action, and it was left to the Liberal-Conservative party, represented by the Government now in power, to introduce and enforce the dry canteen in Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Dry here, wet there.

Mr. BLAIN: This matter was discussed in this House a session or two ago, since the war broke out. It was then stated, without contradiction, that the canteen within the borders of Canada was under the control of the Canadian Government, but that when our troops went overseas they were under the control of the British authorities.

Mr. MACDONALD: With the permission of the hon. gentleman, I desire to say that I plainly asked the Prime Minister in February last who was in control of these camps in England, and he stated that the Canadian authorities were in control through the Canadian Overseas Minister of Militia.

Mr. BLAIN: The hon. gentleman must remember that the resolution presented by the hon. member from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) is in favour of the discussion of a definite matter of urgent importance as

> Evils alleged to exist among our soldiers overseas arising out of the liquor traffic in camps and military centres.

It does not say anything about either the wet or the dry canteen.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BLAIN: But the discussion has been broadened—I think with a view to injuring the Government—it involves consideration of the question whether or not the centres of population near the camps in the Old Country should or should not have the open bar. I repeat that the Canadian people will realize that this Government is not open to censure at least from the Opposition on this subject. Except for what we have heard from the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) we have not had any expression of opinion on the main point from any hon. gentleman opposite, not even from the leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This subject was discussed for twenty years in this country, including all the time he was in power, and so far as we can judge from any

utterance of his he does not know yet whether he is in favour of the dry or of the wet canteen. We need not look for any guidance in this matter from the right hon. gentleman, I am sure of that. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), now so zealous for the welfare of the soldiers, and my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) have spoken, yet neither has ventured to express himself on one side or on the other. Their ambition, I think, is to do injury to the Government. I say that in kindness, but I have listened to the discussion carefully, and I cannot see how any good can come out of it. This country, as well as Britain, has been at war for nearly three years. Hundreds of thousands of our soldiers have been sent overseas. Thousands of letters have come to friends in Canada from those men. In the county of Peel, which I have the honour to represent, the number recruited runs into hundreds. Their friends have received many letters from them, and these letters appear week after week in the local newspapers. And the same is true of many other places. But I have yet to read one line from a soldier at the front making any complaint against the regulations in force in Great Britain or France with respect to the liquor traffic. If there was any complaint to be made surely we should have heard about it from some of our own men. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite, I would ask even the right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself, if any of them has in his possession, or has ever seen, a letter from a Canadian soldier across the water making any charge against the Government in relation to this matter.

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

Mr. BLAIN: I myself am asking a question and trying to get an answer from some hon. gentleman on that side. I would put the question to my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley). Has he in his possession, or has he ever seen during the last three years while we have been at war, any letter from a Canadian soldier in England or in France making a charge against the Government with respect to the wet canteen.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That gives me the opportunity to ask the question I wanted to ask the hon. gentleman. I understand that no soldier at the front is allowed to send any letter making complaint in regard to such a matter. I am told, further, that at the time of the most serious difficulty in regard to the use of the Ross rifle our Canadian soldiers were informed that any soldier who made a complaint would be court martialed.

Mr. BLAIN: That looks rather political also. But would the hon. gentleman be good enough to answer the question I put? He knows that many questions have been written about by the soldiers, especially while they were in England before going to the front. Does he know of any letter from any of our soldiers making a complaint such as the hon. member for Rouville has made in this House to-day?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does the hon. gentleman refer to a complaint specifically against the opportunity afforded to obtain strong drink? If so, I have not received any such letter of complaint against that privilege being given.

Mr. BLAIN: Hundreds of our soldiers have been discharged and have returned to their homes in all parts of Canada. Some of these men have addressed public meetings. But I have yet to hear of one complaint being voiced by these men, either on the public platform or in the press, or in any other way, such as my hon. friend has made this afternoon. Therefore, I have the right to say that, so far as the Government is concerned they have no complaint. I would venture to remark that if my hon. friend from Rouville had been particularly anxious about the welfare of the soldiers at the front, my hon. friend could have gone to the Minister of Militia privately and asked him the question. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) instead of putting his question on the Order Paper could have done that also. As everybody knows, we are passing through very critical times now and statements of this kind going broadcast through the country, while we are trying to urge our people to go to the front to fight this tremendous battle, may have a most undesirable effect. Therefore, hon. gentlemen on both sides should be careful what matters they bring up for discussion. I am sure that my hon. friend from Rouville on reflection, will agree after this discussion is over, that he could have obtained that information from the Minister of Militia without bringing it up on the floor of the House especially when he has so little to substantiate the statements which he has made.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North): Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the newspaper called the Financial Post, which was the subject of a good deal of discussion this afternoon. On the front page of this newspaper I notice a conspicuous headline which says:

"Evils in the army arising out of the liquor traffic. Millions lost to Canada. Wet canteen is ruining countless Canadian soldiers. Vice rampant as result of liquor obtainable in the army. How this affects Canada in dollars and cents, adding to our heavy burden of debt."

No doubt it was the conspicuous, glaring headline that caught the eye of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) and led him to read the lengthy and striking article of which that is the heading. As an hon. gentleman who is interested in the affairs of this country and of the Canadian army and of the Empire, and anxious for their welfare in every phase and ramification, he was no doubt led to inquire as to the truth or falsity of this article. It is not long since an article appeared in a newspaper no more conspicuous, and not regarded as any greater authority than the Post, having something to do with a criticism in connection with the Ross rifle. That paper was taken up by one of the ministers of the Crown and made the subject of comment in this House; that minister even went so far as to intimate that any person who would give publicity to such language should be shot. The article in the Post to which reference has been made appeared on the 21st of the month. To-day is the 26th so there has been ample opportunity for ministers to notice this article and reply to or refute it; but nothing of the kind was done. The hon. member for Rouville refrained for five days from making any comments on this article, I suppose expecting a satisfactory reply to it to be made by some one on behalf of the Government, an explanation that would be satisfactory to the people of this country, particularly to those who have sons in the army or expecting to go overseas. Nothing had been said and so it was quite proper for an hon. gentleman of the prominence and responsibility of the hon. member for Rouville to bring this matter up in the House, and make some inquiries about it. I do not think it was at all necessary for the hon. gentlemen opposite to fly into such a passion as they did on account of this inquiry. All that was necessary was for the Minister of Militia to say that the article was not true, and to give such explanation as would be fitting from the parliamentary head of the military service of Canada. But I am sorry to say that occasion has been taken by the forelock and by some of our safety-first colonels in this House to spread themselves and to give the country to understand that they had special and first-hand knowledge about this thing. We never heard of them very much before and I do not blame them for taking this opportunity of making it known to the people that they did don the khaki and did go across the Atlantic, otherwise we would perhaps never have heard about them. There was no occasion to fly into a passion as they did in giving this explanation. One hon. gentleman, who sits on that side of the House and who donned the khaki and who went across the ocean just as well as the colonels who have spoken so strongly to-day, gave much more damaging information in respect to what is afflicting our young men on the other side of the water than the mere inquiry which was instituted by the hon. member for Rouville. I am sure that if any one should be subject to criticism, if any one is deserving of condemnation for making statements in connection with the evils into which our young men fall in connection with the army, it is this gentleman on the other side who is just as well informed, I presume, as any of those who have spoken to-day. He has given most startling information. But they say nothing about him, he is all right. But any hon. gentleman from this side of the House who says anything at all about any matter calling for criticism is made the subject of attack. We in this Parliament profess to be proud to follow the practices of the Mother of Parliaments in the great mother country, and if we do so in parliamentary matters I do not think we shall go far astray. What has been the course of criticism in the Mother of Parliaments since war broke out. It will not be denied that at the outbreak of the war they had in England as strong a Government as they ever had in that country. It was led by as able a man as ever occupied the high position of First Minister in Great Britain. What has happened? Criticism has practically driven that Government out of power and has forced that premier to give up the full power which he enjoyed and to enter into an alliance with the Opposition and to form a compromise coalition Government. This great leader in England was obliged to vacate

his high position at the head of the Government and the country and give way to another man. We would be safe in following the high example of the Mother of Parliaments. Therefore I submit that no man has the right to come here and censure us for any action we may take in bringing matters before the House in a public way if it be found necessary to do so. When did the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) become so opposed to publicity? He used to be a strong man on publicity. He used to be much in favour of seeing things brought to the full blaze of the light of public opinion, so far at least as the public press and Parliament could do so. I remember well, as I was here some years before that hon. member came to this House, when he published in a newspaper of his own party, possibly his own organ in the province of Manitoba, a full report of a speech that he never delivered in this House; and, what is even more extraordinary, he also published in the same newspaper the reply that Mr. Oliver made to it—which was never delivered in the House either. These were the old-time practices of my hon. friend. I am surprised that he should now turn his hose on publicity with such force and disapprove so severely of the course taken by the hon. member for Rouville in bringing this matter to the notice of the House. If the speech of the member for Rouville is published in the newspapers it will be very different from the publicity of the hon. member for Selkirk, for it will be a speech which was actually delivered in this House. My hon. friend used to be perfectly satisfied with speeches which he himself wrote down and sent to the press. He also took the extraordinary course of making and publishing the other fellow's speech as well.

Mr. GRAHAM: Bilingualism.

Mr. McKENZIE: My hon. friend says, bilingualism. It was duplicity of a kind that I cannot fathom. We were told by hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly by that preacher of righteousness, the Minister of Finance, that it was scandalous, shameful, preposterous, cowardly; it was had in all the adjectives that Webster, Worcester, or Walker could produce, that this matter should be brought to the attention of the House. This is a new gospel. We are told that we scandalize people if we point out their sins; if we indicate the way that they should follow; if we suggest that no matter how excellent they may be, they may get into difficulties. If we do these things, we are an anathema in the view of hon. gentlemen supporting the Government. The preacher who stands in the pulpit and advises the ungodly man to forsake his ways and to return unto the Lord, is, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, insulting and scandalizing his people. He is accusing them of being traitors and cowards if he points out to them the way in which they ought to go and urges them to avoid every appearance of evil. According to the doctrine of hon. gentlemen opposite, preachers must now be informed that they should no longer advise their people to seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness and that then all other things shall be added unto them. If they preach any such gospel, our friends on the other side, led by the Minister of Finance, will say that they are cowards and that they are insulting the intelligence of the people. The truth will always bear the light, and we should always bring forward such things as are conducive to enlightenment and to the best interests of the people. In the mother country there was not one iota of restraint upon the members of Parliament; they always pointed out what they thought was wrong and directed the Government into the path of duty. Neither Parliament nor press hesitated to discuss these things. I submit, therefore, that it was altogether unnecessary for hon. gentlemen opposite to fly into a passion because, forsooth, the member for Rouville took notice of this newspaper article and brought it to the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite who have responsibilities in that connection. Hon. gentlemen cannot escape responsibility for the wet canteen, if it is a bad thing. It is of no use to say that the 3,000 miles of the Atlantic deprive us of jurisdiction over those whom we send across the water. We have jurisdiction over there in the person of a minister of the Crown representing this Government, who has full sway over military men while they are in our own camps. If it is a good thing that we should have a dry canteen in Canada—and I am in favour of it—why should we not have a dry canteen on the other side? The Government and the Militia Department who have full control and management of the camps while our units are there cannot take shelter under the fact that some colonel over there took the responsibility of breaking away from the rules and of making a new

departure. A strong Government would not have permitted this, and I am sorry to say that we have not a Government that is strong enough to go up against even a single-handed colonel, bring him to task and show him that we in Canada know what is good for our men. If it was good for our men to have a dry canteen in Canada, it is good for them to have it on the other side of the Atlantic. If our boys have been injured in any way by the wet canteen, if there is any truth in the article which has been read, the responsibility is brought home to the Government, and they cannot get away from it by endeavouring to switch it onto somebody else. If they do not exercise their authority to deal with this matter the people will hold them responsible. The member for Rouville would be responsible if he had not brought this matter to the notice of the Government. It is for us to appeal to the Government and to ask them to do what their majority in this House enables them to do. If they fail in their duty we shall, like Paul of old, appeal to Cæsar, and to Cæsar we shall go, and the people of this country will see to it that there is in power a government which will look after the virtue and honour of the young men of Canada. We would be false to our trust and to our duty if we had not in proper manner brought the subject matter of this article to the attention of the Government.

We were challenged to show that there were any bad effects from the wet canteen. The hon. member for Selkirk put forth a very lame argument, the defects in which can be very easily demonstrated by a domestic illustration. Suppose a good wife should say: "My husband is a drunkard, and I bring liquor home to him because I prefer that he drink in his own house rather than get drunk down town." That, you say, would be poor temperance and poor preaching; yet that is in substance the argument put forward by the member for Selkirk. He said: "I was bringing liquor to them; I was enabling them to have some sort of liquor. If they wanted to get drunk it was better for them to get it within the lines than to go outside for it." I think the proper procedure is to make the obtaining of liquor as difficult as possible for the young men of Canada. If ale, porter and such drinks are obtainable within the lines these are merely kindling-wood to the appetites of the young men. They will get the hard liquor if it is to be got at all, whereas if their appetites had not been kindled in this way they would no doubt

have had the strength and will and purpose to keep clear of it altogether. The Government should take no credit for a dry canteen in Canada unless they apply the principle across the water, where so many of our young men are to-day. This is the place of authority; this is the place where laws are made; this is the Parliament which has control over our military matters. If there is anything to be rectified this is the place to do it. This is the place where the people congregate; we are here representing the whole of Canada; the congregations of the people are here; the power rests in this House, and you, Sir, being the spokesman between us and the King, are supposed to carry our complaints to the foot of the Throne. We have no other place to which to go, and if we are going to be shut off from this avenue of publicity and bringing to light that which is wrong, and to be deprived of the power to rectify that which is wrong, and of doing for our young men either at home or abroad all that is necessary to be done and all that this Parliament can do, we are taking a backward step; we are putting back the hands of the clock and going to the old days when two or three plutocrats in this country and other countries ruled the roost, and the poor people had nothing to say either through their representatives or otherwise. The hon. member for Rouville was perfectly justified in bringing this matter before the House, and in the mild manner in which he framed the resolution and the mild and characteristic manner in which he spoke on it, there was no justification whatever for the outburst of hon. gentlemen who took occasion to tell the world their vast knowledge in connection with those things, and as I have said before, to tell us all that they, forsooth, had to cross the Atlantic. When I was listening this afternoon to those speeches from those distinguished military men, telling us so often what they did on the other side, my mind reverted to the old school boy story of the boy who was making a picture of a horse on his slate on his desk in the school, and when he was through he had to write under the picture "This is a horse" or nobody in the world would have supposed it was a horse. Such is the case of those "safety-first" heroes. Nobody would have thought they had been anywhere within the smell of powder except for the opportunity my hon. friend from Rouville gave them to-day of spreading themselves before the House and getting that glory for which they so eagerly sought.

I could not say less in view of the onslaught made not only upon the hon. member for Rouville but on the principle upon which he was acting and upon the rule which he invoked in bringing this matter to the notice of the people through the instrumentality of you, Sir, and this Parliament. I fully approve the course which he has taken, and if there be any truth in the statements that we have heard, these matters should be looked into and put right. We were challenged by some hon. members to produce any evidence of ill-effects of wet canteens. I have the evidence of an officer belonging to my province who was in training camps in Nova Scotia and in training camps in England. In Nova Scotia he was in a training camp with a dry canteen; in England he was in a training camp with a wet canteen, and he had the same boys under him in both places. In Nova Scotia, they used to go out on long marches fully accoutred, the same as they were marching to the front, and nobody fell by the wayside, every one being capable of completing the march and returning to camp in first-class condition. The same boys went across to the Old Country under the same officers, and when they went on long marches there, travelling perhaps over easier roads than they were accustomed to travel over in Nova Scotia, dozens of them fell by the wayside because they could not complete the march which they could do with ease in this country, for the simple reason that they were indulging freely in this miserable beer. If I had no other reason for saying that a wet canteen is a drawback to the young man who indulges in it, I should certainly insist that no person is better at any time than when he is in his own senses, with the machinery of his brain, body, muscles, brawn and everything that makes up the man in the normal condition. That is the proper condition for a man to be in, not stimulated with false courage and strength by drinking miserable beer that he may be used to take under the circumstances of the wet canteen. I do not care whether you call it "wet canteen" or anything else, I say that the boys should not be drinking alcohol; they should be getting plenty of healthful food, a good place to sleep in, good clothing and all the suitable circumstances that they can get. Then they will be able to fight every time, and they will not require any stimulant. The Scotchman of Nova Scotia, of Ontario, the Irishman or Frenchman of Canada do not need alcohol to stimulate them to fight; they will fight without it in the future as they have done in the past. Let us strike out of their path any miserable obstacle that will lessen their courage, their virtue and their standing as men worthy of the Canadian soil.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly that the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) has introduced here to-day a discussion that can serve no useful purpose, and I feel satisfied, when the news goes abroad throughout Canada to-morrow, as it undoubtedly will, that notwithstanding the time of stress in which we are living, when minutes mean so much, the House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada has devoted a whole day to the discussion of a subject on the strength of an article of doubtful quality that appears in a newspaper, many of the friends of the youths who are to-day fighting the battles of the Empire will suffer untold anxieties and alarm with regard to those who are near and dear to them. We have listened to the speech of the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), who has not advanced any arguments to sustain the newspaper article which has been read here this afternoon, but who has endeavoured to justify the attitude of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House who have spoken on this question. We heard from the lips of the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) the statement that the whole question was whether there should be a dry canteen or a wet canteen, and that we were justified in discussing that question. Yet, the leader of the Opposition, the hon. gentleman who has moved the motion and those who have supported him, have taken no stand in regard to what the hon. member for West Lambton has said, that the question before the House is whether there should be a dry canteen or a wet canteen; they do not commit themselves either one way or the other upon that question. I must, therefore, ask myself what object they have in view in introducing this question into this House at this particular time? We are living in one of the most critical, most strenuous ages that have ever confronted the people of this world, when the people of the British Empire are bending every sinew, exerting every energy to win in the greatest conflict that has ever engaged the attention of man. We have sent overseas many thousands of the flower of the manhood of Canada—we have not sent them;

they have gone voluntarily. Hon. members will remember that a large proportion of the First Contingent consisted of men who were born and who grew up in the old land, men who had been in this country for only a few years. Yet hon. gentlemen in this House insult the Government of the British Empire, the Government that are endeavouring, aye, that have made good progress, towards winning this war for civilization, for liberty and for mankind. They are the people that you are condemning by your action to-day.

It is not the Government of Canada but the Government of the British Empire that you are condemning, and as I said before this discussion cannot possibly serve any useful purpose; indeed, I believe it will do a great injury to the cause that we all ought to have so much at heart. Some of us know intimately many of the young men who went over with the first contingent, and day after day we have followed their fortunes with the utmost interest, and when we have it from the lips of these men themselves that there is not the danger that has been suggested here today, I would ask the members of this House what can be the object of a man of the prominence of the hon. member from Rouville, a man who occupied a prominent position in the late government, in introducing a question in this House about the authenticity of which he himself is not satisfied, his information being derived from a mere newspaper article. The hon. member from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) holds the paper up and says it was no doubt the glaring headlines that induced the hon. member to bring this matter before the House. The hon. member for Rouville is not a youth in politics; he understands the meaning of words, and I again say what I have said before, that I believe many of the statements that have been made and published by the leaders of the Liberal party and by the Liberal press have done much to retard recruiting in Canada. I believe that when the discussion that has taken place here to-day is spread broadcast throughout the country, recruiting in Canada will be injured once more. In view of the statements that have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite and by one hon. member on this side of the House, the hon. member from Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), I think we should be doing a good act if we agreed to expunge from the records of this House the whole discussion on this miserable question that has taken place this afternoon. We are

living in a strenuous age, an age calling on each of us to do his utmost; and yet, can any man who has listened to this discussion conceal from himself the fact that some members of this House have endeavoured to make political capital out of this miserable question? I am not here to make any apology for the men at the front. They need no apology from anyone in this House; they need no advice from any member of this House. They are able to take care of themselves, and able to advise us. When you think of what they have accomplished, can you have any doubt in your mind as to their being physically fit and able to cope with the pick of the enemy troops? When you think of the battles of Ypres, and of the capture of Vimy Ridge only a few days ago, everyone must realize that there cannot be the danger that has been implied here this afternoon.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have criticised hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who have raised battalions in this country and have taken them overseas. They have sneered at these patriotic men, who had the interests of their country at heart, and who would have liked to go to the front. These are the men who know what conditions are in England. I am not here to deprecate the value of the great work that has been done by the British Government. Our Allies are looking to the British Empire for every possible assistance. The British Government has been the backbone of the Allies, the brawn and sinew throughout the whole conflict, and do you mean to tell me that we, sitting here thousands of miles from the scene of conflict, are in a position to criticise the British Government for lack of attention to their duties in respect of the fitness of the men they are sending to the front? Are these men crazy, are they fools, to allow men to be sent overseas unfit, when they are trying to raise men by every possible means? I can trust the British Government in this matter, a Government that has raised an army of nearly six million fighting men, and I am not going to sit in my seat and listen to hon. gentlemen opposite censuring the very best men the Empire can produce, men who are devoting every ounce of energy they possess towards winning the war. Nor would I be justified in sitting in my place and listening to hon. gentlemen opposite treating these subjects in a jocular way, and advancing arguments that are not pertinent to the question without raising a protest. Hon. gentlemen opposite know that this Gov-

ernment has absolutely nothing to do with these matters, and in view of the discussion here this afternoon I believe the people of Canada can come to no other conclusion than that the burdens of state rest very lightly upon some hon. members of this House when a whole day can be devoted to an aimless discussion that can serve no useful purpose, and which I am sure the hon. member from Rouville now regrets that he ever introduced into this House. As I said before, I think we should expunge from the records the statements made not only by the hon. member for Rouville, but by the hon. member from Peterborough. They have made statements that are not justifiable, have slandered the men who are fighting our battles for us, men who realize their responsibilities better than hon. members sitting comfortably in this House. Some of those men have been in the thick of the fray for nearly three years, and thousands and, I am afraid, tens of thousands of them will never return to Canada The blood of those men that have fallen on the fields of France and Flanders is crying out to us to see that this fight is carried to a successful conclusion; and do you mean to tell me that a discussion of this nature is going to assist one iota in winning the war? It is much to our discredit that this question has been brought before the House and our time wasted, when there are so many other questions of importance demanding our attention.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): I desire to say a few words before this question is withdrawn, chiefly to endorse the opinion expressed by my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark), that it was extremely unwise to bring this matter before the House. This discussion, which was introduced by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), and has taken up the whole day, is based upon evidence so weak that not one of us would throw at it a dead cat with reputable antecedents. What is the basis of it? A letter said to have been written by somebody called Goforth. I understood the hon. member for Rouville to say he did not know anything about this Mr. Goforth, and I have not heard a single gentleman who has spoken in this debate say that he knew anything about him. Even the Financial Post, which publishes his letter does not pretend to say that it knows anything about Mr. Goforth. So, we have had a discussioin here spreading over the whole day based upon the evidence of somebody we know nothing about. It is said by hon. gentlemen opposite that this is a question between the dry and the wet canteen.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear! That is the whole question.

Mr. CROTHERS: I submit that this is not the whole question; it is not the question at all as set forth in the letter upon which this discussion is based. Mr. Goforth does not seem to have signed his letter or to have dated it, nor is there any statement as to where it was written or when except that one hon. gentleman said it was written three years ago, but nobody has attempted to either substantiate or disprove that. The letter itself, however, does not pretend to be a declaration in favour of the dry canteen against the wet canteen. If hon. gentlemen opposite ever find time to read the whole letter—it spreads over five columns—they will find that it is devoted to two things particularly: First, a general lecture in favour of the prohibition of the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors in Great Britain, France and Canada; and, second, promiscuous charges, with no names given, against the officers, non-commissioned officers and men of our overseas forces. It seems to me that this is a very unfair statement to send out to the country. It is defamatory of every one of the hundreds of thousands belonging to our expeditionary forces. Why? Because it defames them generally, and, as nobody's name is given it is applicable to the whole force. This man Goforth, whoever he is—and nobody seems to know anything about him—

Mr. REID: Except the hon. member for Rouville.

Mr. CROTHERS: I understand that hon. gentleman to say that even he does not know anything about him.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crothers) know the standing of the Financial Post?

Mr. CROTHERS: I heard of it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does the hon. gentleman think the Financial Post defames our soldiers?

Mr. CROTHERS: I say that the Post itself does not pretend to set forth facts as a basis for its criticism—not a fact. And this man Goforth, instead of advocating the dry canteen, rather argues in favour of the wet canteen, as will be seen by those

who read his letter. His contention is that intoxicating liquor will find its way to the military camps until the manufacture, importation and sale of it is prohibited. Speaking of Valcartier Camp, he said:

Every one who is in a position to know knew that as long as there was liquor for sale in the City of Quebec, in the Province of Quebec, or the Dominion of Canada, too much of that liquor would find its way into Valcartier Camp. Nearly every night there was drinking in the tents around us—

This was in Valcartier with its dry canteen.

—and the following extracts from my diary speak for themselves.

Mr. GRAHAM: That could not have been written three years ago.

Mr. CROTHERS: This diary is dated 13th September, 1914, and that is nearly three years ago.

Mr. GRAHAM: But the letter must have been written after that.

Mr. CROTHERS: But the subject here is Valcartier Camp in 1914. Here are some of the extracts from the diary:

Friday, September 13. Our tent pulled down by men returning drunk from Quebec. Lantern smashed; liberal dose of kerosene in the bread bag. R. B. staggering drunk, turned somersault on the tent when it was down.

This in a dry canteen.

Tuesday, September 22. Tent ahead of us pulled down at midnight in the rain. Drunken brawl. In morning I counted outside the tent, seven empty gin bottles, four brandy flasks, one whiskey bottle and one Jamaica rum.

All in a dry canteen. The hon. member for Rouville said that the whole question is whether there shall be a wet or a dry canteen, but here is this man's own description of a dry canteen.

Mr. TURRIFF: What would a wet one be?

Mr. CROTHERS: One at a time, please. This writer goes on to show that, notwithstanding the dry canteen, if you allow the manufacture, importation and sale of liquor anywhere in the Dominion, it will not make much difference, for the men will get it if they want it. In the third column of the letter there is something also bearing out what I said as to his argument being in favour of total prohibition and not in favour of a dry canteen, his argument being that if liquor is manufactured nothing will prevent the soldier getting it if he wants it. He says:

[Mr. Crothers.]

Liquor in the army is bound up with the question of liquor in the nation. We cannot give up one and keep the other. As long as the manufacture and sale of liquor as a beverage remains unprohibited in Canada, Great Britain or France, so long will our armies be hampered in their struggle.

As in the army so in the nation, all attempts at "control" short of total prohibition are exasperating failures.

Dry canteens and all the rest of them.

The damage to war work caused by drunken civilians—

He does not confine his criticisms to drunken soldiers.

—will never be estimated, and who will say that all the guilt must be borne by the drunkard, not by the brewer and the distiller. The problem of compensation will be ready for discussion when the brewers and distillers come forward with a reasonable proposal of compensation by them for the criminal waste—

Then he goes on to discuss the problem of compensation. The argument of this writer, whoever he is, is not directed especially against the wet canteen, but is directed especially against the manufacture of liquor; and he says in substance and gives as evidence the conditions at Valcartier, that if it is manufactured and sold outside you will have the army drinking whiskey.

Life will not be safe, women and children will not be safe as long as we give the liquor traffic a free hand to turn madmen loose on society.

I might read a whole column, it is a temperance lecture of the old kind in favour of the prohibition of the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors.

The way this matter has been brought before the House, intentionally or otherwise, reflects upon the character of every officer, non-commissioned officer and man who has gone across the ocean to fight for the liberties of this country and is defamatory of every single one of them because the charges are made in a general way and applicable to every one; insulting to our soldiers, insulting to the men who are risking their lives for us, and many have sacrificed their lives and others will do so while still others will come back crippled for life. And yet the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), on the strength of a letter like that, written by a man about whom he knows nothing, for the Financial Post does not pretend to know anything about him.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Are you sure of that?

Mr. CROTHERS: It does not say so.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Have you read the editorial comment?

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes, I read the whole thing; I did not stop at part of it as my hon. friend did. As I say, we have no evidence whatever as to who this man is, where he is from or what reliance is to be placed on his statements. I understood it to be said to-day that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) desired to get some information touching this matter and went to the Minister of Militia quietly to ask him as to conditions across the sea. That, I submit, was a proper course to take. I understood that the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) was requested to allow this motion to stand until the questions asked the Minister of Militia by my hon. friend from Pictou should be answered. If these questions were answered and answered satisfactorily there would have been no necessity to bring this matter up here or anywhere else. It does not appear why the hon. member for Rouville did not wait instead of exposing every member of our expeditionary force to the insults that have been hurled against every one of them here this afternoon. These are men who are sacrificing their lives for this country. It is not fair treatment of our boys at the front. In addition to what I have already said we have had the evidence here this afternoon of three or four hon. members of this House who have been on the ground and who know what the conditions are with respect to these particular charges. Not only that, but we have men commanding our men in France; we have men training our men in England, men who are on the ground. Does any one suppose that General Byng has no regard for the character or welfare of our young men over there? He is on the ground. He knows the conditions. I have confidence in General Byng and the Canadian officers with him. Does any one believe for a moment that if conditions existed such as this man Goforth, wherever he comes from, said existed they would be permitted by these officers to continue? Does anyone for one moment believe that the gentlemen who represent the Government of Canada in England have no regard for the welfare of our young men over there? They have just as much regard for their welfare as any hon. gentleman on the other side of the
9 p.m. House or on this side of the House. I have confidence in those men who are on the ground. I think we can safely leave the matter to them, although there is no objection to inquiring into it quietly. I submit that the hon. member for Rouville would have discharged his duties as an hon. member of this House better in the interests of this country and in fair play to the soldiers of this country if he had gone privately to the Minister of Militia and said: Here is a fellow called Goforth, I do not know where he comes from, who says something here in the shape of a letter which is not signed by him, which has no date, which I find in the Financial Post. There are some grave charges made in this letter. Can you tell me whether these conditions exist in England or not? If you cannot, will you be kind enough to ascertain by cable from somebody in England in whom you have confidence, who can tell you? Then he could wait a day or two until there was an opportunity to receive an answer, and if the answer was satisfactory he would have spared the relatives of these boys who are at the front from feeling that their sons and husbands and brothers have been insulted and defamed by several members of the Opposition in this House.

Mr. F. B. McCURDY (Parliamentary Secretary of the Department of Militia and Defence): Mr. Speaker, I think I am within the judgment of the House when I say that there were two definite statements made by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). I was not able to apprehend which of those two statements was put forward by the hon. member himself and which was given currency by him, although originating in the letter of Mr. Goforth, portions of which he read to the House. But the two definite statements which I noticed were, first, that there existed at the present time a wet canteen in Canada, and, second, that a change with regard to the operation of the canteens overseas had been made since the present Minister of Militia assumed the duties of that office. Statements have been made during this debate which have abundantly proven the falsity of both these statements, so I shall not dwell further on those points.

The letter read by the hon. member for Rouville shows distinctly that in Canada, where there is a dry canteen, conditions were totally unsatisfactory. If Mr. Goforth's letter meant anything at all it meant that in Canada, under the operation of the dry canteen, conditions existed which were unsatisfactory. My hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) referred to

vague reports which he had from officers—he was very indistinct in referring to his authority for these reports. He suggested that officers had told him so and so? Now, on the other hand the House listened this afternoon, not to vague or indistinct alleged reports from undisclosed officers, but to the testimony of officers, members of this House, who after having done good work in recruiting and assisting in the raising of a force, have gone overseas, seen the conditions which existed on the other side, and have come back and given us first hand their stories. The story of each one tallies with the story of the other. Whatever the conditions may have been three years ago, when Mr. Goforth wrote his letter, they are, at the present time, according to this firsthand evidence, highly satisfactory.

In passing, perhaps it is not out of place to refer to the force about which Mr. Goforth wrote. The prestige which is enjoyed by Canadians and Canadian troops on the other side at the present time was established by this same force of whom he wrote. When the test came at Ypres, Givenchy, Langemarck and Festubert, they were not found wanting. Whether the stories which have been detailed through the medium of the letter published in the Post, and read by the hon. member for Rouville this afternoon, are credited or not, the fact remains that when it came to the test for which these boys went overseas, they made good and established a reputation for tenacity and gallantry which resounds throughout the whole world.

The question of the liquor problem has been, and continues to be, difficult. At the best, it cannot be easily and satisfactorily settled. You have heard, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, evidence given by returned officers who have observed conditions on the other side. When in England in January, in conversation with a Canadian officer, who occupies one of the highest positions in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and an officer who has without exception the confidence of the whole Canadian force and, I believe of all the people of this country, stated that he had seen the dry canteen in operation in England and he had seen the wet canteen in operation. He had seen both tried out and it was his opinion that the troops were better off with the system of the wet canteen under which beer is sold to the troops than they were under the dry canteen. I am not myself qualified to express an opinion, but he is eminently qualified and that is his opinion. You are aware Mr. Speaker, and the House is probably aware, that conditions in the Old Country and Canada are entirely different in regard to the liquor traffic. The issue of licenses and the control of this traffic are under the civil authorities in England. In the vicinity of, and closely adjoining the camps occupied by the Canadian troops in England, are numerous public houses. If the civil authorities in England were prepared to do as the civil authorities in some of the provinces of Canada have done, that is to deal with the liquor problem in the same way that some of the provinces deal with it and abolish the sale of spirits, we would have a different condition to meet entirely. But what do you have? Immediately adjoining the camp areas, where troops are quartered and in training, you have public houses in large numbers. It is open to the boys, the moment they are off duty, to go to these public houses, they have gone to them and the experience of the most respected military authorities overseas, who have the confidence of the troops and of the people of this country, is that under the conditions as they exist in England the best results are obtained by operating a canteen such as is operated by our forces on the other side. It is better, they say, for the boys to have access to beer within the camp than that they should have recourse to public houses where strong spirits are sold. This canteen is not, as one might infer from some of the statements made this afternoon, operated without restrictions. On the contrary, it is operated under regulations which make such occurrences as those referred to in the letter read by the hon. member for Rouville most unusual and extraordinary.

I would hesitate to make a suggestion to an old parliamentarian as is my hon. friend from Rouville but I would draw his attention to the fact that he has received advice this afternoon from colleagues sitting on his own side of the House who questioned whether he was altogether wise in bringing this matter up in the form in which he has brought it up. I would further remind him that there are other members sitting on that side of the House who, when they had any suggestion to offer in the interest of the troops or for the improvement of methods, would forward that suggestion to the Minister of Militia. Such suggestions, I can assure him, are always welcome.

Whenever anything is apparently wrong in connection with the forces, I am certain that any suggestions which may be privately made to the Minister of Militia will be gladly received. I will content myself with that remark. I am not questioning the right of my hon. friend from Rouville to bring this matter up in the House. I believe we have all our opinions and some very strong opinions have been expressed this afternoon, but I am not going to express any opinion in that regard. But I would make this suggestion that in case there are operations which might be improved, possibly the advice which he and other hon. gentlemen on that side of the House have received this afternoon from a clear headed member of their own party may be worthy of the consideration of my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux).

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (South Renfrew): Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here working at my memory and trying to ascertain if there is any subject under the sun in the way of criticism that we in this House could bring up that the other side would not object to. Of all the foolish—no, I must not say that—of all the peculiar utterances to which I have ever listened in this House, I think the most peculiar is that which harks back whenever any matter is mentioned to questioning the loyalty or wisdom of members on this side of the House. Well, to put it shortly, I am getting heartily tired of being a member of Parliament and being met with that kind of an argument every time anything of importance is suggested. The member for Rouville brought up a question which, even if you treat it as lightly as did the Minister of Labour, is one that touches the domesticity of almost every family in Canada. I was astounded at the Minister of Labour.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Not I.

Mr. GRAHAM: He edited a letter which he was reading, and if anything could be deduced from his editorial additions, it was that he did not believe in a dry canteen; that men would get liquor any way so long as it was manufactured. No, times have changed in Canada since this war began. The old argument that prohibition did not prohibit has been used all over the country, but the fact remains that nearly all Canada believes that prohibition does greatly restrict the sale and consumption of liquor. I believe that at least 90 per cent of the members of this House hold the same opinion. If that be true, is it wrong for men in this House whose sons are under the colours to say something about this matter? One would think, to hear the Minister of Labour talk, that we were in Russia before the revolution. Does he not know that every government of the Allies except the Canadian Government has either turned itself inside out or been turned inside out by some other power since the war began, on account of criticism offered by serious men who had the interests of their country at heart just as much as those to whom their criticism was directed? The soldiers at the front are intelligent and are not to be fooled by such talk as the Minister of Labour indulged in to-day. They are sons of men in this House; they are sons of Canadian families, and any discussion regarding them should be entered into from an intelligent standpoint, not by a silly appeal to those who are fighting for us while we are at home. They understand just what a man means, no matter what he says, whether in this House or elsewhere. To bolster up the idea that the men would get whisky whether there was a dry canteen or not, the Minister of Labour related some very peculiar conditions that existed at Valcartier.

Mr. CROTHERS: My hon. friend is misrepresenting me entirely; I did not argue for a wet canteen or a dry canteen or prohibition. I was simply setting forth what Goforth argued, and Goforth is at the bottom of this discussion.

Mr GRAHAM: As I remarked when the minister was out, he edited the letter as he went through it. I explained that one could make no other deduction from his editorial comment than that he believed that the soldiers would get whisky whether there was a dry canteen or a wet canteen.

Mr. CROTHERS: That is what Goforth said.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend edited Goforth.

Mr. CROTHERS: Oh, no.

Mr. LEMIEUX: You commented on it.

Mr. GRAHAM: All the way through. We will not argue that; Hansard will tell. Canada has moved forward during the last two or three years; where there formerly were public houses all around the camps, there

are now practically none. We have removed the temptation from the men in the Canadian camps. The ex-Minister of Militia established the principle of dry canteen—and where is he now? He is not in this Government, and I should judge from the remarks of the Minister of Labour that the Government had changed its mind on this dry canteen question. For my part, whether the Canadian Government or any other Government has control, I am absolutely in favour of the principle that there should be no wet canteen in the camps where our boys are located.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is the whole question.

Mr. GRAHAM: I want to differentiate; no one can accuse me of being an extremist. I have no sympathy with the idea entertained by some good-thinking people that we should not give our boys at the front cigarettes and that kind of thing. I am in favour of letting the men have anything that will comfort them without injuring them. But it cannot be for the benefit of our men in the training camps—I am applying my remarks solely to the training camps—that they should have wet canteens. The member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. McCurdy) pointed out a condition in England that did not exist here. It did exist here, until a few months ago, at Camp Niagara, Borden Camp, Toronto, London, Brockville, Ottawa—the very conditions that he outlined as now existing in England. Nothwithstanding that, the Government of which he is a near member, established the principle of a dry canteen. If that principle be right so far as the training camps in Canada are concerned —and the Government is committed to the principle—surely it would not be wrong to ask that the same principle be adopted and carried out when our boys go overseas.

As to the men in the firing line, some hon. gentlemen opposite have endeavoured to draw a red herring across the trail. No one is discussing what is done in the trenches. If the experienced officers in charge of the men on the firing line believe that under trying circumstances—the seriousness of which not a man in this House save one, perhaps, thoroughly understands—a certain ration each day or at certain periods should be given to the men, I am not going to say that they are wrong. What I wish to emphasize as my position, however, without desiring to embarrass any one, is this: the Government of Canada, having established the principle of dry canteens in this country, ought not to depart from that principle when our boys go overseas, so long as they are in the training camps. It is idle to say to those of us who live in provinces which have adopted prohibitive legislation that as much liquor is consumed under a dry canteen system as is consumed with the wet canteen. The greater the number of obstacles thrown in the way of getting liquor, the smaller the consumption will be. I care not whether it is by the authority of the British Government or by the authority of any other Government, this Government is responsible for the welfare of our boys wherever they have control. And in saying this I mean not only the Government, but Parliament. Having made myself clear, let me suggest one other thing.

To this Parliament has been entrusted, for five years by the people and for one year by ourselves, the duty of looking after the affairs of Canada whether she be in peace or in war. We cannot escape that responsibility, and we ought to accept the responsibility of discussing these things with each other in a fair way, because it makes no difference whether a man sits on that side or on this side of the House, we are all equally interested, in more ways than one, and we should not fly at each other's heads the minute there is a difference of opinion about these things. I will not quietly allow any member on either side of the House to question my right to discuss the conditions of our Canadian troops either here or in the Motherland. With all due deference to the stirring appeal of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers), I believe our boys at the front look to this Parliament as their guardian (not to any one set of men in it), and any man who hesitates to assume that responsibility, no matter what the criticism, is not performing his full duty. I do not look upon the position of the House of Commons, no matter upon which side we sit, as one that demands silence on these things. If we were all to sit silent, we would soon ascertain that our boys at the front condemned us, believing we were not doing our full duty to them, and no matter what the criticism may be, I believe every member in this House ought to take the situation seriously, and we ought to feel a freedom, particularly in this time of stress through which we are passing, perhaps greater than we ever did before, in pointing out where we can where things may be remedied and efficiency become more efficient. What is Parliament for? Is it for the Government to come in and say: You

must do this and you must do that, and everybody quietly acquiesce? In that case, we might as well all stay at home. Why have a Parliament at all? This is the forum of the people, and if there be any portion of the people of Canada that need protection, need care, need looking after, that portion of the people is to be found in the training camps of the Old Country or fighting for us in France. Surely we are looking at this thing from the wrong angle; we ought to be united as one man in seeing that the very best that can be done for our soldiers at the front is done, and no matter what the views of a man, honestly expressed, may be, the Parliament of Canada is the place in which to express those views.

In conclusion, I want to say again that I am in favour of pursuing this course so long as Canada has control in regard to the canteens, no matter where our boys may be. When they leave the training camps to go into the firing line, I do not intend to set up my opinions against that of those of long experience, but I do say this, that because a man lives in London or elsewhere, he is not a bit better qualified to judge of whether there should be a dry canteen or a wet canteen for the Canadians than we are in this Parliament, and we have said once for all that we are in favour of dry canteens. I am in favour of dry canteens for our boys, no matter whether they be in Canada or in the training camps in the Old Country.

Hon. Mr. ALBERT SEVIGNY (Translation): I followed with close attention the speeches delivered in the course of the debate on this resolution. I have come to the conclusion that far too much significance has been given Mr. Goforth's criticism as expressed in his letter published in the Financial Post. I came across many officers and soldiers who had returned from the front and they were unanimous in the statement that discipline in the camps left nothing to be desired and that they had no trouble whatever from intemperance. The officers stated that in England and France, beer could be had at the canteen after drill hours, and there is not a man in this House who could find fault with the military authorities for allowing our soldiers to partake of such light refreshments after hours of hard training, just as the French soldier is allowed his glass of wine.

I have just said that we are making too much of Mr. Goforth's letter; the same is true of many other documents that find their way in the public press of this country. This very afternoon we have had another instance. At the opening of the House, our attention was drawn to a newspaper item alleging that soldiers who cross the province of Quebec are subjected to insults as they march through Montreal, Quebec or Rivière-du-Loup. Whoever is in touch with the prevailing sentiment in the province of Quebec cannot but realize how much it is below the dignity of the House of Commons of Canada to take notice of such abuse, which is launched through the medium of the press by irresponsible parties and is a mere concoction of slanderous untruths. I am quite aware, Mr. Speaker, that if any gentleman this afternoon had moved the adjournment of the House in order to call attention to a statement appearing in a newspaper edited in the province of Ontario suggesting that soldiers had been insulted in the province of Quebec, all my colleagues from our province, standing up in their indignation, would have replied before the House and before the country: "It is injudicious for us to take so much stock in a letter published in Ontario or elsewhere on happenings in the province of Quebec." I take this opportunity of asserting that the criticisms appearing in certain newspapers concerning events alleged to have happened in the province of Quebec are absolutely groundless. Canadian soldiers leaving for the front, from whatever part of the country they hail, are cheered and congratulated as they march through our cities along our country roads. Some are prone to criticise because in the City of Quebec for instance, the people are not continually displaying their feelings in outward manifestations. If to-day we are less demonstrative, the reason comes not from our lack of interest in the war, but from a peculiarity of human nature. Mr. Speaker, the City of Quebec, since the month of August 1914, has seen thousands and thousands of soldiers marching past; thirty thousand filed through its gates on their way to Valcartier and later other regiments, going to other camps. So, if the people of the City of Quebec are not on every occasion turning out to give public ovations to our boys parading through the street, does it mean that they are insensible to the sacrifices made by our soldiers? No indeed, Mr. Speaker; heretofore the province of Quebec has been all soul in the war like the rest of the country, and no matter to what extent French Canadians may be belittled in other provinces, they understand their duty and will perform it to the end, and never will they be wanting in admiration not only for our boys from

the province of Quebec, but for every Canadian soldier from any part of the Dominion.

Should we have been justified, Mr. Speaker, to take six hours of the time of this House to discuss the accusations contained in the letter read to us early in the day? Certainly not. And I say we are not justified in spending six hours over what Mr. Goforth may have thought fit to say in his letter. I heard the minister of Labor (Mr. Crothers) giving Mr. Goforth's account of what took place at Valcartier. I was in the City of Quebec in 1914 and every day that our boys were in camp, I made it my duty to go to Valcartier, where I had friends to whom I could be of assistance. In three weeks' time thirty-three thousand men were gathered at that one point. Can it be thought possible that such a large body of men as yet unaccustomed to military discipline, may be collected from every corner of the country without some slight disorders taking place before embarking for the front? Why should those slight disagreements be magnified? Why not, instead, point to the splendid discipline of the troops at Valcartier in 1914, so much admired by all visitors to the camp? The same order prevailed last year. Why be shocked if in a very few cases insignificant breaches of discipline were noticed? Mr. Speaker, there are men right here in Ottawa, a prohibition city, as well as in Montreal and elsewhere, who are not enlisting and nevertheless have their little fling. Should we exhibit unflinching severity on account of an occasional infringement of the law by some soldier? I know the members of this House are too broad-minded for such petty criticism.

Hon. gentlemen who have been to the front and have spoken on this question, called attention to the admirable behaviour of all our boys. We all agree that they are well disciplined and made heroes of themselves on the battlefield. I ask whether we who stay behind, and who for the most part lack military training, have the right to say to the military authorities, to say to such a distinguished officer as general Turner, for instance,—a Liberal, by the way—who has charge of the Canadian forces in England, that he does not know what he is about and should in future forbid his men to take a glass of beer... Should we dictate to the highest military experts commanding our boys in England and on the Continent? I claim not. As for me, Mr. Speaker, so long as our soldiers, whatever be their nationality, fight as they fought at Ypres, Langemark, Festubert, Givenchy, and especially Vimy, the military heads who train men for such struggles will have my most entire confidence.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston): I do not know that I can add anything of great value to the discussion that has taken place this afternoon and evening, but I think I would be recreant to my trust, coming, as I do, from a military city, if I sat silent and allowed to pass unchallenged the remarks that have been made here to-day. I quite agree with the position taken by my hon. friend for South Renfrew (Mr. G. Graham) that this House should welcome discussion, but it should be discussion of a constructive rather than of an iconoclastic character. I doubt very much if we are justified in indulging in criticism that cannot be of much advantage, and which, under certain conditions, may be of great disadvantage to the country. I think I can appreciate the position of many women in this country who allowed their sons, their brothers and husbands to go to the front, realizing that having gone to the front these men would be subjected to great temptations, and I am not unaware of the heartaches there will be throughout Canada tomorrow when the press carries from one ocean to the other the wild statements that have been made in this House to-day in reference to the alleged excesses of troops at the front. I was at Valcartier on the Sunday when that magnificent force of 33,000 men were gathered there before proceeding overseas. I know nothing of Captain Goforth; he may be a man of character and a man of reputation, and he may be an irresponsible scribbler, but until I know the worth of the man and the facts on which his letter is founded I am not prepared to assume that the criticism he passes upon the men that I knew at Valcartier is entitled to any weight. No finer body of men were ever gathered together in Canada than the 33,000 troops I saw at Valcartier, and if they had indulged to excess in alcoholic beverages they gave no evidence of it as they marched before the Duke of Connaught that Sunday afternoon. They went over to England. We had a dry canteen in Canada. Captain Goforth says it was not a success. Those troops went from Valcartier to Salisbury Plain, and those of us who followed conditions there know that for about two weeks there was a dry canteen at Salisbury. I have never been a soldier in a military camp; I know nothing of military discipline or how soldiers should be managed, but I know men from Salisbury told me that after a short time the dry canteen was

found impracticable. Conditions in England were very different from conditions at Valcartier. At Valcartier the camp was in the country; at Salisbury it was in a thickly settled district. Places at which liquor could be got surounded the camp, and if the men could not get what they wanted at the camp it was a simple thing to go outside the camp and get it. Some men did forget themselves. The strict enforcement of the regulations on shipboard may have made some men more "dry" than they otherwise would have been, and at Salisbury excesses by some were indulged in. But there is one thing this country should never forget. If some few of the men at Salisbury indulged to excess and did not know how to live, they taught Canada that they knew how to die at the second battle of Ypres. I am not going to sit quiet in this House and hear the reputations of all these men slandered, men who in my judgment will go down in history as heroes, not as drunkards and men given to excess.

I saw something of the dry canteen in my own district, in the city of Kingston, the headquarters of the third military district. Not long after the camp was established complaints began to come in that a dry canteen was of no advantage if the men could get liquor outside after hours. The military authorities complained that, though the men were kept in until six o'clock, after that hour they went to the city and until the time when the bars closed they got what they wanted. The closing hour for the bars was then fixed at seven o'clock, but still there were complaints. An arrangement was made with the license holders that nothing should be sold to soldiers in uniform, but beer and then only for one hour. That was more satisfactory and was maintained until an end was put to the entire sale of liquor by the Prohibition Act. Now, a word as to the conditions overseas. Only a week ago I got a letter from a Canadian officer in England, who stated that he had honestly tried to carry on a dry canteen—and he was a man who did not indulge in intoxicating liquor—but found that it was impossible, that if he wanted effective discipline and a maximum of training, it was essential that he should have a wet canteen in which men could get beer, rather than have them go from the camp ground to other places in which they could get stronger liquor and more of it, and at the same time be subjected to other temptations. We should be careful not to be too ready in our criticisms and to avoid doing the men in England an injustice. Last year I saw something of the conditions at the front. I was at the front, in France, and talked to men in charge of the Colonials, and these men told me that they had no difficulty in regard to temperance, that the men were sober and well-behaved, and were doing their duty as they should. Mr. Goforth's letter does not deal with present day conditions, but with the conditions he alleges prevailed in 1914; and, even assuming that he is correct in everything he says, why should we send far and wide statements to the disadvantage of our men concerning conditions which may have been irregular but which do not now exist?

But a criticism far more damning than that in regard to intemperance has been spoken here this afternoon, and that is in regard to venereal disease. I have documents in my possession that bear on that subject, and I thought I would draw attention to one or two statements of fact. The first is made by Surgeon General G. C. Jones who, referring to Dr. Bruce's report in a letter of 2nd March, 1916, says:

> The total number of Canadian venereal patients in England is 740.

That is, on the second day of March, 1916, there were only 740 men of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces in England suffering from venereal trouble. Dr. Bruce, in his report, states that on 13th August, 1916, there were 695 venereal cases in the Shorncliffe area. I had been at Shorncliffe, and I confess it astounded me to hear it said in this House this afternoon that a great percentage of our men were suffering from venereal trouble. If Surgeon General Jones and Colonel Bruce are correct that there were fewer than eight hundred men suffering from venereal disease, then it will be seen that the statement made here this afternoon is not supported by the facts. I heard statements made at a recent meeting of the Soldiers' Aid Commission in Toronto that six hundred cases were held up for pension suffering from venereal trouble. I was amazed at that, but on inquiry I was assured by Major Todd that there was no truth in the statement, and that they had only a few cases of that character before them for consideration. I have discussed this matter with doctors in my own city and elsewhere, and they tell me that in their experience the returned soldiers are not found to be suffering from venereal disease in much larger proportion than civilians. I think the men are entitled to

have these statements made on their behalf and that we should take pains to make it plain to the country that the statements made this afternoon were not founded on a careful review of the facts.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: I certainly had no intention to delay the business of the House when I brought this question before my fellow-members. I do not regret the course I took, notwithstanding the aspersions and suggestions from the other side, and even from this side. After twenty-one years as a member of this House I know something of my public duty, and, as to loyalty, in that I yield to no one. I did not bring this question forward as suggesting an attack upon the Government, or upon the Minister of Militia and Defence. I made a very mild statement, inspired by a newspaper published in Toronto by a man who is well known to the members of this House and to the community in general, a personal friend of several of the ministers. That newspaper published the letter of Captain Goforth and commented strongly in favour of his attitude. It was my duty as a public man, it was my duty as a friend of the Canadian army in the field, to bring this matter before the House, and I have done it without questioning the bravery, the patriotism, or the fighting qualities of our soldiers. I listened to the speeches that have been delivered in this debate, including that of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers). I can understand a speech of that nature delivered in a back concession by a fifth-grade politician, but when such a speech is delivered in this House by a minister of the Crown it causes me no little surprise. The hon. minister suggested that I should not have spoken at all on this question. Let me tell him that if I had slandered and defamed soldiers I should be in good company, as I will show. But I have not slandered, I have not defamed, I have not libelled our soldiers. Were I to slander and libel them I should slander and libel my own kith and kin. Let me remind my hon. friend, in case he may repeat that address before his electors, that if he ever refers to my statement this afternoon he may tell them that in my family there is one veteran of South Africa, there is one nephew at the front, one nephew killed at Ypres, and my own son is in the army. Therefore, it is as a Canadian, as a loyal subject of His Majesty the King and as the father of a boy who will soon be at the front that I have spoken this afternoon. I dare say that of these hon. gentlemen who have delivered these loyal utterances this afternoon not one of them stated whether he was in favour of a dry or a wet canteen, and not one of them would take issue with me if he were standing before his electors. More than that, let me say that I am ready to join issue with any of the hon. gentlemen who have lectured me on loyalty and patriotism not only before this House but in any of their constituencies. I am ready to take the same attitude in front of their own electors—aye, before the Canadian soldiers themselves. I challenge any one to deny me the privilege as a Canadian to speak the language I have spoken this afternoon. The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) should know that I brought this matter before the House because I thought it was in the public interest, but he has approached the question in the way which we might expect from a gentleman of his size. Listening to him, when he was suggesting that I had defamed, slandered and libelled the Canadian soldiers, instinctively I thought of Johnson's definition of a certain loyalty and a certain patriotism.

This is not a political issue in the narrow sense. I claim that this is a national issue. It affects the welfare of our soldiers and of their families. The duty of a public man who happened to possess the information which I imparted to the House this afternoon was to focus the attention of the public on these facts in order to know whether the alleged evil exists or not. What did I say to arouse the anger of my hon. friends? I beg each of my hon. friends to read my remarks in to-morrow's Hansard. They will find that first I made the statement that the ex-Minister of Militia had wisely established a dry canteen for the Canadian soldiers. Does anybody take exception to that? I stated that having established a dry canteen, some one whom I do not know had taken it upon himself to substitute wet canteens. In that statement, happily for me, I was corroborated by the hon. ex-Minister of Militia himself (Sir Sam Hughes), who stated that he craved the honour of having established the dry canteen, but that his ex-colleague the Minister of Militia overseas, in order to insult him, had restored the wet canteen in the camps in England. I did not make the statement; the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton made it this afternoon. What did I say further, Mr. Speaker? I said that disorder was alleged to have taken place as a result of the establishment of wet canteens in the camps, and I brought

specific cases to the attention of hon. gentlemen. The Minister of Labour suggested, a few moments ago, that this letter had never been written, that it was not signed, that, indeed, it may have been a forgery. A forgery? The letter is not signed, but on the first line of the first page what do you read, Mr. Speaker?

> What the army loses through drink.
> By Capt. Paul Goforth.

And my hon. friend thinks it is an argument to state that the letter is not signed after the last line. Mr. Speaker, I stated the specific cases given in that letter by Capt. Goforth, who gives the dates, the circumstances, and the names of the camps. Are the facts true or not? Did I state that they were true? I stated that evils were alleged to exist, that they ought to be investigated, and that if, on investigation, they are found to be true, the plain duty of the Minister of Militia is to humbly request the Imperial authorities or the War Office to restore the dry canteen in the camps where our Canadian soldiers are assembled. That is the gist of the remarks I made this afternoon. Why all this anger, why these lessons in loyalty and patriotism? Is the Canadian Parliament afraid to face the issue? Is an issue or a grievance to be settled by discarding it? Either the facts are true or not. If they are not true, so much the worse for Captain Goforth. He is still at the front, and if he has libelled, slandered and defamed his fellow officers and soldiers under him, well, Mr. Speaker, I leave him to the care of his soldiers and his fellow officers. But if they are true, what of it? If the statements contained in Captain Goforth's letters are true, I ask my hon. friend the Minister of Labour will he stand by the wet canteen or will he not stand by the dry canteen?

Mr. CROTHERS: My hon. friend suggests an investigation. It occurs to me that it was his duty to do some investigating before he brought these serious charges before the House and the country. I think it was for him to get some evidence that they were true or untrue.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend ought to read the Lemieux Act enforced by his own department. He will find it on the Statute Book. There is such a thing as compulsory investigation, but I dare say that in the present instance, when statements are made in a respectable and responsible paper like the Financial Post by a friend of the Government, and when the charges of Captain Goforth are endorsed in a strong editorial, it is the duty of the Government to investigate such charges and find out

10 p.m. if they are true. Every father, every mother, every clergyman, yes, and every respectable citizen in the country will expect that much from the Government.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Who is the owner of this paper?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I think he is a namesake of yours. It is Mr. Maclean of Toronto, if I mistake not. Perhaps the Minister of Finance could tell us that.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am not sure; I do not know.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who is the proprietor of that paper?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am not certain as to that, but I think Colonel Maclean.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Colonel Maclean, a soldier, holding rank in the Canadian militia, would publish in his paper statements of the nature of a forgery, would defame and slander and libel the four hundred thousand Canadians who are serving abroad? What does my hon. frined think of that?

Mr. CROTHERS: My hon. friend has stated several times that he does not know whether these are facts or not. He admits now he does not know Mr. Goforth or the editor of the paper.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The House will surely not expect that I shall answer the interjection of my hon. friend. I say that according to Captain Goforth, who is still in the army, who therefore comes under discipline, disorders of a very serious nature have taken place and those disorders are enumerated by the Financial Post published by Colonel Maclean of Toronto, a supporter of the Government, a friend of the Minister of Finance. Mr. Speaker, if the alleged facts which I have mentioned are untrue, we have a board of censors in Canada. Why not suspend the publication of the Financial Post? If the statements by Captain Goforth, which I have quoted, are not facts, why not cashier him at once? But no, the Minister of Labour would like the member for Rouville to investigate the facts beforehand.

Mr. MACDONALD: As the minister investigated the cost of living.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The member for Huron (Mr. Lewis) spoke of his experience and stated that drunkenness in the army in England was an unpardonable sin, and that anyone guilty of drunkenness was court martialled. Exactly; and I find that Captain Goforth speaks of such a case. He says:

Soon after our arrival at Shorncliffe there was a special meeting of the officers' mess to decide whether we would go on with a "wet" mess or follow the example of Lord Kitchener and the King—

A disloyal Kitchener and a disloyal King I suppose.

Broadminded arguments about "liberty" and "moderation" won the day. Yet, within a month from that time, I had the unwelcome task—

Mr. Speaker, mark my words.

Yet, within a month from that time, I had the unwelcome task of prosecuting two of my brother officers for drunkenness before a General Court Martial, and our Regimental Sergeant-Major for the same offence before a District Court Martial. The Sergeant-Major was found guilty of drunkenness at Hythe on the line of march and was dismissed from the service. He appealed to the Privy Council, but the judgment of the court was sustained. There was a man who knew his work to perfection, who had served in the South African war, and who wore on his breast the ribbon of the long service and good conduct medal; and yet he was broken completely, and broken through nothing but drink. Why should a capable warrant officer be dismissed from the service? Why should an efficient officer be cashiered? Is it not high time that we determined to dismiss the liquor traffic from the service? Is it not the liquor traffic that should be cashiered?

That is the language of an officer in His Majesty's army, a Canadian, and yet, because I report to the House that serious state of things, I am told that I should have kept silent, that I should not have even mooted the subject before the House this afternoon. I repeat that I have done only my duty. Now I am told by the member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury), who lost his temper, that this Captain Goforth is nothing else but a crank. Well, if Captain Goforth is a crank, it is a very serious aspersion on the Minister of Militia and the military authorities generally who have sent our boys under fire commanded by a crank. That is not a certificate of very great wisdom on the part of the military authorities.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance also stated that it was a slander to mention such facts, a slander against our soldiers at the front. I do not know if he listened to my statements this afternoon, but if his accusation of slander is based on hearsay, I would tell him that the hearsay comes from warped and twisted interpretations of my statements. I simply enumerated the various statements made by Captain Goforth, and the mere stating of these allegations should not bring on my head the thunder which was brought this afternoon. As I stated a moment ago, if I have slandered the soldiers I am in good company, because in England, in the British Parliament, the mother of all Parliaments, the Prime Minister was not afraid to tackle the problem of liquor in the army. I have his very words here, delivered a few months ago. He said:

We are fighting Germany, Austria, and drink, and so far as I can see the greatest of these deadly foes is drink.

Is Lloyd George a libeller? Is he a slanderer? Is he disloyal? Surely not, since he is at the head of the present Government. If he were disloyal he would be in excellent company with Rt. Hon. Walter Long, Lord Milner, Rt. Hon. Bonar Law and all the other leaders of the Tory party in England. Mr. Speaker, no, it is the duty of a member who has the interest of his fellow citizens at heart, to bring to light facts such as I have revealed to-day. I resent more especially the remarks which were made by my friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark). I regret that he is not in his seat at the present moment. He thinks that because the Empire is at war, and because Canada is at war, we should maintain silence and not divulge abuses and weaknesses such as are set forth in the statement made by Captain Goforth. Of course, if there was no war there would be no soldiers and no camps, and if there were no camps there would be no wet canteens and therefore there would be no disorders and we would have nothing to say. But unfortunately there is war and, as I said a moment ago, it is not by ignoring a grievance which exists that you settle it. The hon. member for Red Deer claims to be and is an excellent Liberal. As a Liberal of the English school I believe that, after all, the cure for all evils is publicity. My hon. friend lectured me with regard to the soldiers fighting in the trenches. Did I speak of the trenches? The only reference I made to the trenches was when I said that the Russian Government, having sent soldiers to France, had exacted from the French military authorities an agreement that in the trenches where the

French soldiers were served wine the Russian soldiers should not receive any liquor at the hands of their Allies. My hon. friend hinted that I had spoken with some disparagement of the work done in the trenches. He spoke of Verdun and of the heroic battles in which the French soldiers were engaged. I did not need that lecture, for I know what the French soldiers have accomplished just as well as I know what the English and the Canadian soldiers have accomplished at the front. I do not begrudge the small rum ration which is served to our soldiers in the mud of the trenches. I did not speak of that: I spoke of the life of the soldiers at the camps in England. I said that it was alleged that the wet canteens at these camps had been the cause of innumerable disorders and I pleaded that the Government take action to restore the dry canteen and to make representations to the Imperial authorities to that end. If my hon. friend from Red Deer were in his seat, I would remind him that it is the essence of Liberalism to expose evils in order to free society from their effects. Describing the aim of Liberalism, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman said:

> We would endeavour to secure to every man the best conditions of living, and so far as can be done by laws and customs, to secure him also an equal chance with others of a useful and happy life.

Lord Willoughby de Broke has said:

> The essence of our policy is to give each individual the elements that will afford him an opportunity of at least living a free and a decorous existence, and the opportunity to raise himself or herself to the highest point of moral and material efficiency.

I say that it is the act of a true Liberal to ask for the suppression of intoxicants in the training camps, because liquor does not make for the moral or material efficiency of the soldier. My hon. friend, I know, has three sons at the front. I have only one who will be at the front very soon, and I would rather have my son live in a camp under respectable conditions than have him exposed to the temptations to which our soldiers are constantly subjected because of intoxicants. Mr. Speaker, I beg to withdraw the motion that I made this afternoon.

Motion of Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux for the adjournment of the House negatived.

On motion of Sir Thomas White, the House adjourned at 10.24 p.m.

Friday, April 27, 1917.

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

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill No. 40, to incorporate La Société des Artisans Canadiens Français.—Mr. Achim.

Bill No. 41, respecting The Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—Mr. J. A. Currie.

APPOINTMENT OF ULDERIC TREMBLAY.

On the motion of Sir Thomas White, the recommendation of His Honour the Speaker, laid on the table of the House on the 20th instant, respecting the appointment of Mr. Ulderic Tremblay to the Blue Book Translation Branch of the Translation Staff of the House of Commons was concurred in.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Minister of Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 42, to amend the Chinese Immigration Act.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Explain.

Mr. ROCHE: This Bill is intended to allow Chinese students to visit Canada without their being subject to the usual head tax. In the past the head tax has been imposed and collected, but has been refunded upon the students leaving Canada. In the United States they admit Chinese students without any head tax. A great many complaints have been made by and on behalf of the Chinese in this matter, and it has been decided to introduce an Act placing the Chinese students on the exempt list, along with merchants, tourists, and others of that class.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

COMPANIES AMENDMENT ACT.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 43, respecting companies.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Explain.

Mr. MACLEAN: I introduced this Bill at the suggestion of a committee of the Canadian Bar Association, by whom it was prepared. I would prefer, however, that any explanation of the measure be left in abeyance until the second reading, when the Bill will be printed. The Bill is rather lengthy, and an explanation would also be

lengthy. I trust that the House will agree to give the Bill a first reading so that it may be printed.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CANADIAN NAVAL AEROPLANE SERVICE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. J. D. REID: The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) asked me a question yesterday in reference to hydro-aeroplane service, and I promised to get the answer to-day. Mr. Desbarats, the deputy minister, has sent me the following memorandum:

> With reference to question by Mr. E. M. Macdonald, M.P., on page 838 of the Hansard of April 26, it is not at present the intention of the Naval Department to organize a hydro-aeroplane service. The department is not aware that any of these machines have been brought into Canada for the establishment of such a service.

Mr. MACDONALD: If I did not ask the minister the other day to bring down what papers there were on this subject, I should like to be understood now as asking him to do so.

Mr. REID: Of course, the answer I gave was prepared by Mr. Desbarats, whom I instructed to read the question and give me an answer which I could give to the House. I shall ask Mr. Desbarats to get the papers ready and all that can be brought down will be brought down.

INTER-IMPERIAL PREFERENCE—FRENCH TREATIES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): A cable despatch appeared in the press yesterday to the effect that at the Imperial Conference now sitting in London an agreement was reached in respect to inter-Imperial preference arrangements. I desire to inquire whether the minister has had any official notification of the same. The press also informed us that there was contemplated a somewhat summary cessation of certain treaties with France. While the minister is answering the first question, he might inform me as to the second.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: May I ask my hon. friend in what paper or papers these reports appeared?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In all the papers.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. LEMIEUX: In the Montreal Star, I think, of Monday night.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have no information respecting the matter, nor has it been brought to my attention. I shall be very glad to look at the articles in question and be prepared to give a further answer in a day or so. The matter has not been brought to my attention; therefore I should judge that there is no substantial foundation for the report.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

STATEMENT BY HON. WM. PUGSLEY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY: In a discussion which took place on April 25 in regard to the Intercolonial railway, I am reported in Hansard to have used the word "loyalty" in one or two portions of my remarks in connection with the employees. I am inclined to think that the report is accurate, but it does not convey the meaning that I had intended to convey. In other parts of my speech I used the word "efficiency." I think that the use of the word "loyalty" was doing an injustice to the employees, and I wish to substitute for it the word "efficiency." What I really intended to say was that the present system had interfered with the efficiency, not with their loyalty, of the employees.

QUEBEC-SAGUENAY RAILWAY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: Nearing the close of the last session, an Act was passed by this House in reference to the Quebec-Saguenay Railway, and under that Act a case in respect to the value of that railroad was submitted to the Exchequer Court. I understand that the judge of the Exchequer Court has filed a decision which should be interesting to the members of this House in view of the fact that a further investigation in connection with that road will, I believe, come up before the close of this session. I was going to suggest to the Minister of Justice or to the Minister of Railways that if they would be good enough to have copies of that decision distributed, it would be of interest to myself and to the other members of this House.

Mr. COCHRANE: An Order of the House has been passed for the production of those papers, and they will be brought down in a day or two.

PENSIONS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: Might I ask the hon. gentleman who is leading the House whether it is the intention of the Governnment this session to introduce any Bill providing for an amendment to the Pensions law?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is the intention to present a Bill dealing with the entire subject of pensions. My hon. friend will recall that a joint committee of the House was appointed last session to report upon pensions, and that subsequently an Order in Council was passed constituting a Board of Pensions Commissioners for Canada, and authorizing that Board to carry out the administration of pensions. The Order in Council also fixed the rates of pensions for the several ranks. The Board of Pensions Commissioners have been proceeding with their administration under the authority of that Order in Council. It is the intention, as I stated, to bring down, a little later in the session, a Bill dealing with the entire subject of pensions. Of course, the Board of Pensions Commissioners is proceeding lawfully at the present time under the present Order in Council, but it is thought advisable that the matter should be dealt with by a Bill carried through Parliament in the usual way.

THE BUDGET.

DEBATE ON ANNUAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.

The consideration of the proposed motion of Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance) for the Committee of Ways and Means, and the amendment of Mr. Turriff thereto, was resumed from Tuesday, April 24.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, it is worth while at all times to review with care the financial position of our country in each recurring fiscal year, but it is doubly necessary that the review in these times be with especial care, fairness and thoroughness. The outcome of the struggle in which we are engaged will be decided by a preponderance of military skill on the one hand and of business organization and financial strength on the other. Which, in the ultimate, will be the controlling factor, it may be difficult to say, but our business is to see to it that whichever is supreme in the end, the one factor or the other, we are the stronger party.

The Budget deliverance this year is the most inspiring message ever given to the people of Canada by any Minister of Finance. This is the fiftieth Budget of this Dominion and it is incomparably the best of all. I say this not to boast nor to ascribe credit to the Administration in particular for these results; I say it because the results themselves are of sufficient importance and sufficiently vital to us at this time to warrant impressing them upon this House and upon the people of Canada. It is a matter of secondary concern who are chiefly to get the credit or what measures are especially to get the credit for the enviable position we are in to-day. The matter of prime importance is that we have attained the commercial strength we have and that, at this critical hour, we can face the balance of the conflict with renewed courage and vigour.

What are the results and what briefly is our position? We find ourselves in the first place in the possession of a revenue unheard of in the history of Canada, indeed undreamed of in any previous year. I realize the significance of the statement made by the leading financial critic of the Opposition, that no one could have anticipated that we would at this time be in the financial position in which we are; that we could have attained along commercial lines to the results that we have attained. We find ourselves in possession of a revenue of $232,000,000, or $60,000,000 in advance of our receipts in any previous year of our existence. The advance alone is more than the whole revenue of Canada fifteen years ago. We find ourselves in receipt of that revenue without having strangled or crippled or even impaired any line or class of industry in this country or any individual in this country, and we are able to look abroad over the land and to say that all classes of our people from the humblest to the highest are individually and generally in a better position than they have ever been before. As against that revenue, we have an expenditure, outside of war expenditure (which, for the moment, I leave out of account), totalling $172,000,000, or practically the same as last year, included in which is the capital expenditure of $27,000,000, and an interest and pensions expenditure attributable to the war debt alone of $25,000,000. Did our system of bookkeeping assign to war expenditure all that is in reality its due, we would have an expenditure in this year of

only $147,000,000, and the surplus revenue over that total expenditure, ordinary and capital, would reach the enormous total of $85,000,000. It is argued on the part of Opposition critics—as inevitably it must be and no complaint can be found for that attitude—that even at that figure we are in excess of our expenditure of only four or five years ago. That is correct, but we are in reduction of what we have spent during the past three years.

Last year, not including interest on war debt and pensions, that expenditure of $147,000,000 on ordinary and capital account would have amounted approximately to $155,000,000. The year before it was $180,000,000, and the year before that about $183,000,000. So that within the last four years there has been a most pronounced, a most emphatic retrenchment. Going back of that again, to the times when our revenue was very much smaller, when the scope of the operations of the Dominion Government was very much more contracted than it is to-day, and when the cost of living was very much lower, we find the figure somewhat less. But what is the figure? There is no lesson to be learned, even though the result is truly told and not falsified, by taking individual patches and comparing one year with another. A great historian has said that by taking mere fragments of history you can learn nothing at all, or any lesson you like, but that if you take history as a whole you get great and salutory lessons, valuable for all time. It is the same with the history of our finance.

Looking back to the year 1909, let us say, or I will take any other year that is named, our expenditure for that year was ony 16 per cent less than the expenditure for the year we have just passed, leaving out all war accounts. Just 16 per cent difference in almost eight years of this country's history, and in the course of that time the cost of everything has increased; the scope of the operations of this Government has increased; the services we have performed for the public of Canada have multiplied. So much is this so that it would be impossible for any business concern in Canada with a like increase in its duties to show an equally small increase in its expenditure. While eight years ago we spent a sum of money on capital and ordinary expenditure of $128,200,000, only 16 per cent less than what we spent last year, our revenue in that year was only some $85,000,000. Our revenue this year is $232,000,000, or almost 300 per cent more than it was in 1909. As against almost 300 per cent of an increase in revenue we have an increase in expenditure, all things together outside of the war, of only 16 per cent. That is a broad view of the situation. The figures are almost as favourable for any year you like to take back of 1911; there would be very little difference. That is a broad outlook on the way we are moving, and on the efforts that have been made to retrench effectively in large sums. Our revenue is $232,000,000, and our expenditure $172,000,000; we have paid all our accounts on capital and ordinary expenditure—and that is what counts, it is neither the one nor the other, but the two together that counts—we have paid our interest on war debt and pensions, and have $60,000,000 to the good. Before this Government took office only in four complete years since Confederation did this country ever pay its way; two of those years were under the late Administration, and two were prior to their time. But there have been four years in which there were surpluses since this Government took office. Last year there was a surplus of about $2,000,000; another year, 1912-13, there was a surplus of $25,000,000, and the previous year a surplus of about $122,000. As I said before, previous to the taking of office by this Administration only in four complete years since Confederation did this country ever pay its way. On the other hand, those who came in Parliament at the same time as myself will remember that commencing with 1908 and going on through 1909, 1910 and part of 1911 there were very large increases in the debt. Taking the first three of those years and not the fraction of the last, this country ran behind in its expenditure over revenue to an amount exceeding $72,000,000. That was the increase in our capital debt in three years, and part of the expenditure that we have to make to-day, which adds to our total outlay, is the interest charge on that $72,000,000 that the country ran behind in 1908, 1909 and 1910.

Now we have an increase of 16 per cent in expenditure over 1909. I will give a few reasons for that. In the first place, were all the conditions the same? The increase in the price we have to pay for our services would account for at least 16 per cent increase in expenditure, and we have other expenses and other services that we did not have then. It takes a great deal more to run a railway when that railway is making $16,000,000 of revenue than it does when it is only making $8,500,000. The total revenue of the Intercolonial in 1908 was only $8,500,000, but its revenue this year is over $16,000,000, almost twice

what it was in 1908; consequently, the expenditure incumbent upon us to keep up that road is greater than it was then. But whereas in 1908 we lost $800,000 on the Intercolonial, in the year that has just gone by the Intercolonial had a surplus of over $1,200,000.

I will give another reason why our expenditure is greater. There was a government that built the National Transcontinental Railway, and as a result of the necessity placed upon us by our predecessors of running that road, we are out many millions more. If they had succeeded in building another transcontinental road the expenditure of this country would necessarily be much more than it is.

On the other hand, what is the state of the country generally with regard to trade? There is no figure that is comparable in importance to the people of this country with the figures of our export trade. A country of less than eight millions of people stripped of almost 400,000 of its young manhood by the call of war, produces and manufactures goods sufficient for the consumption of its own population, and then sells to the outside world $1,178,000,000 of surplus. War time or no war time, high prices or no high prices, there is no country in the world that can present figures comparable with those. Our total trade is $2,043,000,000 and of the total trade we have a balance in our favour of $314,000,000. So that $864,500,000 is our total import and $1,178,500,000 is our total export; that is, we sold to the outside world $1,178,500,000 and bought from the outside $864,500,000 worth. The importance of the volume of our sales is very much greater than is the volumn of our purchases.

Ordinarily, large imports are not to be deplored; we cannot become a great exporter unless we import largely also. But the country that regulates and organizes its trade so as to use fully its own resources and to bring those resources to the highest value by its own industries, makes its exports greater than its imports, and so makes money out of its trade. That is the position we are in to-day; we are selling $314,000,000 more than we are buying from the outside world. This is what makes us prosperous. For we are not great carriers of trade, nor have we great investments in foreign lands. Therefore, unless we are able to make goods and sell them to the outside world we could not hope to pay our obligations. Fortunately, we have reached that position, a position of great strength and one that must be gratifying to every citizen of Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Do these export figures include the munitions and war supplies furnished to Great Britain and the Allies, and also those for the use of the Canadian troops at the front?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The exports undoubtedly include munitions and war supplies.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Those for our own soldiers?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Everything made in this country and sold to the outside world. Let us give a moment's thought to that point. Let us assume that our exports of munitions of war amounted for last year to $300,000,000—and I think that is a high estimate. Even deducting that amount you still have $878,000,000 left. "But," we are told, "the prices are higher than before the war, and consequently the increase is not what would be indicated by the total value." Well, how are we to arrive at an estimate of the increase in prices? I adopted a method which I think is a fair one. I find that in 1914 the United Kingdom had a total trade of the value of £1,222,000,000 and that in 1916 in the following year these sales amounted to £1,553,000,000. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) was, I think, astray in his figures according to the official record. Here is an increase in the exports of the United Kingdom of 25 per cent. I think it is fair to assume that they are selling to the outside world about the same quantity of goods as before the war. It is hardly likely that they are selling any more, for the restrictions on shipping would make that impossible. The inference is that the increase in the total value is due to an increase of prices. Making a similar allowance in the case of Canada's trade, you find that our exports on the basis of prices before the war would be over $600,000,000. That is a colossal figure and illustrates what may be done by great efforts and under a sound fiscal system. It shows what can be brought about by trade organization as opposed to a policy of laissez faire.

The ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) was in office for three years, and we sat facing him in opposition. We heard him, and we also heard the Minister of Trade and Commerce of that day speak with pride—and with just pride—of the trade of Canada of that time. But take the trade of Canada for all the three years while the ex-Minister

of Public Works was in office, and the aggregate is less than the trade of Canada for last year alone. Take the exports alone —and the exports have grown more rapidly than the imports—and you find that for last year they were greater than the total exports for four years of the late Administration. These are facts that mean a great deal to Canada; they speak of the destiny of our country, and give us courage and confidence to maintain this struggle to the end.

I wish to refer briefly to certain arguments advanced by the hon. member for Red Deer. I refer to them for this reason—that I know he advances them out of regard for what he believes to be a truth, namely, that the fiscal policy of this country at this time is important from a war standpoint. It is from a war standpoint that he discusses matters in this House, and the arguments he has advanced are worthy of courteous consideration for that reason. He tells us that it would be the best thing we could do at this time to throw down our tariff wall entirely and let all goods into this country free. To follow any other course, he says, is to imitate the example of Germany and not that of Great Britain. I am as far as the hon. member from desiring to imitate the example of Germany in anything that pertains to honour, humanity, or other higher qualities of man; but I do not think it wrong to study the methods of Germany in matters of business organization, because we have not yet reached the stage at which we can ignore the results which that country has achieved by its methods. The hon. gentleman pointed out that Germany, at the opening of the war, had thrown down the barriers and had removed tariff restrictions from certain goods, such as bread-stuffs, fats, and other foods. Well, if we were to do that also we should be following Germany's example. But I cannot understand the attitude of mind that would cite this as being a denial of the protective system by Germany in time of war. What is the object of that protective system? It is to give German producers a better hold upon the German market. After the war broke out and the British navy was on the water, there was not much necessity to use the tariff to keep the home market for the German producer—the British navy saw to it that there was not much competition from outside. Consequently, there was no longer reason for a tariff on foodstuffs—quite the contrary. The hon. gentleman said: The ship of free trade in Great Britain stood the storm, the ship of free trade is the ship that I go in; free trade has been maintained by Great Britain in this struggle. It is nothing but a misnomer to say that Great Britain is a free trade country. It levies duties greater in amount than those levied in Canada; last year Great Britain collected $350,000,000 in tariff duties. We collected only $134,000,000. And, instead of diminishing or removing tariff duties because of the war, they have put on new duties and increased old ones. And these increases of duty are not on luxuries only, but on necessities also. They have resorted to the tariff to raise revenues for this war, and in doing so they have added to the protective effect of that tariff. Let me give you a few of the articles upon which they have increased their duties. They have diminished duties, as far as I can find, on nothing whatsoever. They have removed no duty at all. But they have increased duties on tea, on sugar, on cocoanut, they have put a duty of 33⅓ per cent on clocks and watches, they have put a duty of 33⅓ per cent on automobiles —clearly protective duties in both cases—

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Should not my hon. friend say that that was done to prohibit the import altogether and not for revenue purposes?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would say so if it were correct, but it is not.

Mr. MACLEAN: I submit that it is correct.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The fact is that they have prohibited many things altogether by special enactment but they have not prohibited these things.

Mr. MACLEAN: These articles of clocks and watches and automobiles were subjected to a very high rate of duty purely for the purpose of prohibiting the import, and that was stated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in bringing down that particular budget.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When Great Britain sets about to prohibit the import of any articles she sets about it directly, and she enacted legislation prohibiting the importation of many articles and restricting the importation of many others, but when she set about to collect revenue she set about it directly also, and she collects revenue from clocks, watches and automobiles. If she wanted to keep them out why did she not do it directly the same as she did with respect to other articles? The revenue col-

lected is set out in the revenue of the British Government, which returns I hold in my hand. On motor cars they have collected over £530,000, from that article alone in the first year in which they had a duty. Under the increased duty on tea they collected £4,500,000 and on sugar £11,700,000. These are articles that are on the table and in use by the poorest people in the country. Yet my hon. friend from Red Deer assumes that our system levies a tax on the poor and lets the rich off, whereas their system levies on the rich and lets the poor off. We, on the contrary, have no duty whatever on tea in this country, neither war tax nor anything else, and we have not increased the duty on sugar since the war began for war taxes or any other purposes.

A study of the situation reveals a very great and important and useful truth to this country. What is the result of the British system now? Great Britain finds herself with a total trade of £1,533,000,000, of which £949,000,000 is import and £604,000,000 export. The balance of trade against that country is £345,000,000, or over a billion and a half of dollars. Now, in view of this outstanding fact that has existed in its main features for many years, in consequence of buying to the extent of a billion and a half of dollars more than she is selling, the question comes: How is she to face her enormous obligations incurred in this war? Well, she may face them by a reversal of her fiscal policy. That is her business, it is not ours. It must be remembered that Great Britain has an enormous business in shipping. Great Britain is the carrier of the world, she makes a great deal of her money in that way and she has had enormous investments in foreign lands extending back for many decades. Great Britain, in a word, as a result of the system she has adopted, as a result of the investment of her money in other countries, is developing the industries and resources of other countries, increasing the population of other countries and making other countries greater commercially instead of herself. That is the position she is in whereas, on the other hand, it is unfortunately true that her rivals in this struggle have enormous balances of trade in their favour and have, within their own borders, every great industry brought to its highest point of perfection. That is one of the great elemental truths that has enabled Germany to maintain the struggle to this day. The British Government, only a short time ago, made an investigation into the situation as to the manufacture of dyes, in that country, one of the most vital industries of the Empire. What was the result? A commission appointed by the British Government reported that the dye inventions were made by a subject of Great Britain, who, unable to establish his industry at home, went to Germany and as a result of the system adopted there, the dye industry became the dominant dye industry of the world. That commission further reported that there was one way, and one way only, by which the dye industry could ever be established in England and England could become independent of the German supply, and that was by means of tariff taxation. Other commissions have similarly reported on other matters and other subjects of manufacture. It is argued that all great countries develop an enormous import trade and that without an import trade there cannot be a sufficient export trade. That is true, but the larger the proportion of the export business to the import business, providing both advance, the better for the country. We find the United States at this time not in the position in which Great Britain finds herself in this regard. We find the United States selling goods in volume away beyond the goods which she is importing, selling goods last year to an extent of double the imports of that country. The balance of trade in favour of the United States is over $2,000,000,000 as compared with a balance of trade against Great Britain of $1,500,000,000. That is the inevitable result of failure in adopting systematic and well reasoned means of bringing to their full development within the country itself all the resources of the country before they are sold.

I do not need further to elaborate the point I am making. I have made it clear, I think, that I am as firm a believer as ever I was in the principle of a moderate protective system for this Dominion of Canada. I am sorry that my hon. friend from Red Deer cannot, on a great matter of fiscal principle of this kind, see eye to eye with us. I would be glad indeed if he could but I fear that the very energy of his rhetoric, the virility and resourcefulness of his powers of composition, sometimes overmaster or becloud his mind and prevent him reasoning with that care and precision which alone bring the best results. Imagine, for example, an argument along this line. We, in this great war, he says are struggling for freedom and liberty, and he concludes

that we are struggling for freedom of trade. The freedom that we are fighting for in this war is not freedom for an individual within a nation to do as he likes. It is not freedom for the people within the country to trade with each other just as they individually please or with the outside world as they like. We are not fighting for protection or freedom of trade or freedom in that sense at all; we are fighting for the freedom of our nation and of every other nation to decide for free trade or protection or to decide for anything else that the democracy of that country demands. We are fighting for the freedom of our nation as a nation, and freedom not only for ourselves, but for every country, within its own domain, to decide upon its own course as it wishes, undisturbed and unprovoked by aggression from without. Freedom of trade is no more what we are fighting for than is the protective system. We are fighting for the right, once and for all, to decide which we will have, free trade, protection, or anything else that we may desire.

It is inevitable in Canada, where we have a tremendous geographical extent, where we have a wide diversity of interests, and a wide diversity of activities, and where that diversity is chiefly marked by a long stretch of country that separates the one portion from the other, where we have in one-half of the Dominion a very large, preponderant agricultural community producing a share of the raw material of the world, the foodstuffs of the world, and where we have in the other half of the Dominion, with a much larger proportion of population, a more highly commercialized people, a manufacturing population on a very considerable scale, a population engaged in many industries and many activities and manufacturing to a larger extent than is possible in our western country—it is inevitable, in such a country as we have here, that the protective tariff which we maintain must be only a moderate protective tariff, a tariff that has regard to the preponderant views of both sections of this country. It cannot have sole regard to any preponderance of sentiment in the East, nor can it have sole regard to any preponderant sentiment in the West. Both must be most carefully considered with a view to that unity which is essential if a nation is to prosper and which at this time is doubly essential, is vital to our success. It is an inevitable and indisputable fact that the prevailing sentiment west of the Great Lakes, and particularly in the three grain-producing prairie provinces, favours a lower tariff than does the prevailing sentiment in eastern Canada. That is not only an admitted truth, but it is a truth that is born of and imbedded in our geography, that is born of and imbedded in the conditions of our national life. The people in those three provinces are the great producers of our grain. They are not a manufacturing people. Consequently they do not get as immediate or as direct results from the maintenance of a protective tariff as do the people in the other portions of Canada. One cannot argue from that that they should not in that country have regard to the whole interests of Canada and not merely to those of the three provinces. Nor can it be argued that the sentiment of western Canada can be ignored by the citizens of this eastern country, or by the Parliament or Government of this Dominion in the framing of its fiscal policy.

That brings me to the discussion of a subject that is embodied in an amendment moved in this House by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). On the 16th day of the present month the Government of Canada, under the powers vested in it under the War Measures Act, placed wheat and products of wheat upon the free list, the effect being that, on the authority of the Underwood tariff of the United States, the same goods, and, indeed, all products of wheat were placed on the free list entering the United States.

4 p.m.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think my hon. friend has made a mistake. He states that this Government, on the 16th of April, placed all products of wheat on the free list. Is he not wrong? It only placed wheat, wheat flour and semolina on the free list, not bran and shorts.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I spoke generally. Bran and shorts were not included. I do not see that the point is material.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is quite material to the eastern stock raiser, very material.

Mr. MEIGHEN: To attain the end in view all that was necessary was to place wheat, wheat flour and semolina on the free list, the result being that wheat, wheat flour, semolina and all products of wheat were admitted free to the United States.

Mr. PUGSLEY: All products go free to the United States, but they do not come free into Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the bringing of bran

and shorts into Canada free of duty is a matter of great consequence, it is a wonder that the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) did not see that it was done when he was in power and could have had it done.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The arrangement of 1911 provided for it, as I understand.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not understand that. I do know that it did not provide for flour coming in free.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No, not free, but it provided for a very great reduction in duty.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A great reduction? Ten cents a barrel.

Mr. PUGSLEY: And I understood that bran and shorts were free.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I never so understood it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think bran and shorts were free and flour was reduced.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not looked it up, but I do not think my hon. friend is correct. However, those are fragments hanging to the main issue, and I think it is better to touch the main issue before we touch the outskirts. For many years in the West, at all events for from five to seven years, there has been a very considerable agitation, growing in extent, in favour of the admission of these products to the free list. It ante-dates the proposal of the late Government in 1911, at which time the agitation assumed the greater scope I have just described. But it has prevailed up to the present time. It has had its source, at all events it has had its chief inspiration, in hon. gentlemen opposite and in the organs of public opinion which support their views and defend their political interests.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That has been the chief source of the agitation, and, that being so, the chief source has been political and the object of the agitation in the main has been political. Notwithstanding that truth, that undoubted truth, a truth that was never in plainer evidence than it has been in recent months, and never in so plain evidence as it has been in this House since this debate commenced, never so clearly stated in writing as in the amendment moved by the hon. member for Assiniboia in this debate—that truth now more manifest than it ever was, that this agitation has been in its source, in its inspiration, and in its progress mainly political, it does not follow that those who have joined in it, those who have adopted these views, expounded many times in an unfair and most one-sided way, are not sincere and honest in their convictions. For the most part they are. The result of the agitation was that there grew up in this country a conviction that there existed an element of injustice in the tariff as it stood, and that the people of eastern Canada being preponderant in numbers, did an injustice to the wishes of western Canada. Such a fact as that is of a character which all governments that see their duty from every angle are bound to take cognizance of. This Government was elected to office in 1911, chiefly because the party led by the present Prime Minister refused to accept the reciprocity agreement negotiated by the late Administration; because they opposed that reciprocity agreement as contrary to economic and national interests of Canada. That is why they were elected to office, and it was their duty to carry out the intent of the people in electing them upon that platform. Consequently, this Government opposed until recently, for reasons which I shall refer to very shortly, the removal of these duties upon flour, wheat and semolina, because they did not believe that the removal of those duties and the consequences that would ensue would on the whole be in the best national interests of Canada. I do not need to review the reasons that were adduced. I know that there were not as powerful objections to that course as applied in this way to wheat and flour alone as those that obtained against the reciprocity agreement itself. The arguments that could be urged against the reciprocity agreement were wider in their scope and stronger in their import than were the arguments that could be urged against the placing of wheat, flour and semolina on the free list. I do not think any hon. gentleman who wishes to be fair will dispute that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In a very humble way, I would dispute it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for St. John believes that all arguments apply equally to the one as to the other. Well, I can quote against the hon. member for St. John the opinion of a gentleman whose views expressed in this House will, at all events in our western country, carry very much more weight than those of the hon. member for St. John. I quote the opinion

of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark, who, speaking in this House in the month of January, 1914, used these words—words that were true, honest and manly. They may be found on page 42 of the Hansard of that year:

> Many arguments that were used in regard to the reciprocity pact of two years ago do not apply to this matter at all.

Pretty straight language!

> This question is not now part of a large general agreement; it cannot be argued that it interferes with our fiscal independence. We simply have to take the tariff off wheat, which would be no sacrifice whatever, and we get entry into the United States market for our wheat.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The same with the articles under the arrangement of 1911.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman say that that does not conflict with the view, which he just expressed, that the same arguments are applicable to both?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I say that the same reasons apply to both.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As against that, I quote the opinion of the hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am speaking of my own view.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The words of the hon. member for Red Deer could not more directly or more forcibly contradict the manifestly erroneous expressions of opinion just given by the hon. member for St. John.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I desire to correct my hon. friend. The hon. member for Red Deer does not, as I understand it, say that the argument against the articles being admitted free under the agreement of 1911 would be stronger than the argument to be made against the admission of free wheat. He says it could not be argued; that is, people might not argue in the same way——

Some hon. MEMBER: Oh, oh.

Mr. PUGSLEY: He does not admit the correctness of the argument at all. That is very different.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You will understand, Mr. Speaker, why I said that the hon. gentleman's position was manifestly erroneous. It was so much so that he himself could not state it. "Many arguments that were used in regard to the reciprocity pact two years ago—not one, but many—do not apply to this matter at all."

Mr. PUGSLEY: The member for Red Deer does not say that they were sound arguments.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He would not dignify them with the name of arguments unless he believed that they were such. This question is not now a part of a large general agreement. It cannot be argued that it interferes with our fiscal independence, and on that account the hon. gentleman urged upon the Government at that time to place wheat, wheat flour and semolina on the free list. What he said was absolutely correct. There is in this Act no general agreement, large or small. It is an independent act of ours which has regard to a previous independent act of others—no one of them arranged or agreed upon at all—it is an independent act on our part and of our own volition, and it stands there, subject only to the regulation and disposition of this Parliament or of the Government acting under the authority of this Parliament. In that truth—and it is a big truth—the big fundamental objection which applied to the reciprocity agreement fails to have any force at all when used with reference to the course that the Government has just pursued. I am not and never was of the opinion that to the extent that it was necessary to secure admission for our wheat, wheat flour and wheat products to the United States, the removal of the requisite duty would to any very disastrous extent be prejudicial to this country. I believed—and I still think that I was right in my belief—that the balance of argument was against that course; that from a national and economic standpoint—I emphasize economic in particular—the balance of the case was against the change. I recognized at the same time that in those three provinces there was growing a preponderance of opinion, ever more general and ever stronger, that to refuse it was an injustice to those provinces. Now, upon what did I base the opinion that the weight of argument was against the change? It was argued on the other side of this House, that, were such course taken, there prevailed in the United States higher prices for our wheat than we were obtaining in Canada and the great object of those who sought for this course was to secure admission to those markets in the alleged belief—and, on the part of the great majority, the sincere belief—that they would secure a higher price for their own products. I argued on the contrary—and others who opposed the movement

argued also—that although it was true that at all events for the more important parts of the year, a higher figure by a margin, there did obtain in the Minneapolis market, than obtained in Canada, we would not get the benefit of that higher figure if the tariff were removed; that instead of the price to the Canadian producer rising, the price to the American producer would fall by the amount of duty or by such narrower amount as the American premium price stood over ours. It was argued also that, in so far as there was result at all from the action we took, we could not reasonably expect to get any better price for our product; that inasmuch as we had a market for our surplus—the very same market that the American people had for their surplus—across the Atlantic, and inasmuch as the export price prevailed in Canada, we would of necessity be losing part of the carriage of our wheat; that we would likely lose part of the milling of our wheat and that those disadvantages, limited but important as they were, had no corresponding benefit to be set off against them. That was the argument we advanced, and that argument, in my humble judgment, was good, and the principle at the back of it stands good to-day. Not only can I say that that argument was sincerely advanced, but I can say that the course of the market and the course of events in general since this step was taken, vindicate to the full the position we took and also the argument we advanced against the removal of the duty on wheat. Hon. gentlemen opposite argued times without number, out on the stump and in this House, and in the main they convinced the majority of the population of the three Western provinces, though I doubt if even yet the majority of the people of Canada agree with them on even this one point, and I am inclined to think it does not—they argued that he result would be an increase in the price to the Canadian producer varying anywhere from the limited figures advanced by the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. MacNutt), placed on Hansard in great detail a year ago aggregating, as I figured them out, exactly 2.82 cents a bushel, to the enormous and ludicrous figures advanced by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) of anywhere from 17 to 27, to 50, to 60 cents a bushel. That was the argument they gave. They said: Open up to us the American market and immediately you will find a levelling of the prices; Canada will go up; the United States will either stand still or just reduce a very little; we will go up to their level; we will get the benefit of the increase in price, and that is what we want.

Before I proceed to discuss the conditions that prevailed in bringing about the removal of these duties now, let me follow up the events that have transpired and refer those events to the arguments of ourselves and of hon. gentlemen opposite and see which of us was correct, and ascertain whether they or we were proprounding to this Parliament sound and lasting arguments that stood the test of time? What are the facts? I have before me a record of market conditions before this step was taken and since. I read from the leading organ of Liberal opinion in western Canada—the Manitoba Free Press. I have no reason to think these figures are incorrect in any particular; certainly they will not be incorrect in our favour, but I believe they are correct. The Manitoba Free Press was in the habit, throughout many months gone by, of giving comparative prices on wheat. I started the Saturday, April 14, preceding the 16th day of April, the day the Order in Council was passed and I find the comparative figures as follows:

Winnipeg, wheat No. 1 Northern, $2.20; Minneapolis, wheat No. 1 Northern, $2.34⅛ to $2.37⅝, or a clear difference of 14⅛ cents per bushel in favour of Minneapolis.

Winnipeg, wheat, No. 2 Northern, $2.15⅛. Minneapolis, wheat, No. 2 Northern, $2.27⅛, or a clear difference of 12 cents a bushel in favour of Minneapolis. That was the condition. On No. 1 Northern the clear difference being 14⅛ cents a bushel, or 4⅛ cents a bushel over the duty that at that time obtained for admission into the United States, that difference of 4⅛ cents being attributable, of course, to speculative or other market conditions of a local character. On the following Monday, the day before the Order in Council took effect the quotations were as follows: No. 1 Northern, Winnipeg, $2.29⅛, Minneapolis, $2.44⅛ to $2.46¼, or a clear difference in favour of Minneapolis of 15⅛ cents a bushel, or 5⅛ cents per bushel beyond the amount of the duty that obtained between the two countries. No. 2 Northern, Winnipeg, $2.24⅝, Minneapolis, $2.38⅛ to $2.46¼, or a clear difference of 14 cents a bushel. Those are the prices that prevailed prior to the passing of the Order in Council which was passed on that Monday afternoon and was heralded to the world that afternoon. The buyers of both countries and of all continents knew that night and without doubt

cogitated upon it over night prior to the opening of the market the next day. What was the result the following day? I read from the same journal, the leading organ of Liberal opinion in western Canada, taking the figures from the Free Press of April 18: No. 1 Northern, Winnipeg, $2.29½. That is just the price it was the day before. I understand it had dropped lower than that during the day, but it came back to $2.29½. These are the comparative prices the day after the Order in Council went into effect.

No. 1 Northern, Minneapolis, $2.34¼. What is the lesson? Winnipeg, $2.29½, and Minneapolis $2.34¼, the day after the Order in Council was passed; Winnipeg, $2.29½, Minneapolis, $2.44¼, the day before. That means that the Minneapolis price dropped by the amount of the duty the very day after we took it off, and there was no advance whatever in the Winnipeg price; the latter remained just where it was the day before. Could there be anything clearer than that? What has been the course of the market since? The margin of difference that existed prior to the Order in Council, over and above the duty, remained just as it was. I do not know enough about the wheat market to tell of the complicated conditions that may have brought that about; at all events, they existed before as now, and I presume they are speculative and local conditions. The price in Chicago at the same time is lower, but the margin of difference between Winnipeg and Minneapolis, Minneapolis over Winnipeg, that existed over and above the ten cents duty remained the same after the Order in Council was passed removing the duty, but the price at Minneapolis dropped the ten cents when we took the duty off, the Winnipeg price remaining the same. Where are the hon. gentlemen who in this House year after year assured us that as soon as we let down these iniquitous barriers the Winnipeg price would advance to the Minneapolis level to the benefit of the Canadian producer? If we follow the market after the 17th of April, we find that both markets advanced together with the same smaller spread between them that obtained the day after the Order in Council was passed. I do not know figures that can be more instructive that were ever advanced to this House, nor can I conceive of an event that more fully vindicates the argument advanced year in and year out by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House and accepted by the Canadian people in the year 1911. The premium that obtained was swept away by the removal of the duty for the very simple reason that the conditions that supported the premium and that advanced the United States market above ours were removed when the duty was removed. What kept it up was swept away, and consequently there was a surplus over the whole area of production and the price went down to the export level. Now I am asked, if that is the case, what benefit do you hope to obtain, and what is the altered condition of affairs that justified you in removing the duties on the 16th day of April? It was not that we believed anything different would take place from what actually did take place in the quotations on wheat. We still maintain that it was clear to those who fairly and without prejudice studied the supports that kept each market where it was, that exactly that would happen which did happen. Is it not clear that grain of all grades would follow the same course as grain of grades No. 1 and 2, and indeed of No. 3 Northern? The farmers of this country had one market only for their wheat, and that was Liverpool; other destinations of our wheat were not worth considering. Our market was across the water at Liverpool, and as a consequence the price of wheat in this country was fixed by the Liverpool market, less the freight and less one cent a bushel which the grain dealer retains for his profit; I believe that is the rate obtaining with every dealer in grain. The secretary of the Winnipeg Exchange has advised me that the prices fixed for grain have been arrived at by that process, and by that only; and that has always been the case. From the Liverpool price is deducted the freight and expenses at the various terminals, and a cent a bushel for the dealer, and the balance is the price they give out each morning for western Canada. I refer to that fact because it has been argued by hon. gentlemen opposite that there has been a combine among our millers to keep the price down. I have never believed that a combine existed. If it did, if any reasonable progress had been made towards showing in this House that it did exist, it would have been the duty of this Government to investigate that combine and take steps to see that it did not continue, if it were shown to exist. But there was manifest to all of us this consideration: There existed in western Canada a tremendous grain concern, a product of the activity and enterprise of the farmers of those western provinces, known in the eastern part as the Grain Growers' Grain Company, and tak-

ing the form of other organizations in Alberta and Saskatchewan; but all of the same nature, all for the same purpose, and all doing the same work. Those three organizations bought the greater part of the grain of that country; I am not sure that they bought over half, but I do know that they purchased much more than any one, and I think more than any three other concerns put together, and they were increasing in their activities and in their business year after year. The business shown in their annual reports for the last two or three years would have brought the blush to almost any miller in this country, at the thought of its very, very large volume indeed. They were in a position to see that the full export value of his grain was obtained by every farmer, and so far as I have been able to investigate they did pay to each and every farmer the export value of his grain. I believe that the conditions that obtained in the South were local condition and local conditions only supported in the main by the tariff, and events have shown that those conditions were removed the day we removed the tariff. Therefore, it was clear that if any combine existed to keep the price of grain below its natural level, these organizations, the great purchasers of grain in eastern and western Canada, were in a position to break that combine of their own act and without the slightest injury to themselves. That was the great outstanding fact, the rock above the mist of all arguments, and no government could ignore it. That fact stood out and was never explained, and consequently there was no reason to believe that any such combine existed. Furthermore, it was stated in the frankest possible way in the annual statements of the larger of these three organizations, the Grain Growers' Grain Company, and I read it to the House only a year ago, that they were not able to make the profits on No. 2 and No. 3 Northern and lower grades of wheat that they were able to make on No. 1 Northern; they were not able to maintain their legitimate profit on the lower grades because the millers could make better use of that grain than they could, and the millers were outbuying them on No. 2 and No. 3 and lower grades, and consequently the company could not do the business in those grades that they wished. That was the very frank statement of that organization itself, and instead of pushing on its activities in our own country, instead of getting a wider grasp of the grain trade in the West, which they designed to achieve, we find them extending their enterprise into the republic to the south, and purchasing for export in that country, because they could make more money in that way than by buying for export in Canada; and they purchased larger quantities of American wheat than of Canadian wheat, showing that on certain grades at least of American wheat they were able to do better than on Canadian grain.

These are the facts that presented themselves, and which could not be without their import, and, to my mind, their very clear and manifest import.

Furthermore, it was manifest that that organization and its sister companies were financially competent, and in point of manning and personnel they undoubtedly were competent, to extend of their own accord their activities into the field closest to them, namely, the milling field itself. There was, so far as I know, nothing in the world to prevent them branching out into the milling industry, if there had been a combine in that industry to bring about enormous profits in milling. But instead of entering the field right adjacent to them, and protecting the farmer against such a combine and such enormous profits in milling, they were going into other countries and engaging in the grain business in the United States. It was clear, and must always be clear, that if they believed that the profits which have been complained of in this Parliament as existing in the milling industry to the detriment of the farmer actually did exist they themselves have remedied that condition by entering the field and compelling the miller to pay a legitimate price for the wheat. But instead of doing that, they come out frankly and say that the miller is able to pay a higher price than they can afford to pay if they are to make a profit. Is it any wonder that I stood in Parliament a year ago and criticised the statement of a director of the Grain Grower's Grain Company who has been very active in all political matters, in which he complained that the Government of this country had no right to maintain a duty which enriched a few grain dealers and millers to the detriment of the general public, when he himself was director in a company which could have forced every miller in Canada, if it had had the will and had believed that there was anything wrong to raise the price he was paying the farmer for his wheat, and his company could have done that without a dollar of injury to itself. That was one of the reasons—and I have a

far stronger one to-day—I had for saying that the motive on the part of these men, who themselves were chiefly the authors of that agitation, was political and nothing but political.

The war has progressed for many, many months and the activities of German submarines and many other activities have had the result of diminishing to a very great degree the volume of British shipping.

One result of that is that it has been impossible for Great Britain to permit the free importation of goods on the same scale as before. They have been compelled to restrict their purchases to such classes of goods, and to such qualities of those classes, as would bring them the greatest returns in foodstuffs and necessities for the space engaged. As a consequence, they have not been able, notwithstanding the pressure of this Government, to purchase any wheat in this country except of the three higher grades—1, 2 and 3 Northern. The market that obtained for years for the lower grades was wiped away, for nobody else was able to purchase these grades—or, indeed wheat of any kind—for export, except the British Government. The British Commission purchasing in Canada—and no doubt this is true in the United States as well—is the only purchaser for export, for nobody else can get space in ships. In our western country there was a large proportion of the wheat that could not reach any of these higher grades, a larger proportion indeed, by reason of the conditions described by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), than usually has prevailed. There was no export price, because there was no export market. When the duty was taken off, on the 16th of April, the Minneapolis price on 1, 2, and 3 Northern fell at once to the export level, that—

Mr. McCRANEY: The Order in Council was passed on the 16th of April. When was this Government notified by the United States Government that the duty on wheat entering the United States had been taken off?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The duty on wheat entering the United States was actually taken off on the 17th of April, but we were notified of it only two days ago. I will come to that later. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCraney) need not think that any one could sanely argue that the effect of taking off the duty did not appear the very next day. Because there was no question as to the fact, it was known to everybody. It took some days to carry out the formalities to be gone through in the United States Treasury Department, but the duty was actually taken off as of April 17. In this connection, I may read—perhaps I should have read it before—the very interesting comment of the Manitoba Free Press on the market of April 17, the day after the duty was taken off:

> When the bell rang this morning there was a moment of silence, then a small voice offered to sell wheat at $2.29, at $2.28⅞, and at $2.28¾. No response was made and the voice shut up. For a period of about thirty seconds the crowd waited, holding their breath. When Minneapolis was put on the board six cents under the previous close there was a howl.

I wonder if the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) was there:

> Thus started one of the most upset markets in history. Winnipeg May was offered down from $2.28 to $2.25 without a trade. At that point the Government agent bought a little and the prices took a sudden swing back to $2.27½.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is the Government also speculating on this exchange?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Better put that question to the British Government. We are not.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I thought the British Government was advised in all these matters by the Canadian Government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are purchasing of their own volition entirely, and I think they are quite capable of doing so. Does any one suggest that free wheat did not have this effect? Let us see what the Free Press says:

> The predominating factor, "free wheat," completely upset the spreads between the different months. There were no new spreads made in the morning and very little scalping trade. The market moved too quickly to permit of taking any liberties. The buying credited to the government agents was the only good buying.

If it had not been for the Government buying, where would the market have gone?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the hon. gentleman the latest quotations?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Right down to date. But the margin of five, six, or seven cents in favour of the Minneapolis price has been maintained until now, notwithstanding that the duty is off. So, it is clear that the taking off of the duty depressed the Minneapolis market by the 10 cents duty and did not raise the Winnipeg market, but that

under world market conditions which affect them both, they have advanced together since.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Both have advanced.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Did the hon. gentleman think they would remain for ever stationary?

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the price to-day in Winnipeg?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is about five or six cents less than the Minneapolis price.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the figure?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know. It is the relative price that counts. Does the hon. gentleman wish now to consider the absolute price? It was the relative prices that we heard of in this House for five years.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the average advance?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was no advance at all. The effect of free wheat was seen the very next day when the Minneapolis market went down.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen) argue that the Government made a mistake in giving free wheat?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all, I am coming to that in a moment, but I was swerved from it by the very proper interruption of the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney). On the frank statement of the Manitoba Free Press, free wheat was the cause of the market phenomena of the 17th of April.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: On the higher grades.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On the higher grades. I am asked why the Minneapolis market on the lower grades did not fall to the export level. Because there was no export level to fall to; there was no export market and no export buying; consequently, there was no market for this surplus wheat except in the United States. And what did we find? We found that wheat of that quality was passing over the tariff wall of ten cents a bushel in very large quantities, and, I believe, at considerable profit, as stated by the hon. member for Assiniboia. The increase in the quantities of these grades of wheat sent to the United States runs from one hundred to one thousand per cent over the quantities of a year ago. The farmers had to sell their surplus wheat there; there was no place else to sell it. There was a market in Canada, it is true, but the market in Canada without the export market was not sufficient to do justice to the producer. As a consequence it became necessary, if justice was to be done to the producer, to see that other markets were open if possible.

Now I have treated this subject from the point of view of wheat alone. I have never been one of those who contended that markets of any kind were not an advantage to a country. The business of the Government is to get for our people all the markets we possibly can, far markets and near markets, and, other things being equal, the nearer the markets the better. That is only common sense. But I will tell you what is still more common sense and still more vital. The market that is important is not the market for the raw product that comes out of the ground; it is the market for the finished product that is worth twice or ten times as much. Surely that is an economic truth that took root in the hon. member for Assiniboia's mind at least forty years ago. It is important to get markets, it is true, but it is far more important to get markets for a valuable article that you make valuable by labour than to get a market for an article in the state it is first produced. How does that apply? Had there been only the question of free wheat, in my judgment, in the way of price there was nothing much to be gained by the removal of the American duty. Still, there would be little if any loss. On the question of flour, an important question affecting an important product of Canada, conditions obtained a few years ago, and obtained a year ago, that do not obtain to-day. There was very much in the contention of the millers, not so much those big millers who have always been quoted by the hon. member for Edmonton, the hon. member for Saskatoon and the hon. member for Dauphin, not so much those large flour producers, the Lake of the Woods Milling Company, the Ogilvy Milling Company, the Maple Leaf Milling Company and those other men, as the 303 other small millers in Ontario and as the 540 other small millers in this Dominion of Canada, that it would be unfair to them, who were producers of a manufactured article, and who had to make very large investments for machinery and to import many other articles in order to conduct their industry, that there should be no protection whatsoever for their flour so long as they paid a protective duty on

what they imported. Am I presenting something on their behalf that has no foundation? Am I arguing something that is not sound? No, hon. gentlemen opposite themselves retained this duty of 50 cents under their reciprocity pact. That anyway is what they advanced. I have always felt that there was something in it. I was not very much concerned with the big producers. By reason of the enormous quantity of their output they are able to produce more cheaply than their competitors who operate on a smaller scale, but it was argued that it would be doing a great injustice to these 540 small milling companies, who are competing with the larger millers and serving the country too in a real sense with the production of flour. I know of one milling company in this country which, in a single year, paid into the treasury of Canada $200,000 in duty on articles used by that company. Other smaller companies pay less, and they argued, and argued with great force, that while it would be well to make a concession to public opinion in western Canada, it would not be right that they should be compelled to pay these duties and get no protection whatsoever or get no advantage in the market which they were paying to keep up. That argument had great force. But what are the conditions now in that regard? At the present time the price of wheat has so advanced and the price of flour has so advanced that while the important part of their industry has always been the milling portion of it, it now seems to be comparatively small compared with the business of dealing in wheat. The fifty cents a barrel that they have had by way of protection on flour became a comparatively insignificant consideration. With flour running up to $11, $12 and $13 a barrel, what is fifty cents a barrel—less than five per cent, and relatively of trifling importance in the milling trade. Consequently by removing that small amount of protection for them in the presence of conditions that have far more to do with their success or failure than the small amount of duty, we were not paying the same price by any means for the removal of the duty on wheat against us to the United States that we would have paid in years gone by. Having regard for the fact that there was a manifest necessity in regard to the lower grades of wheat, if there was to be a fair market under the conditions obtaining now in the transportation world, in the presence of the fact that the only people buying will not buy that article at all for export, and having regard also to the fact that the price we are paying in the way of a removal of the flour duty amounts to a trifling sum, means very little indeed to the miller and is indeed small in magnitude compared with what it was a year, or three years ago, there exist very substantial reasons why this should be done now as compared with the reasons why it should have been done two years or even one year ago.

Speaking of flour, it is interesting to remember some of the arguments used by hon. gentlemen opposite on that subject. I remember that I heard the hon. member for Edmonton in particular only a year ago taking the ground with thunderous emphasis that by taking this course we were going to split up the combine in this country and reduce the price of flour to the consumer. I remember the hon. member for Assiniboia telling us that just as soon as we took the duty of fifty cents a barrel off flour the poor fellow getting $1 or $2 a day would be able to get his flour fifty cents cheaper. Well, we took the duty off flour on the 16th April of this year. Has he got it any cheaper? No, wheat did not rise next day, but flour rose next day, rose fifty cents a barrel and it has been rising ever since. True the rise at that time no one would attribute to the removal of the duty. It had nothing whatever to do with it. No one would argue that the removal of the duty had increased the price of flour. At all events, the fact is that it did not go down and the fact is that it did increase. The removal of the duty had no effect whatever in reducing the price of flour in this country contrary to the arguments advanced in this House for years by hon. gentlemen opposite. So much for that.

There is the further fact to which some importance may be attributed recited in the Order in Council that it is well under conditions obtaining now when the United States are our allies, and when the surplus foodstuffs of both countries are pooled together, that there should be a freer movement between them. There is some force in that and for this reason: transportation conditions are now so abnormal and methods of transport for our crop are so limited that we have to have every facility to reach them and to reach them with just as little interference as we can have. If there is going to be a boat at a certain time sailing out of New York, or any other port, we want to be able to get the grain there even

though it is milled in transport or milled and mixed at Minneapolis in order that we may be able to get it on the way to the ports quickly because of the necessity for food that exists in the British Isles and in allied countries. There is much in the further statement which I purpose to make now. This is something to which I must attach more importance perhaps than is usually attached to it. I believe it is of importance in this country that there should be no section of the people who are allowed to live under conditions that they believe are unjust. I believe that any discontent that exists in any part of this country, particularly if that discontent is geographically centred, should if possible be removed even though we pay a price to remove it. I am not in a position to say—others are just as good judges as I—that were a vote to be taken to-day in the whole of Canada the opinion of the majority numerically would be in favour of the course we took, I cannot say that the majority would not have preferred that we had not taken that course, except out of regard for the wisdom of making a concession to the West. But if you have regard to that fact, it is wise, particularly at this time, as was cited in the Order of Council, to remove all possible cause of discontent on this subject. I believe the majority in this country, East as well as West, are prepared to make a concession in order that there may be no such feeling of injustice. Whatever may be the majority numerically one way or the other, it is undoubted to my mind that the strength of the sentiment in those western provinces in favour of free wheat is deeper than the sentiment against it here. The sentiment in favour was more pronounced, than with regard to this one act and one step, would have been the sentiment in eastern Canada against it. And eastern Canada is big enough and always has been to meet in some measure a predominating feeling of their western fellow citizens.

I have cited the four considerations of consequence. I have recited the reasons which prevailed when we took this course which did not prevail before. I have no apologies to make. I have endeavoured to make capital out of no ir-

5 p.m. relevant fact. I believe the course we took is just, I believe our former course was just, and the course we shall take in the future we will endeavour to make equally just.

I wish now to say a few words on this specific amendment. It is a most remarkable amendment. It is based, if I understand it, on two claims. One of them was advanced by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean); both of them, as indeed all claims are always advanced, by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) who leaves nothing out. The claim advanced by the hon. member for Halifax was that our Order in Council was illegal, that it transcended our powers under the War Measures Act, and secondly—I believe the hon. member for Halifax referred to this as well—that though it may have been within our legal powers it would die automatically when the war was ended; and they were very anxious to legislate not only for the present but for the far or near distant future when the war shall be over. I do not think that the hon. member for Halifax, now that he has had two or three nights to think it over, would dare to repeat in this House any doubt—expressing it as a lawyer and not as a politician—that that Order in Council was within the powers conferred on the Government by the War Measures Act. The Deputy Minister of Justice who was in office throughout the entire regime of hon. gentlemen opposite and whose opinion has been, in Canada at all events, unexcelled on subjects such as this, and whose opinion, let me say furthermore, we as the Government are bound to accept, (provided it is not in conflict with that of the Minister of Justice), thought that the Order in Council was sufficient. And apparently the opinion of the law officers of the United States agrees with that of the Deputy Minister of Justice, because they have promptly accepted the Order in Council as a legal removal of those duties and have acted upon it. In this connection I shall read a letter addressed to the Minister of Finance by the Consul General of the United States, dated the 24th instant, three days ago:

Dear Sir Thomas:

I am to-day in receipt of a telegram from the Department of State which acknowledges my telegram of April 16, relative to free wheat, wheat flour and semolina, and informs me that the Customs Division of the Treasury Department states that "wheat, wheat flour and semolina entered and in bonded warehouses on and after April 17, are free of duty."

That is the result of what has been done, and that was the result that was in view. The officials of other countries beside Canada have acted on similar legislation. But the language of our Act is so clear and forcible that there is no room for doubt as to the power of the Government to take the course it did. The result, anyway, has been

achieved, and argument on that point becomes academic in view of the result.

Now, as to the alleged point that this Order in Council will die at the termination of the war and that consequently it would be wise now to legislate as to what should be done afterwards, I say, first, that if ever an amendment bore on its face the earmarks of political chicanery it is this amendment. It is an attempt to raise a doubt in the minds of western Canadians; it is an attempt to raise a doubt in the minds of the officials of the United States of America—although it has failed in that object—as to whether or not this Act is not of some peculiar temporary character on which we should not rely. Nobody ever thought of such a doubt before. I never heard it even whispered. The War Measures Act gives to the Government of Canada power to enact Orders and regulations having regard to a number of subjects recited in the Act, and one, if not more than one, of those classes of subjects clearly embraces the action we took. That legislation having been passed, the Government was then in a position to do what otherwise only Parliament could do, enact and enforce orders, regulations and laws binding upon the people of this country. We so enact, and what we do is to enact a law just as if it had been done by this Parliament. It is done by the Government under the authority of this Parliament, which means that it is done by this Parliament.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Just as if it were in the Act itself.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am glad that I have convinced a legal member of the Opposition.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It does not need any convincing; it is absolutely clear on its face.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Consequently it takes effect just as if we legislated in Parliament that these duties were removed and it has just the same effect as if this Parliament, by specific enactment, had removed the duty. It is argued by the hon. member for Halifax that at the end of the war the Order in Council lapses and that consequently the duties that were removed under the Order in Council must be restored, or, rather, would be automatically restored. I hardly know how to put the absurdity of that position in clearer form than I put it to the hon. member while he was speaking, that once we legislate by Order in Council under an Act that gives us power to legislate, that is legislation, and it has the same effect, the same permanence and the same finality that any other legislation has. All legislation may be amended, may be repealed. This, like all other legislation, may be amended or repealed. It has the same permanence and the same finality as any legislation passed by this House. What is done by Order in Council while the War Measures Act is alive is legislation and remains legislation just the same as any legislation passed by this House.

If it were different, what would be the result? Under the War Measures Act—to take the example that I took before—we by Order in Council appropriated to this country the title to the Ross rifle factory in Quebec. We have enacted other Acts of a similar character. If the legislation lapses with this Parliament and the effect of what we do must be reversed, what will be the result in the case I have mentioned? In March of this year we declared that the title of Sir Charles Ross to that factory ceased to be his and became ours. If the hon. member for Halifax is correct, when the war is over that title ceases to be ours and goes back to Sir Charles Ross, although we have paid for it, although he has the money, although he may be dead or may have spent the money. This is utterly absurd and clearly shows that there cannot be the faintest reason or ground for the contention that the hon. gentleman advances.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am afraid the hon. gentleman has not read the War Measures Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I helped frame the statute; perhaps that is sufficient for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not believe the hon. gentleman drafted it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I had to do with framing it, and that would likely give me some information concerning it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. gentleman must have forgotten its terms, since he argues as he does about the Ross rifle factory.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The draftsman is usually a poor interpreter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under the Order in Council based upon the War Measures Act, on April 16 we removed the duties on wheat, wheat flour and semolina. Does the hon. gentleman argue that these duties, which have been wiped away, come back again

when the war is over any more than the title of Sir Charles Ross in the Ross rifle factory goes back to him when the war is over? What is the difference? The hon. member for St. John would, I know, very much like to expatiate on this question; let him tell me now what the difference is.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I will endeavour to answer the hon. gentleman when—

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman will not answer now, when he may be caught on the very point. He will not stand on his feet and attempt to draw a distinction, because there is no distinction. If when the war is over the duties again apply to wheat, wheat flour and semolina, the title of Sir Charles Ross also reverts to him.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is the hon. gentleman serious in that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Much more serious than the hon. member for St. John. If he were serious, he would get up and state the difference.

An hon. MEMBER: He does not look very serious.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would not like to look as serious as hon. gentlemen opposite have looked this afternoon.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is about as serious as he was when he made those famous charges in the House of Commons about a year ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Was that the charge which showed a waste of $80,000,000 on shells?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The charges that were investigated and declared false by the Meredith-Duff Commission, yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Oh, no, you refused an investigation on that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would be rather unfortunate for Canada if my hon. friend's argument were correct. I will tell you something else that would go back, besides the title of the Ross rifle factory; the title to about 23 acres of land which hon. gentlemen opposite, without the slightest reason or justification, conferred as a free gift upon a political friend or favourite of some kind, without any remuneration to the people of Canada. The title to this land, which hon. gentlemen opposite filched or took from the people and presented to Sir Charles Ross, would revert back to him if their argument on this question were correct.

Here is an amendment to a motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means. It calls upon us to pass a vote of adulation on hon. gentlemen opposite, to pass a reflection on this House and on the law officers of the Crown, and to do so for no purpose in the world except that of meeting the political exigencies of hon. gentlemen opposite. What they are sorry for is that this grievance in which they have revelled for so many years is now removed. They want to keep alive the agitation which has been their chief hope in western Canada. They are anxious to stir up and keep white the embers of a controversy without which there is not very much light for them on the horizon. Now that that controversy is removed and removed with such permanence as it is within the power of this Parliament to effect they are not satisfied; they want to do something which will retain to them some of the advantages they hoped to gain by that agitation all through these years. That is the purpose of this amendment. The Deputy Minister of Justice says that the legislation has the same permanence as any legislation ever passed by this Parliament. We must be governed in matters of law by the opinion of the law officers of this Government; otherwise we are untrue to our trust. The amendment of the hon. member for Assiniboia, boiled down, is nothing more or less than this: "Whereas I, John G. Turriff and somebody else whose name I will not give, should be accepted on matters of law by the Parliament of Canada in preference to the responsible law officers of the Crown; therefore be it resolved that we do over again something that is already done, with all the finality and permanence that is in the power of Parliament to do it." That is the amendment which the hon. member for Assiniboia solemnly asks us to pass.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: Would it not be possible for this Government to repeal that Order in Council by another Order in Council? And, if that is so, how can the hon. gentleman say that the Order in Council has the same weight and permanency as though it were an Act of Parliament?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly it is in our power to repeal it, and if we pass this resolution and bring in a statute we could also repeal the statute. They are both on the same ground exactly.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The authority under which we may remove duties as a war measure is the very same authority under which we may impose duties as a war measure. Both are exactly on the same basis; consequently, if we pass the amendment and introduce the legislation that it calls for, that legislation would be temporary in the same sense that this is temporary and it would be permanent in the same sense that this is permanent.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: That is, if your majority did not change its mind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Exactly so; the hon. member for Red Deer has the point exactly.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But you could not do it behind the backs of the representatives of the people.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, the power would undoubtedly exist. I have to thank the House for the patience with which my altogether too much prolonged discourse has been received. I refer again to the matter of greatest moment in this Budget. The motion of my hon. friend is not the matter of greatest moment; it was my duty to refer to it fully and at length because I, in part, represent western Canada in the Administration. But the outstanding feature is the successful commercial course that this country has pursued, the strong position that it occupies, the course that we have taken in bringing business to Canada and in retaining business here by our policies. And in the bringing of some of that business to Canada no one deserves more credit than the ex-Minister of Militia himself. The outstanding feature is that by the business we are doing, the goods we are producing, we are able to sustain our country through this struggle and can sustain it to the end. That is the gratifying element of this Budget. It is important that no one should allow any mere secondary feature or any amendment, whatever be its design, to draw our attention from this great achievement, and it is important that the people of Canada, reviewing the statement for the year, take from it that renewed inspiration, courage and confidence which the awful tasks confronting us require, and which an enlightened study of our deeds already done can scarcely fail to command.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: By the courtesy of the hon. member for St. John I have been given a minute and a half to draw the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) to a statement he made with regard to myself, based upon a figure, as far as I could follow him. It is not of any very great importance, and I am sure that my hon. friend will be just as glad to have it cleared up as I myself shall be. He said that I was a little wrong in my figures after he had made a statement, if I understood him, that in some recent year Britain exported £1,500,000,000 worth of goods.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I said was that the total trade was £1,553,000,000. I understood the hon. gentleman to say it was £2,000,000,000.

Mr. CLARK: My speech as reported in Hansard will show that I was speaking purely of exports at the time, and I spoke of $2,000,000,000 as the exports of Britain in one year, not the total trade.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is $3,000,000,000. The hon. gentleman is well within the mark.

Mr. CLARK: I understood my hon. friend to say that the total export trade was £1,500,000,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. CLARK: I am not at all sure that my hon. friend did not make a mistake, because I took the precaution of going to the Hansard office, and if the hint is worth anything to my hon. friend, I would like him to look up the report of his speech before the unrevised Hansard appears. If I made a mistake, it was one that tended to weaken my argument because I was showing at the time what Britain was able to do in time of peace, being my argument upon the assertion that she had actually exported in round figures $2,000,000,000 worth of goods in one year. It appears that I was a little below the mark, and to the extent that I was below the mark, I weakened my own argument. That is a form in which I should always like to err.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is quite correct, if the hon. gentleman said that. I understood him to say that the total trade was £2,000,000,000. The figures for Great Britain for 1916 are: Total trade £1,553,307,393, of which £604,154,714 are exports and £949,152,679 are imports, a balance of trade against Great Britain of £344,997,965.

Mr. CLARK: In no case could a quotation from last year have been any correction of what I stated, because my figures

were quoted from some recent year in time of peace.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The export trade would be about $2,000,000,000 in time of peace.

Mr. CLARK: A little over.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (St. John): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure as to whether my sympathies ought to be extended more to the gentlemen who are sitting behind the Government benches than to my hon. friend the Solicitor General during the course of his speech this afternoon. It is evident that the hon. gentleman's efforts were directed entirely to justifying the conduct of the Government in the eyes of their supporters. There could be no other reason for his long speech, first in condemnation, and, secondly, in justification of this Order in Council. The hon. gentleman devoted a good deal of his time to showing that the Government had been right in resisting the demands of the Liberal party and of the people of the West that wheat and wheat products should be placed upon the free list. He gave very strong reasons, and I think anyone reading that portion of his speech in Hansard would come to the conclusion that there would be a very great danger to-morrow, or within a week, or within a month, if the hon. gentleman had his way in the Cabinet of having this Order in Council repealed, because, as I have said, the hon. gentleman has told us that he has not changed his mind, and that he believes the refusal of the Government in the past to place wheat and wheat products upon the free list was entirely in the best interest of the country and in accordance with the great principles of the national policy. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman was obliged, of course, to give some reasons why the Government had acted. The extraordinary thing which the hon. gentleman has done is that at last he seems to have been driven by the peculiar workings of his own mind to justify this Order in Council on the ground that it has given to the small millers in Canada a market for their flour in the United States.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I said that?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, because, as I understood him to say, it gives them the opportunity to dispose of their finished product. The hon. gentleman says that it is much more important for the people to have a market for their finished product than for their raw material, and that on that ground the Order in Council may be supported.

I intend to deal with the points which my hon. friend has made with regard to this Order in Council, to refer to the amendment, and to show that instead of being the very horrible thing that my hon. friend thinks it is, it is an amendment which ought to commend itself to all the members of this House. Before doing this, however, I should like to refer very briefly to the remarks which my hon. friend made with reference to the state of the trade of the country. That was the subject of my hon. friend's remarks in the earlier part of his discourse, and after the lugubrious performance which he had given us with respect to free wheat, he returned to this cheerful trade condition in order, I suppose, to bring his supporters out of the slough of despond into which he had driven them by his reference to the free wheat policy. The hon. gentleman referred to the fact that the trade of Canada—and in this respect he followed the Minister of Finance—had reached, during the past fiscal year, the enormous sum of upwards of $2,000,000,000. He spoke of this, as did the Minister of Finance, as being a most cheering condition of affairs. Think of it, said my hon. friend, that in a very few years the export and import trade of Canada had risen from $600,000,000 to upwards of $2,000,000,000. I almost wondered why my hon. friend did not come down with a resolution thanking the Kaiser for the magnificent prosperity which he had brought to Canada, because it is the Kaiser who is responsible for it all; it is not the Minister of Finance nor the Solicitor General; it is not the Government of this country; it is not the ordinary business development or the ordinary prosperity of the people of Canada; it is by reason of the bringing about of this bloody war by the Kaiser and his Government. Surely, when we are considering as to whether Canada is in a prosperous condition or not, we ought to have regard to the normal condition of affairs; we ought to consider whether the manufactures of Canada are developing in such a way as to bring permanent prosperity to the people of this country; we ought to consider whether the country is being developed by new settlers who are coming in and cultivating our vacant land. If that were the condition of affairs, we might rejoice at it. But instead of rejoicing at the fact that this condition of affairs exists to-day, the people of Canada ought to have a feeling of sadness because it is owing to these terrible war

conditions that we have this vast trade, and as I said not long ago in this House, the export and import trade of which these hon. gentlemen boast is a trade that is washed with the blood of the young men of this country who have gone to the front and have risked their lives on the battlefields of France and Belgium. This condition of affairs is nothing to be proud of; it is nothing to rejoice at; it is something which we ought to deplore.

Surely, in order to give to this House any fair estimate of what has really been the increase in our exports and imports, we ought to know in tonnage what that increase has been. Giving it to us in dollars and cents gives us no idea of what the increase has been. For instance, as has already been stated in this House, the export of 50,000,000 bushels of wheat does not mean to-day what it meant a few years ago when wheat was worth 70 cents a bushel, that 50,000,000 would be worth only $35,000,000, but to-day it would be worth $100,000,000. That does not mean a larger employment of labour; it has added nothing to the transportation business of this country; but by reason of the inflated prices, it has counted in the exports which give to my hon. friends on the other side so much comfort, and of which they boast so loudly. And so with all the other exports, and so with the imports, which have greatly increased in price. Surely hon. gentlemen opposite should give this House a statement as to what portion of these exports is represented by rifles, by powder, by shot, by shells, by boots and shoes, by clothing and other supplies which have gone to our soldiers at the front, all of which, so far as the export business of the country is concerned, should be treated as if they were not exports at all, because they are articles that are going to the boys at the front who are fighting the battles of Canada, and are not sold to any foreign country; they are paid for out of the treasury of Canada by our own people, and yet these goods have been added to the exports with a view to inducing the people of this country to believe that we have a vast export trade.

It has been stated in this House this afternoon that the Munitions Board have actually given orders in Canada, on behalf of the British Government, to the extent of $850,000,000 for munitions of war. Now, although the product of these munition factories all goes to the front, and part of it will be paid for by the people of this country when the accounts between this country and the British Government are adjusted, yet we find this whole amount added, as if it represented part of the legitimate exports of this country and ought to be taken into account when determining our prosperity; and so with regard to imports. Surely hon. gentlemen should have told us what quantity of the raw material that has been brought into Canada from other countries was to be used in the manufacture of shells, powder, clothing, boots and shoes and other supplies for our troops at the front. There has been an increase of millions and millions of dollars in our imports of anthracite coal to supply the factories in this country that are making supplies for the front, and the same remark would apply to bituminous coal. I do not know what the figures are, but surely they should have been given, and deducted from our total imports, so that we might know what was the real and permanent prosperity of the country. I do not intend to deal at any length with the financial situation of this country, as I want to be as brief as possible and this phase will no doubt be dealt with by other hon. gentlemen in the course of this debate. But I desire to say that an examination of the cost of running the different departments of the Government, the cost of running the Public Works Department, for instance, where the expenditure rose in three years under this Government to double what is was during the last three years of the previous Administration, and an examination of the vast increase of expenditure in the Department of Railways, and I venture to say of all the departments of the Government, will convince this House and the people of this country that ever since this Government came into office, and more particularly during the first three years of their administration, they carried on the affairs of Canada with a reckless disregard of the resources of the country and the ability of our people to carry the large burdens they were placing upon them. If this Government had exercised reasonable economy, when the war broke out there would have been from $50,000,000 to $70,000,000 of a surplus available, which could have been devoted towards the cost of our share in the war.

I wish to say a few words on the question of free wheat. I shall speak on this question not as a stranger to the West, or as one who is only interested in the West by being a citizen of Canada, because while I am a resident of the province of New Brunswick and represent one of its constit-

uencies, I have for the last thirty-six years been closely identified with a very important section of our northwestern country. It happened that away back in the fall of 1881 I went to Manitoba, and from there on to Saskatchewan, and from that day to this there has never been a time when I have not been financially interested, and for one of my means very deeply interested in that country, and I am as interested in its prosperity probably as much as any member of this House who does not come from one of our western provinces. I have followed the course of events there pretty carefully, and have seen great areas develop; I have seen the discouragements of the West, and its sources of encouragement and of hope. I have seen it pass through dark days. I can remember when farmers were willing to sell their wheat in the market of Regina for forty-three cents a bushel, and when people talk of the high prices farmers are receiving to-day, they ought to remember the hard years through which these men have gone, and should not begrudge them a fair and reasonable return for their labour in the cultivation of their farms. I am one of those who recognize that upon the development and prosperity of the West depends in a large measure the prosperity and development of the whole of Canada. The West is a country of glorious possibilities, a country of tremendous resources, with vast areas of fertile land the like of which I do not believe can be found anywhere else in the world. There are vast opportunities for development, and if the West only has a fair chance it is going to increase in population and increase enormously in prosperity, and in the years which are to come it will be the pride and the very backbone of this country. It has been a consideration of those conditions that has induced me ever since I have been in this Parliament to support anything which might give to our western provinces free access to the market of the United States, not only for their wheat and wheat products, but also for their oats, flax and whatever else the farmers of the West are capable of producing. It has always seemed to me that it would be very easy indeed, with an increase in population, and with cheaper farm machinery for the West, to glut the markets of Canada and of Great Britain, and for that reason it is of vital importance that we should have a market for our farm products in the great Republic to the south of us. There is a law of supply and demand which governs as to farm products as well as with all other products.

Free access to a large consuming population means a large market, which is of advantage to the farmer even though it may not to any great extent increase the price of what he has to sell. As I said the other day, the farmer cultivating, let us say, 160 acres of land, sells his products at certain prices and has a certain aggregate return. But the farmer, like every other producer, has his overhead charges, and as his total product is increased the overhead charges grow proportionately less. If this same farmer can cultivate twice as much land, or three times or four times as much, and can sell all his products, he will make more money than by selling the product of the smaller acreage. But, if there are not large markets to which the farmer may have free access, there is no encouragement to him to increase production, for if he and his neighbours follow that course they may easily glut the market and cause prices to fall, thereby wiping out their profits. While the United States is a great agricultural country, it is a great consuming country as well. Near the Canadian border there are great cities, such as St. Paul, Minneapolis, Chicago, Milwaukee, Cleveland, New York, Baltimore, Boston and others, containing a vast consuming population to which, under free conditions, the farmers of Canada might look for a market for their products. In the great state of New York alone there is a population of about ten millions, or two millions more than the population of Canada, and I am told that of that population only 375,000 may be properly described as rural. If this be true, you have a consuming population of over 9,600,000. And this is but an instance of the markets which the farmers of Canada could find in the United States.

It is true that the Liberal party for years past has joined hands with the farmers of the West in urging that wheat and wheat products should be placed on the free list. I have no apology to make for that; I am proud to have been associated with the gentlemen who, in the best interests of the people of the West and of the whole Dominion, sought to bring about this reform. On the same grounds I heartily supported the reciprocity arrangement of 1911. It is to be borne in mind that the most important product of this country, free access for which to the United States market would have been secured under that reciprocity agreement, was wheat. A

number of other articles would have been afforded easier access to that market—lumber, hay, potatoes, cheese, and many others—but wheat stood at the very top of the list. The hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) tells us that this granting of free wheat is a very different proposition from the reciprocity arrangement. It is different only in degree. Suppose that there was no statute of the United States permitting the free entry of wheat into that country on our making it free in this country, and suppose that the Minister of Finance, impressed by the reasons that induced this Government to pass the Order in Council in favour of free wheat, had gone to Washington to secure for Canada that benefit; discussing the matter with the Secretary of State of the United States he would say: we do not wish to arrange for the free admission of a large number of articles, but we would like to make an arrangement for free wheat, wheat flour, and semolina, but it must be understood that each country is to be absolutely free to repeal this legislation whenever it thinks it in the interest of its own people. Had this been done, in what respect would it have been different from that which has been done to-day? When these gentlemen were confronted with this problem did they draw up an Order in Council having no regard to what the United States had done? Not at all. They consulted the statutes of the United States and adopted the very wording of their statute on this subject. They did not even use words broad enough to confer upon the eastern farmer the boon of free bran and shorts from the United States with which to feed his cattle. They did not use the words they might have used, "wheat and wheat products," but they used the words "wheat, wheat flour, and semolina," the very words used in the statute of the United States.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) interrupted me to say that the reciprocity agreement made these products free, but I find that it provided a duty of $2.45 a ton on bran. Will the hon. gentleman explain why the Government of which he was a member did not give the farmers at that time the "boon" of which he speaks?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. gentleman may be correct as to its not being free, but at all events the arrangement made a great reduction.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No reduction, I think—it was 12½ cents per hundred pounds.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Mr. PUGSLEY: I will be glad to have that looked into. It will probably be found that the duty on bran in Canada was equal to that in the United States—it was equalized.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But why was not the "boon" of free bran given?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Perhaps it could not be got at that time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But there was nothing to prevent the Government taking the duty off bran coming into Canada?

Mr. PUGSLEY: To-day my hon. friend has found that the United States has allowed free into that country wheat and all wheat products, because Canada has allowed free entry of wheat, wheat and semolina. Why were these words, "wheat, wheat flour, and semolina," used unless this Government was guided by the statutes of the United States? I doubt very much if the Solicitor General knew what semolina was until he found the name in the United States statute. I frankly confess that I did not.

There is another question I would like to ask: Why did not this Government wait until Parliament opened before it passed this Order in Council? Here is the inauguration of a policy of enormous importance affecting the trade between these two countries. It applies to the most important product of Canada. It is the chief natural product of the two countries and here it is proposed to take advantage of the reciprocal provision—you cannot call it anything else—in the statutes of the United States under which this great product will pass freely between the two countries. This Government, and the party which stands behind it, had, in 1911, told the people of Canada that our great railway systems had been built east and west for the purpose of carrying trade east and west instead of north and south. They had taken the ground that it would bring down the very keystone of the National Policy if this should be adopted. They had taken that ground when, in 1911 it was proposed to make an arrangement with the United States, not an arrangement binding either country for all time but an arrangement which, just like this statutory arrangement could have been repealed at the will of the Parliament or Congress at any time, as clearly appears from the correspondence which took place between the Hon. Mr. Fielding and Secretary Knox. Now, they are proposing to reverse the policy for which they had asked

the approval of the people of Canada. Did they wait until the representatives of the people had gathered in this Parliament from the Western shores of Canada, from the East, from the great provinces of Ontario and Quebec and from other sections of Canada? Did they await to consult Parliament's opinion? Did they even wait to consult their own supporters? No, Sir, instead of doing that they gave them no opportunity of presenting their views, and the views of the people who sent them to this Parliament, but on the 16th April, three days before Parliament re-assembled, behind the backs of the people's representatives, they passed this Order in Council.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is my hon. friend aware that the hon. member for Assiniboia, a year ago, complained that we had not done this very thing by Order in Council?

Mr. GRAHAM: When Parliament was not in session.

Mr. PUGSLEY: We were demanding that this should be done in the interest of the people, of the country and gentlemen on the other side of the House were saying that it was utterly indefensible to do it, that it was contrary to the policy which the people had sustained in 1911, that it would be contrary to the pledge they had made to the people of Canada upon which they secured their support and upon which they relied to get into this Parliament as their representatives that they should do anything of the kind. Why did they not consult their friends? It was because they knew that they would not be likely to support them in caucus. But they know also that when they get a measure passed in Council so that they are committed to it they can rely upon their friends not going back upon them and sustaining them even though it is with many heartburnings. The Government perhaps felt a greater degree of confidence in getting support after the order was passed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Did the hon. gentleman consult caucus in 1911 on the reciprocity pact?

Mr. PUGSLEY: In 1911?—yes.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, and it was submitted to, and had to meet with the approval of Parliament before becoming law. By the terms of the letters which passed between the two negotiators it was expressly stated that it should be submitted both to the Parliament of this country and to the Congress of the United States before it should go into effect. Our Government would not have so defied public opinion as to enter into an arrangement of that kind except it was subject to the approval of Parliament.

Was there any great urgency? Can you think of any urgency that there was? It was the 16th of April. The wheat had practically all passed out of the lands of the farmers in the West. We know that in the West the farmer threshes his grain in November. He gets it to the elevator and markets it just as speedily as he can. There are very few farmers, I venture to say—my hon. friends from the West will correct me if I am wrong—who hold any large quantity of grain in their hands after the first of February, or the first of March, subsequent to the year in which it is harvested. All the elevators are filled with grain. It is largely in the hands of the speculator. Can any one suggest any great object in passing that Order in Council on the 16th of April when Parliament was reassembling on the 19th of April and when their supporters in Parliament should have been consulted before taking that step?

An hon. MEMBER: And the Budget speech had not been delivered.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Budget speech had not been delivered. I venture to say that the people will want to know the reason for this hurried action. I would not charge that it was intended to put money into the hands of these sepeculators for the reason that it would raise the price of wheat and would make a product which they had bought from the farmers at from 75 cents to $1.25 a bushel very largely worth from $2.25 to $2.40 a bushel. I would not suggest anything of the kind. What, then, was the reason for it? Why not wait until Parliament and the people's representatives could be taken into the confidence of hon. gentlemen? Parliament is the great council room of the nation. It is the place where the people, through their representatives, ought to be informed as to these questions and consulted in regard to actions of this nature which the Government propose to take. But, no Sir, they passed it through without first consulting their own supporters.

Now, my hon. friend the Solicitor General makes the statement that the Deputy Minister of Justice says that this Order in Council has the effect of legislation. I am glad that my hon. friend and I are in

accord as to the effect of the Order in Council. The Order in Council has exactly the same force and effect as if it had been made part of the statute. There is no doubt about that. That is the way that it is construed always.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It has the force of any statute.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It has the force of any statute on which it is based.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of any statute.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Of any statute on which it is based. It is like the rules made under a judicature Act. These Orders in Council are not unknown at all, they are not unusual and they are not unique in character. Take a statute providing for a judicature Act; in England and wherever a judicature act has been passed, the Legislature has given to the Supreme Court the power to make rules which have the force of the statute just the same as if they were enacted in the judicature Act itself. So, in regard to boards of health; every board of health act provides that the provincial board of health may make rules and regulations which have the force of law just as if they were enacted by statute. In England and in this country you will find numbers of statutes which are passed giving to certain bodies, sometimes to the Governor in Council, sometimes to another public body, power to make orders or rules and regulations which are to have the force of law. Now, Sir, these rules and these orders are what are known as subordinate legislation. But, Sir, they must depend for their validity and their endurance must depend upon the basic Statute upon which they are founded and for the carrying out of which these different parties are given power to make such orders. Take the case of a Board of Health which is created and power given to it to make regulations which are to have the force of law just as if they were enacted in the Statute creating the Board of Health. But that Board of Health is to last three years, the Act creating it is to come to an end in three years. Would it be argued that when the Board of Health goes out of existence as the result of the expiry of the temporary Statute that the regulations would still stand and that they could still be enforced?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The effect of them would stand.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not at all.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: Anything done under them would stand.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There are two kinds of Statutes known to the law, as my hon. friend knows. One of them is what is known as a perpetual Statute and the other a temporary Statute or Act. A perpetual Act is one to which there is no limitation. While it can be repealed at any time by Act of Parliament, it is known as a perpetual Act. You will find that distinction in all text books. Now this War Measures Act happens to be a temporary Act. My hon. friend has not called attention to that. He has spoken of this as if it were like any other Statute; it is called the War Measures Act but he treats it as though it were like any other Act. Some parts of it are perpetual but some parts and the most vital are temporary and are to expire at the termination of the war.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

The House in Committee on Private Bills, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Bill No. 8, to incorporate the Bishop of Mackenzie River—Mr. R. B. Bennett—in committee.

On section 1—incorporation:

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the hon. gentleman explain the Bill?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: It is a Bill in the usual terms for the incorporation of the Bishop of Mackenzie River, who happens to live without the bounds of the province. It involves nothing contentious in any sense. The Private Bills Committee made the necessary amendments to make it conform to other Bills of a similar nature.

Mr. GRAHAM: Does the hon. member know what the amendments are?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Merely verbal.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—investments:

Mr. PUGSLEY: I see that the corporation may invest its funds and moneys in first mortgages on freehold property.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Corporations of that character in western Canada have in

many instances found it advisable to invest what little funds they have in productive mortgages rather than in other forms of securities, and that power has been granted by the provinces. The only reason why this Act is before the committee is because the corporation is in the unorganized territory of the Dominion. Otherwise the matter would be dealt with by the provinces.

Mr. GRAHAM: The stock in which they invest has to pay a dividend of three years?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Last year similar legislation was passed in respect of a Catholic corporation in the northern country.

Section agreed to.

On section 6—lands conveyed in certain deeds, letters patent, etc., vested in corporation:

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The power of vesting property would not belong to this Parliament were it not for the fact that the district concerned is outside of organized territory. There is no doubt as to the right of Parliament to exercise that power.

Mr. GRAHAM: If this Parliament did not do it, no power could.

Section agreed to. Bill reported.

Bill No. 14, respecting the Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited, and to authorize it to change its name to "United Grain Growers, Limited."—Mr. Bradbury—in committee.

On section 1—power to change name:

Mr. STEELE: This Bill went through the Private Bills Committee without amendment except one slight change in clause 3.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—head office and other places of business:

Mr. STEELE: There was a slight amendment to that clause. After the words "place or places" in the second last line the words "in Canada" were inserted.

Section agreed to.

On section 6—grouping of shareholders in local societies based on territorial districts:

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: This had better stand until the member for Selkirk comes. It is an important section.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I would suggest that it stand. This section seems to have some unusual feature, and I think it should be explained to the committee.

Section stands. Progress reported.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 25, to incorporate the British American Telephone and Telegraph Company.—Mr. Jameson.

Bill No. 31, respecting The Cariboo, Barkerville and Willow River Railway Company.—Mr. Stevens.

PRIVILEGE.

STATEMENT BY HON. GEORGE GRAHAM AS TO INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. GRAHAM: Might I ask the indulgence of the House to complete a statement that I made yesterday, by reading a telegram?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That can be done only with the consent of the House.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If any one objects, the hon. member is out of order. I have no objection.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I have no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM: The telegram reads:

Montreal, April 27, 1917.

Hon. George P. Graham,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

Referring to Mr. Bennett's statement and your denial respecting an alleged agreement of the late Governmtnt to hand over the Intercolonial Railway to the Canadian Northern Railway, a press report represents Mr. Bennett as having said in the House of Commons yesterday that if you (Graham) would consult the former Minister of Finance, you would find that the capital value was fixed, the rate of interest on this capital agreed upon and the term of years of the agreement fixed. I desire to give this statement the most unqualified contradiction. I never saw or heard of such an agreement. I never had any negotiation or discussion with anybody representing the Canadian Northern Railway Company respecting transfer of the Intercolonial Railway.

(Signed) W. S. Fielding.

PRIVILEGE.

STATEMENT BY MR. J. H. BURNHAM.

Mr. BURNHAM: With the consent of the House—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. The House will now resume the adjourned debate.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend (Mr. Graham) having brought to the attention of the House a matter that can be

dealt with only by consent, possibly members will be willing to extend similar indulgence to the hon. member for Peterborough, who, I understand, desires to make a brief statement.

Mr. GRAHAM: As this is Friday night, if the statement is not made now, there will be no opportunity to make it until next week. We, on this side of the House, have no objection to the hon. gentleman's making a statement.

Mr. BURNHAM: I wish to rise to a question of privilege. On Thursday evening, the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), as appears by Hansard, spoke regarding my remarks on venereal diseases. I wish to say that my reference was to the question of venereal diseases and the war at large, and not to any specific army, as a perusal of the reporter's notes will show. I have re-read the reporter's notes and find no instance of the use of the word "Canadian" by me in that connection, but simply a reference to Canada's possibly being in danger after the war, meaning, of course, to refer to immigration, although I did not use the word "immigration."

THE BUDGET.

Consideration of the proposed motion of Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance) for the Committee of Ways and Means, and of the amendment of Mr. Turriff thereto, resumed.

Hon. Mr. PUGSLEY (resuming): Before the House rose at six o'clock, I was proceeding to argue that this Order in Council was of a temporary character. It is in the nature of temporary war legislation, and the Solicitor General and myself both agreed—in fact, he was rather pleased, as he thought, to convince me of his assertion, but I did not require any convincing because it was absolutely clear law that any subordinate legislation which any body, whether the Governor in Council or a Board of Health, or any similar body has the power to make, has the same effect as if it had been enacted by Statute.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I said was "in any statute."

Mr. PUGSLEY: I said, if the order had been included in the Statute of 1914, in section 6, it would necessarily expire at the termination of the war. My hon. friend dealt with the matter this afternoon as if the War Measures Act were a permanent measure. I stated that there are some clauses in it which are of a permanent character and the effect of which may be spoken of as perpetual, whereas there are other clauses— and the most important clauses so far as the present question is concerned— which are of a temporary character. I would call the attention of hon. members to the War Measures Act, from which they will see that I am correct in that statement. This Act was passed on the 27th of August, 1914. First is the citation:

> This Act may be cited as The War Measures Act, 1914.

Then by section 2, it provides:

> All Acts and things done or omitted to be done prior to the passing of this Act and on or after the first day of August, A.D. 1914, by or under the authority of or ratified by,—
> (a) His Majesty the King in Council;
> (b) any Minister or officer of His Majesty's Imperial Government;
> (c) the Governor in Council;
> (d) any Minister or officer of the Government of Canada;
> (e) any other authority or person;
> which, had they been done or omitted after the passing of this Act, would have been authorised by this Act or by orders or regulations hereunder, shall be deemed to have been done or omitted under the authority of this Act, and are hereby declared to have been lawfully done or omitted.

That, of course, has no application to the present question. Then it is provided by section 3:

> The provisions of sections 6, 10, 11 and 13 of this Act shall only be in force during war, invasion, or insurrection, real or apprehended.

Sections 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 12 are in the nature of perpetual legislation. Now, it is under the 6th section, which is declared to be temporary and to remain in force only during the war, that this Order in Council was passed. Section 6 says:—

> 6. The Governor in Council shall have power to do and authorize such acts and things, and to make from time to time such orders and regulations as he may by reason of the existence of real or apprehended war, invasion or insurrection deem necessary or advisable for the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada; and for greater certainty, but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing terms, it is hereby declared that the powers of the Governor in Council shall extend to all matters coming within the classes of subjects hereinafter enumerated, that is to say:—
> (a) Censorship and the control and suppression of publications, writings, maps, plans, photographs, communications and means of communication;
> (b) arrest, detention, exclusion and deportation;
> (c) control of the harbours, ports and territorial waters of Canada and the movements of vessels;

(d) transportation by land, air, or water, and the control of the transport of persons and things;

Next is the clause under which this Order was passed.

(e) trading, exportation, importation, production and manufacture;
(f) appropriation, control, forfeiture and disposition of property and of the use thereof.

To make my argument at this point clearer, let me ask, if this Order in Council is to have the same effect as a statute what would have been the effect if, instead of paragraph (e), which gives authority to make Orders in Council relating to trading, exportation, importation, production and manufacture, the Act had declared that wheat, wheat products and semolina should be placed on the free list? I admit that the Order in Council is just as strong as would have been a clause to that effect in the Act, but in that case it would, of course, come under section 6 and, by section 3, section 6 is to be in force only during the war. Therefore, unquestionably, if, instead of the Order in Council passed by the Governor in Council under the authority of section 6, Parliament had exercised this authority itself, its effect would cease at the end of the war. Now, the question is, does the Order in Council have a more extensive operation than the section of the statute on which it is founded? I submit not. It is merely subordinate legislation which Parliament, instead of enacting itself, has given authority to the Governor in Council to enact. As I have said, it is similar to the case of boards of health established by provincial legislatures and given power to make regulations. If the Act establishing the board of health is temporary in its character the moment the time arrives when the Act becomes inoperative then ipso facto any orders or regulations made by the board of health cease to have any effect. If there can be found in the statute itself any evidence of an intention on the part of Parliament that any Act which was done by Order in Council should remain in operation after the Act itself went out of force, then a court would construe it as being the intention of Parliament that it should be so continued in operation after the Act had terminated, but under the authorities there must be a clear intention on the part of Parliament that anything which is done shall continue in force after the Act has ceased to operate. My hon. friend the Solicitor General said, "If the suggestion of hon. gentlemen opposite is correct, how would it be with regard to the Ross Rifle factory? The Government has expropriated that property; suppose they should not pay for the property until after the war ceases, would the property revert back to the Ross Rifle Company?" Well, Parliament had that in view, and by section 7, which is of the nature of perpetual legislation, provides that the Government shall pay for any property that has been expropriated. Parliament realized that if all the sections of the Act were to be of the same temporary character as sections 6, 10, 11 and 13 there might be cases where grave injustice would be done, and section 7, therefore, provides:—

Whenever any property or the use thereof has been appropriated by His Majesty under the provisions of this Act, or any order in council, order or regulation made thereunder, and compensation is to be made therefor and has not been agreed upon, the claim shall be referred by the Minister of Justice to the Exchequer Court, or to a Superior or County Court of the province within which the claim arises, or to a judge of any such court.

That section does not end with the war, as do sections 6, 10, 11 and 13. Section 7 provides for the payment of any property which has been expropriated under the temporary Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does not my hon. friend see that Section 7 simply provides the means for paying for the factory? It does not affect the point at all. If what my hon. friend says is correct, the title would revert back to the Ross Rifle Company after the war. Section 7 makes no provision of that kind whatever.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Anything that has been completed while the temporary Act is in force is carried to a conclusion and becomes effective.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is completed.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Parliament may have taken the property, but not have paid for it before the end of the war, and to meet such a case, Parliament provides the means of paying for the property even after the war has come to an end; section 7 was passed for that purpose. But, as I have said, section 6, under which this Order in Council was passed, is temporary in its character, and ends immediately on the conclusion of the war. It has very often happened that a question has arisen as to the effect of a temporary Act, and there is one important case referred to in a very valuable book entitled Craie's Statute Law, which is based upon Hardcastle, an authority of the very greatest merit. In this text book a

case will be found where a question arose as to whether a temporary Act had the effect of repealing a franchise under which certain tolls were collected, or whether it merely suspended the operation of the franchise. The court held that it would depend upon what was the apparent intention as expressed by the Act of Parliament. In one case it was provided that the temporary Act should continue for a certain period of time and until the close of the then next session of Parliament, and the court was convinced that the intention of Parliament in passing the temporary Act was that, at its expiration application should be made to Parliament to deal with the matter. The court held that as the intention was that application should be made to Parliament, the franchise was repealed. It is always a question, no matter whether the Act deals with regulations, tolls or anything else provided for by another Act, whether the latter Act is simply suspended in its operations, or repealed.

There is not a line or a word in this statute from which it could be inferred that Parliament had any intention of continuing sections 6, 10, 11, and 13 or anything done under these sections one day beyond the termination of the war. If that be so, this subordinate legislation, this Order in Council, must end with the basic legislation upon which it is founded. It certainly could not have been intended by Parliament to give a subordinate body, which is what the Governor in Council is, greater power than that which is exercised by Parliament itself. Parliament in this legislation is dealing with temporary matters, it is enacting that which it is desirable to enact because of the exigencies of war. Had the provisions of this Order in Council been enacted directly by Parliament as part of section 6, instead of as subordinate legislation by Order in Council under that section, it would have come to an end with the war. The Solicitor General admitted that—he was obliged to do so. As the authorities show that subordinate legislation is to be construed as if it were contained in the basic Act itself, and as this section of the statute comes to an end with the war, the Order in Council based upon it cannot have a longer life. On this point I will refer to this same authority, Craies. At page 262 he gives examples of what in England are called "statutory rules"—subordinate legislation having the force of law. He says:

> The most salient examples of statutory rules are the Rules of the Supreme Court (including the Crown Office Rules), the County Court Rules, the Summary Jurisdiction Rules, the Regulations to Prevent Collisions at Sea, and many, if not most, Orders in Council.

There is nothing sacred about an Order in Council any more than about a regulation made by any other authority given power by statute to make it. Craies further says:

> Under certain statutes it is directed—
>
> (1) That Orders in Council, etc., made under the statute are to have the same effect as if enacted therein; or
>
> (2) That rules when made are to lie on the tables of both Houses of Parliament for a certain time; or
>
> (3) That the validity of the order, etc., shall not be judicially questioned.
>
> The case of Institute of Patent Agents v. Lockwood suggests that in the first of these cases "the proper canon of construction is to read the original Act and the subordinate legislation together as if they were one Act and were to be construed together;" and it is submitted that the same rule applies to cases (2) and (3).

Thus, when a statute gives authority to any body or person, whether the Governor in Council, or a board of health, or a court, any order made under that statute is to be constructed with the statute on which it is founded, and when, by effluxion of time, the statute becomes of no effect, the order made in pursuance of it and based upon it also comes to an end. That is subject always to this consideration—that if Parliament has clearly shown an intention that the subordinate legislation is to continue after the expiration of the statute, the courts will give effect to it. In cases where a temporary Act suspends the operation of a franchise or the levying of tolls, then, when the temporary Act expires, the statute whose operation was by it suspended ipso facto comes into force again, just as before the temporary Act was passed.

That nothing can be done under a temporary Act after it expires has been established in a number of cases. There is one rather interesting case to be found in Craies at page 338. Mr. O'Connell was charged with an offence under a temporary Act. When brought to trial he pleaded guilty. But he was not punished, and many thought that this was because of political pressure having been brought to bear. But when inquiry was made it was found that, though he had been tried and had pleaded guilty during the continuance of the temporary Act, afterwards that temporary Act had expired before sentence and there was thus no power to sentence him.

I have spoken of instances in which Parliament has clearly made provision that

subordinate legislation shall continue in effect after the temporary statute on which it is based has come to an end. But there is nothing of that kind in this Act. On the contrary, you have the strongest evidence that the intention of Parliament was the very opposite. Power is given to the Governor in Council to make, unmake, repeal, or vary these Orders in Council. That shows clearly that Parliament never intended that when subordinate legislation was enacted under this law it should be permanent

That is a reasonable consideration. Parliament said, as it now must be presumed to have intended, that amongst the powers relating to trade and commerce as a war measure it may be deemed advisable to take the duty off wheat, wheat flour and semonila and other articles during the war. How reasonable it is that it should be done by way of suspending the customs duties act during the war. That is the effect, as I have said, speaking as a general thing, of all temporary acts which in any way relate to duties or customs or franchises under which certain tolls, charges or duties, may be collected. In addition to that view being in accordance with the authorities, it seems to me that it is a reasonable view to take because Parliament, if it intended to give authority as the Solicitor General contends—a position which is doubted by my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) but which it is not now material to discuss—but if Parliament intended to give authority during the war to have these articles transferred to the free list, everybody can see that to suspend the customs duties in the meantime would have been the most effective and most reasonable way to carry that into effect and, under the authorities, that would be effected under this temporary statute. It would not be a repeal of the customs law in these particulars but it would be the suspension of the operation of the Customs Act during the pendency of the temporary Act, and when the temporary Act ceased to be operative, suspension would cease and the customs duties would again come into force. If I am right in that view it sustains the position that was taken by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) which he said he took upon the advice of a legal gentleman possessing a good knowledge of the law. I have no idea who the gentleman was who so advised him but, if my opinion had been asked, I certainly would have felt bound to give the same opinion to the hon. member for Assiniboia as that gentleman did.

As far as the statement of the Deputy Minister of Justice is concerned, I submit that his opinion in no way differs from the view which I have presented. Evidently he steers clear of the issue. He knows what the Minister of Finance wants and he does not want to give the Minister of Finance a wrong opinion, but if he can satisfy the minister without giving him a direct opinion he is not averse to doing so.

Mr. BURNHAM: If the Government advance a certain opinion they are certainly denying the contrary but when the hon. gentleman finds a certain section demonstrating that this Government can do a certain thing would he interpret it as being intended to prevent them from doing that thing?

Mr. GRAHAM: Put it on the Statute Books so that there would be no mistake.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If I were in power I would say absolutely that I would feel bound to take the position that this is a temporary Act, and that the customs duties would at its termination come into force. The temporary Act expires when the war terminates and the customs duties again become operative. The Deputy Minister of Justice says that the order has the effect of legislation—we all admit that—of subordinate legislation—and then he says that these duties are removed by this temporary Act, which, of course, is entirely consistent with the position I take that they are temporarily removed, and that they can only come into operation again by the authority of Parliament. And he says that wheat, wheat flour and semolina will remain free unless fresh duties be imposed by or under the authority of Parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Read the whole of the last sentence, please.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I will read it.

> Therefore, I am of opinion that the Order in Council became effective as from its date permanently to remove the duty imposed by the present customs tariff on wheat, wheat flour and semolina and that these products accordingly become free of customs duty, and will remain free unless fresh duties be imposed by or under the authority of Parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What does "permannently" mean?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Upon reading it again I am inclined to think that Mr. Newcombe

must mean permanently. The idea I had before was that it was until the duties were reimposed under the authority of Parliament, but the word "permanently" would rather indicate that Mr. Newcombe's opinion is that it is permanent, and I should be disposed to leave it at that.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is the pride of members of the legal profession that they admit at once when they make an error, and I gladly admit that I misinterpreted Mr. Newcombe. But, while I have great respect for Mr. Newcombe's opinion, I am inclined to think that there has been a failure to call his attention to the authority of Hardcastle and Craies, because these authorities are absolutely clear that when an Act temporary in its character prevents the collection of duties and tolls and the exercise of franchises, that Act, at the end of the time when it is declared that it shall be in operation, shall cease to be in force, and, ipso facto, the ancient franchise will be restored and the tolls or duties provided by statute will go into force again unless there is an expression of a clear intention on the part of Parliament to the contrary.

Supposing I should be in error as to this, then there is the other fact which cannot by any possibility be gotten over, that the Governor in Council is expressly given by this statute the power to revoke this order at any time during the war. They cannot do it afterwards because the authority ends with the war. Under section 6 they have authority to revoke it at any time during the war. These are the words contained in section 6, sub-section 2, the statute under which this order is passed, and they are as clear as language can be:

> All orders and regulations made under this section shall have the force of law and shall be enforced in such manner and by such courts, officers and authorities, as the Governor in Council may prescribe, and may be varied, extended or revoked by any subsequent order or regulation.

There is the clear authority given by section 6 of this statute, the same statute which, during the war, gives the power to make an order and to enforce it during the war and also the power to revoke it. There is no question about that. That shows that the order is temporary in its character. It shows that if the Government should desire to do so, they might, behind the back of the public and behind the backs of members of this Parliament, in secret session, in council, at any time, revoke this order and restore the duties on wheat, wheat flour and semolina under the Customs Act.

So that whether its temporary character is ensured by the fact that that Act is temporary and will expire at the termination of the war, or whether it is temporary in its character because, without reference to Parliament, the Governor in Council has the power, to-morrow or at any time it pleases to do so, to revoke this Order and to place these products again under a duty, the argument which is made by the gentleman who moved the amendment and those who support it from this side of the House in favour of placing these products on the free list by Act of Parliament and so doing away with its temporary character, takes on the greatest possible force. Can anybody dispute that? And if any one were to pay attention to the argument of the Solicitor General to-day I should say there would be the greatest possible danger, if that hon. gentleman can carry weight with Council, that the Order may be revoked very soon, and particularly in view of the fact that we had not a full Cabinet Council in Canada when the Order was passed. The Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), another important minister representing a Manitoba constituency, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers), and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) were all absent; indeed, I think even the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) was away at the time; so that four very important members of the Cabinet were absent. Now, what may happen a little later on, when, perhaps, a different view may prevail? The Solicitor General, if any weight is to be given to his argument to-day, has endeavoured to convince this House and this country that he and his colleagues were right in the view which they took a year ago, when they stood up in this House and voted against free wheat. His argument is along these lines, and I am sorry to say that his argument places the Solicitor General and this Government in the rather unenviable position of bringing down an Order in Council which they do not believe will be in the public interest, if we may credit what they say. Because what is the fact, and what does the Solicitor General say when you boil it down? He says, as a last reason why this Order should have been passed, that while he thinks that a majority of the whole people of Canada would be against it, yet out in the West, through the act of these dreadful Grits, through their repeated agitation,

they have really convinced the people out there that free wheat would be in the interest of the country; the majority of the people of Canada do not believe that, but the people in the West, these poor easily misguided farmers, have been persuaded by Grit speakers on the platform and in this House, and it is not desirable, particularly when an election is at hand, to have any large section of the people dissatisfied.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Election?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, that is the effect of what the hon. gentleman says.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What election?

Mr. GRAHAM: Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What does it mean? It means that upon a great question, a question of the trade relations between these two great countries involving the greatest natural products of both countries, upon a great question upon which the Conservative party came into power in 1911, upon which they asked the people to give them their support and their confidence, and upon which they succeeded in getting a majority of the representatives of the people, the hon. gentleman in effect says: Notwithstanding all that, notwithstanding our position at that time and ever since upon the trade question, notwithstanding that we have asked our followers to stand up in this House and vote down resolutions of a similar character in the past, and although I thought then we were right and I think still we were right, yet for fear that we shall lose some Conservative support out in western Canada, we are going to swallow our principles and give to these dreadful Grits what they have been asking for.

Mr. GRAHAM: It hurts but we are going to do it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I should like to read this Order in Council. I think it is the most unique document ever presented to Parliament, particularly coming from a Government that thinks it was unwise to pass it, particularly coming from a Government whose Solicitor General has eagerly searched the newspapers from day to day in order to present to this Parliament evidence that it was unwise to pass it, that instead of having the effect of increasing the price of wheat it has really lowered the price of wheat.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No I did not, not at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Let me read it Mr. Speaker:

> At the Government House, Ottawa, Monday, the 16th day of April, 1917. Present: His Excellency the Governor General in Council.
>
> Whereas the Minister of Finance reports that certain conditions arising out of the war seriously affect prices obtainable in Canada for wheat, especially of the lower grades—

And, Sir, bear in mind that that was passed at a time when Canadian wheat was quoted at $2.20 per bushel. On the 16th day of April, the very day when this Order in Council was passed, wheat was quoted at more than $2.20, and yet the minister says:—

> Whereas the Minister of Finance reports that certain conditions arising out of the war seriously effect prices obtainable in Canada for wheat, especially of the lower grades—

Now, you see, that is rather put on the ground that it is owing to the low prices of wheat that they have been brought to the serious consideration of the passing of this Order. Wheat was only 2.29½ when this Order was passed. Why, what sympathetic consideration the Minister of Finance must have for the farmers of Canada when he will violate every principle which has animated him for the last five years on this trade question, when he recognizes that he got into this Parliament upon the cry of "No truck or trade with the Yankees." How tremendously he must have been overwhelmed by the low price of wheat, $2.29 a bushel, when he sat down to write this recommendation to Council. He says:

> Whereas in normal times there exists a good commercial export demand for milling purposes from Great Britain and the Continent for wheat of all grades—

Now Sir, what are meant by normal times? They would be times of peace, would they not? And what is the highest price of wheat in times of peace? Not one dollar a bushel and in normal times the minister would do nothing for the farmers, when the farmers were getting only one dollar a bushel.

9 p.m.

Mr. GRAHAM: Less.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Less than a dollar a bushel. In 1915 it was only ninety cents a bushel.

> Whereas in normal times there exists a good commercial export demand for milling purposes from Great Britain and the Continent for wheat of all grades—

There was no necessity of doing anything for the farmer when wheat was at the price it was in normal times, ninety cents per bushel.

And whereas this demand has for some time past almost entirely ceased on account of shortage of ocean shipping due to submarine warfare, practically all available tonnage being required to transport grain of the higher grades and flour made therefrom, purchased in Canada and the United States by the British and Allied Governments for their respective needs.

One would suppose that, getting as they do a price 100 per cent more than they ever got before or even dreamed of getting in normal times, the farmers would not have found it a very great hardship to pay the duty upon the lower grades of wheat going into the United States. Even then they would not do too badly as compared with their condition in normal times, when their appeals never touched the hearts of members of this Government. This order proceeds:

And whereas in consequence of this condition wheat is being exported to the United States market for sale there, notwithstanding the customs duty payable thereon under the provisions of the United States tariff.

So it is in consequence of the fact that the farmers are getting $2.29 a bushel for their high grade wheat and that they are sending their lower grade wheat to the United States and paying duty thereon, that the attention of the Minister of Finance is directed to this most important and most disturbing question. So they would have us believe, by this beautiful Order in Council.

Mr. GRAHAM: Disorder in Council.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They must get this thing through quickly before Parliament reassembles, and they make inquiries from the Grain Commissioners. The order recites:

And whereas from inquiries recently made from the Board of Grain Commissioners for Canada and other authentic sources the Minister of Finance is satisfied that the prices now prevailing in Canada for wheat, particularly of the lower grades, are, owing to the cause above mentioned, much lower than the prices obtained therefor in the United States.

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Mr. PUGSLEY: "Much lower than the prices obtained therefor in the United States."

Mr. GRAHAM: Who admits that?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The farmers are getting, as I said before, $2.29 for wheat of the higher grade, and they are selling large quantities in the United States, paying duty of 10 cents a bushel. Then the order proceeds:

In fact, there are strong grounds for the belief that advantage is being taken of the situation to maintain prices of the said grades at figures lower than are warranted by general market conditions, and from information at hand it appears that there still remains a large amount of last year's Canadian crop unmarketed.

And whereas it is desirable at a time when a special appeal is being made for increased agricultural production to supply grain and foodstuffs to Great Britain and her Allies, which now include the United States of America, that the Canadian farmer should feel that he will obtain the best market prices obtainable for product of his industry.

But the Government having waited until April 16, after the cropping season is opened, the farmer will not be able to avail himself of this order so as to enlarge his crop during the present year. If my information is correct, the people whose unfortunate financial condition appeals to the Minister of Finance and his colleagues are the speculators who months ago bought up the wheat from the farmers and have it stored in the elevators all the way from Calgary to Montreal and Quebec. The order proceeds:

And whereas, the Minister of Finance is of the opinion that it is in the circumstances advisable that such action should be taken which would give to Canadian wheat free access to the markets of the United States—

Now the minister is beginning to talk upon broad principles.

Mr. MACDONALD: He was against that.

Mr. GRAHAM: One year ago.

Mr. MACDONALD: That is when he began to be against it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How pitiable it is that when we come near the time that we have to face the electors, our principles are scattered to the dust. "In the circumstances." In what circumstances? In the circumstances that Western wheat to-day is 100 per cent higher than it has ever been in the history of the country. (Reading):

It is in the circumstances advisable that such action should be taken which will give to Canadian wheat free access to the markets of the United States in lieu of the commercial markets in Great Britain and on the European continent.

In lieu of them! A man is sometimes appointed to a position in lieu of somebody that is dead. The minister is now going to

seek the American market in lieu of the European market. He goes on:

In lieu of the commercial markets in Great Britain and on the European continent, formerly available under the conditions then existing, and, with this object in view, he directs the attention of His Excellency to certain provisions of the Customs Tariff of the United States.

Have you not, Sir, often heard the Prime Minister and other members of the Government, speaking in this House of the reciprocal statutory arrangement which was to be made under the negotiations between Mr. Fielding and the Secretary of State of the United States, assert in tones of thunder that we should legislate in the interests of Canada independently of what the Congress of the United States might do in the way of legislation? And yet the Finance Minister calls the attention of His Excellency to certain provisions of the United States tariff. He goes on to say:

By item 644 thereof wheat, wheat flour, semolina, and other wheat products, shall be entered free of duty from countries which do not impose a duty on wheat or wheat flour or semolina imported from the United States; otherwise the duty upon wheat is fixed at ten cents per bushel, and upon wheat flour at forty-five cents per barrel, and upon semolina and other products of wheat ten per centum ad valorem.

Mr. MACDONALD: Read that again, to make sure that you are quoting the United States tariff.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I will read it again, because it seems hardly possible that the Minister of Finance should quote the United States tariff. The Minister of Finance actually points out to His Excellency the Governor General, that the United States has made a statutory offer to this Government to admit wheat, wheat flour, semolina and other wheat products into the United States free of duty if the Canadian people through their executive authority or their Parliament will place them on the free list. Is there any negotiation there? None, my hon. friend says. Is it not this, that when this legislation has gone into effect under the authority of the Order in Council, the admission of the products of the one country into the other is dependent upon the reciprocal legislation which these two countries have passed? How different is that from the arrangement of 1911, except as to the number of articles which were to be admitted under reciprocal legislation?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is the same thing.

Mr. PUGSLEY: These hon. gentlemen have said that they want no entangling alliances with the country to the south of us. In 1911 it was agreed that there should be no entangling alliances; it was agreed that each Parliament should be free and independent to legislate at any time to alter the duty in any way that might be thought in the best interest of its people. So, to-day, this Parliament is free; so to-day the Congress of the United States is free. Both cases are exactly similar. As I have said, there is not the slightest difference except as to the number of articles which were in the reciprocal arrangement of 1911 and the number in the reciprocal arrangement which you have to-day. What did my hon. friend do? Did he have no truck or trade with the Yankees? Did he not, the moment this Order in Council was passed, send a copy of it to the United States consul, so that he could inform the authorities at Washington that Canada would allow wheat, wheat flour and semolina to enter the United States free of duty? Then the Order in Council says:—

And whereas, if Canada should place wheat, wheat flour and semolina on the free list, our wheat and wheat products would gain free entry to the markets of the United States.

For the last six years you have said that Canada is going to legislate in her own interest; that Canada is to have no truck or trade with the Yankees that Canada is not going to base her fiscal policy on that of the United States. It is, however, put forward to His Excellency as a reason for placing these articles on the free list, not that that is to be of any advantage to the Canadian people, but that thereby we will get free entry into the great American market for the wheat and wheat products. Then the Order in Council says:—

And whereas it is desirable, in the national interest that, for the reasons stated above, free access should be obtained to the markets of the United States for Canada's wheat.

Not for Canada's low grade of wheat, not for this wheat that it is said we cannot sell to anybody else, but for Canada's wheat, her Manitoba hard, everything, all kinds of wheat. This Order in Council says, under the guiding hand of him who was once a strong Liberal, under the teachings which he had, in years gone by, when he was taught to believe it was desirable that Canadians should be given access to all the markets possible, and that there should be the greatest freedom possible in trading between these two great countries—under the guidance of the Minister of Finance, be-

cause it is he that makes this report, not the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Acting Premier—

Mr. GRAHAM: Not the Solicitor General.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No, it is not the Solicitor General, but the Minister of Finance, who says:—

> And whereas it is desirable in the national interest that, for the reasons stated above, free access should be obtained to the markets of the United States for Canada's wheat. Therefore, His Excellency the Governor General in Council, under the authority of the War Measures Act, 1914, section 6—

This temporary section, which expires when the war ends.

> —is pleased to order and it is hereby ordered that wheat, wheat flour and semolina be transferred to the list of goods which may be imported into Canada free of duty or customs.

The minister says that this is desirable in the national interests for reasons stated above. In view of the allegation that it is, as we on this side say that it was, that it has been for the last six years, and that it always has been, in the national interest that there should be a free exchange of wheat and wheat products between these two countries, what are the reasons that animate this Government in advising His Excellency that Canadian wheat should have free access to the United States? One is that a large amount of tonnage of wheat goes to the United States for shipment to Europe. I do not see that that would be any reason, because wheat could go into the United States under the law as it was before this Order in Council was passed, simply on the payment of the customs duty for bond, I think, of about one cent a bushel, or it may be even less than that. I have here a communication from the Secretary of the Board of Trade at Quebec. This is a public document, copies of which have probably been sent to other members of Parliament. It is dated the 14th of April, and says:

> I would draw your attention to the following questions specially dealt with in this report:
>
> 1. The alarming diversion of the grain trade of the Canadian Northwest to the United States ports. Notwithstanding the sacrifices made by Canada in building three transcontinental railways, 181 million bushels of our grain went to New York and other United States ports for shipment in 1916, as against 131 million bushels to points in Canada, for consumption as well as for export, of which 40 million bushels subsequently went to Portland.

If the Quebec Board of Trade is right, then 221,000,000 bushels of Canadian grain during the last year went through the United States to United States ports, as against 91,000,000 bushels that went to points in Canada for consumption as well as for export. Yet this is one of the actual conditions existing at this time which have induced the Minister of Finance to tell to His Excellency that it would be in the national interest that all restrictions should be taken away from the importation of wheat into the United States. Another circumstance is that the lower grade wheat cannot be marketed in Canada, and vast quantities of it—and that would seem to be borne out by the report of the Board of Trade—are marketed in the United States, notwithstanding the duty of ten cents per bushel, and—and this is one of the important and convincing circumstances—as at the present time the Canadian farmer is only able to sell under present circumstances his first class wheat at $2.29 per bushel, and is obliged to pay a duty of ten cents a bushel on even inferior grades of wheat imported into the United States, as he is to-day selling vast quantities of wheat in the United States and paying the duty, and as it is desirable to supply all the goods possible to the United Kingdom and her Allies, of which the United States is one—under these circumstances and in the national interest it is desirable to waive the duty and so to secure these wheat and wheat products shall go into the United States free. Have I not given the circumstances just as they are divulged by the Order in Council? If there are any other reasons to be given, tell me what they are. The Solicitor General, in one part of his speech, dwelt upon this fact, that it was desirable to send all the Canadian wheat possible through United States ports so that it would get to the Allies.

The fact that last year this vast quantity of Canadian wheat went into the United States would seem to destroy the argument which the solicitor submitted in that particular. No, Sir, the only justifiable ground upon which it can be put at all, is that this provision ought to be of a permanent character; that in times of war and in times of peace, so far as food products are concerned the tariff wall between the two countries should be torn down and the producers allowed to secure the best markets wherever they can in either one country or the other and the consumers buy at the lowest possible price. In setting forth their reasons hon. gentlemen opposite are deceiving themselves, and they think they can pull

the wool over the eyes of the people of this country, but they will not be able to do it. They have done what they have done, because they have not been able to stand up against the strong expression of opinion from the farmers of the North West. Let them confess that they dare not face the electorate in those constituencies with the tariff wall unremoved, and that in order to secure votes they have sunk the principles upon which they professed to stand here in Parliament, principles to which they asked their supporters in this House and the people of this country to rally. Let hon. gentlemen opposite confess that they have thrown away those principles because they feared that if they did not give the farmers free wheat they would lose a vast number of votes in the North West of people who hitherto had been ranked among their supporters. I am happy myself that these hon. gentlemen are gaining knowledge; they are improving slowly. It is true that we have been hammering away at them for a number of years, as a teacher hammers away at a dull boy to develop his mind. I am only one humble member of this party who has been seeking to instruct hon. gentlemen opposite. They have had good instructors on this side of the House and in a great many people in this country, and they have been learning slowly, and it is not only on this question that they have made progress. I wonder if my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sevigny) is in the House? If I may digress for a moment, I would like to call attention to the wonderful development that has taken place in his intellect in the last few years. I happened to read in the Montreal Star the other night the report of a banquet that was given to my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue at Valleyfield on the 16th of April, the very day, by the way, when this other marvellous intellectual development was manifested in the passing of the Free wheat Order in Council. The Minister of Inland Revenue is reported as follows:

> When, said Mr. Sevigny, only thirty years of age, lacking the experience I acquired later, I declared I was opposed to all contributions by Canada to the wars of the Empire and opposed to a local navy. I won't deny that I committed that error. I frankly admit, etc.

Can you condemn him, Sir, very much for that? He was only thirty years of age when he appealed to the electorate in 1911. It is true that the younger Pitt was Prime Minister of England when he was only twenty-one. But there are not many William Pitts, and perhaps it is not wonderful that this young man was not fully developed intellectually at the youthful age of thirty. He said at the banquet that he had learned much since then. Now that the hon. gentleman has had six years of intellectual growth, and has come to the conclusion that Canada ought to participate in the wars of the Empire, and that we should have a Canadian navy, let me express the hope in all sincerity, and with the best intentions, that he will endeavour to exercise that influence which his ability and high standing and excellent qualities entitle him to exercise; let him have the courage and confidence that should distinguish those who have arrived at intellectual maturity.

Mr. McKENZIE: What did he say at the banquet?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I will read it again as I see the Minister of Inland Revenue has just come in. The Montreal Star gives a report of a very delightful banquet at Valleyfield on the 16th of April at which the Minister of Inland Revenue was present; it says:

> When, said Mr. Sevigny, only thirty years of age, lacking the experience I acquired later, I declared I was opposed to all contributions by Canada to the wars of the Empire and opposed to a local navy. I won't deny that I committed that error. I frankly admit, etc.

I was saying in the absence of my hon. friend that he was only thirty years old when he declared that he was opposed to all contributions by Canada to the wars of the Empire and opposed to a local navy, and that we cannot expect too much of a young man only thirty years old. I was speaking of the delight it gives me to find the Solicitor General and his colleagues developing along intellectual and patriotic lines, which development if carried to a conclusion, must inevitably result in benefit to this country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us how old he was at the various times he changed his political views.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Let me tell my hon. friend that never in my political life did I change my views except upon justifiable grounds, and if the Minister of Finance will tell us what age he was when he performed a similar act,—

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I never tell my age.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If the Minister of Finance tells me that I shall endeavour to tell my age, but I can tell my hon. friend that I never changed my political views except on justifiable grounds, for whenever I appealed to the people to approve of my conduct they never had any hesitation in supporting me, and therefore I feel pretty comfortable so far as my public life is concerned. Let me give just a little attention to the Minister of Inland Revenue; the Solicitor General must not think he is the only pebble on the beach, and try to attract all the attention to himself.

Mr. MACDONALD: How old was he when he changed his views?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I was glad that the Minister of Inland Revenue made the statement he did at that banquet, and I hope that during the short time he will occupy a position in the Cabinet he will be able to influence for the good of his country the gentlemen with whom he has heretofore been associated in the province of Quebec. Yesterday a very deplorable incident took place in this House. We had the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Best) bringing in, without making inquiry as to whether its statements were true or not, an article from a newspaper, which I regret to say, has done a great deal to stir up race and religious feeling in this country. The Solicitor General and the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sevigny) did not call him to task or rebuke him. The Minister of Inland Revenue stated what he would have done if the hon. gentleman had made a motion to adjourn the House, and also said that the outrageous statements in that article were untrue. Let me express the hope that the fact that the Minister of Inland Revenue did not at the time rise in his place and take advantage of his position as a member of the Government to rebuke the hon. member for Dufferin was the result of an oversight, and that the minister will take the earlist opportunity, in caucus, to rebuke hon. gentlemen who are disposed to follow that course, and will use his undoubted influence—

Mr. SEVIGNY: Was the hon. member (Mr. Pugsley) in the House when the statement was read by the hon. member for Dufferin?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Does not he know that at that time I tried to speak and was called to order by the Speaker?

[Sir Thomas White.]

Mr. PUGSLEY: I said that I trusted it was an oversight. I am glad to know that it was because he was prevented from speaking. Let me express the hope, and I do it in all sincerity, that if any of his colleagues are disposed to take the improper and ill-advised course taken by the hon. member for Dufferin he will endeavour to prevent such action in the future.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I am ready to do anything to prevent discord between the two races, but I shall succeed better if the hon. gentleman will stop the Liberal party from campaigning as they did in the county of Dorchester in January last.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Let me tell my hon. friend I am not aware that any hon. member on this side of the House has ever sought to introduce race or religion here. I come from a province in which one-quarter of the people speak the French language —usually they speak English as well, but they are French-speaking. They are among our very best citizens. English-speaking and French-speaking people do business together, they associate together, their children go to the same schools, and they live in the utmost harmony. I think it is greatly to be deplored that there should be found gentlemen who will raise these race and religious issues. I was not able to follow the speech of the hon. gentleman as I should like to have done. I am sorry that I cannot follow French easily, nor understand it perfectly; it would be the greatest delight of my life if I could do so, for I admire the French language as much as I admire the French people. I liked the hon. gentleman's speech, but I think he failed in this, that he did not offer rebuke to the hon. gentleman who followed the course of which I have spoken. It seems to me that if those who have influence would show a disposition to prevent in every way possible the repetition of conduct such as that of the hon. member for Dufferin, the effect could not be other than good.

My hon. friend stated at Valleyfield, that in 1911, when he was only thirty years of age, and his mind was not fully developed, he had opposed a local navy. There is a feeling in this House and in the country that the reason this Government returned the tenders and refused to give a contract for the construction of ten war vessels—cruisers and destroyers—under the Naval Act of 1909, was the pledge which the Minister of Inland Revenue and his associates had exacted that there should be no Canadian navy. Now, after a lapse of

six years, and when his mind has presumably, as he himself says, developed far beyond what it was when he was thirty, he regrets his conduct at that time in opposing a local navy. Let me appeal to him to say to his colleagues, with all the influence which he ought to be able to command as coming from the great province of Quebec, so wealthy and with such a large population, that the time has come when the Government of Canada might well follow the example of Great Britain and the United States and engage with all its resources and all its energies in the building of ships. If he does this he will not only show that he regrets his action in 1911, but he will take the most effective measures to undo the harm done by the pledge which he and his associates exacted from the Conservative party at the elections of 1911. In view of the difficulty which England and her Allies are experiencing in getting foodstuffs, in view of the appeals made by Mr. Balfour to the United States, to send whatever ships they can, whether wooden vessels, cruisers, destroyers, or even tug boats, I say that the greatest crime that any government ever committed against the people was the deliberate determination on the part of this Government not to build ships in Canada. We have lost five or six years, during which great results could have been obtained.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And we have lost prestige.

Mr. PUGSLEY: And we have lost prestige. Incalculable harm has been done to the Empire and to Canada. Let me implore my hon. friend to declare at an end the promise which he is alleged and believed to have exacted from the Prime Minister in 1911; let him declare that the past is forgotten and that we must, even at this late date, begin to do our duty to Canada and the Empire by engaging in the building of ships, not war ships alone, but also commercial vessels.

I was going to read some numerous Orders in Council which have been passed under the War Measures Act rescinding Orders which had been previously made, but I do not think it is necessary to do so because no one can question that this Government to-morrow could revoke that Order in Council and that it is merely temporary in its character. Therefore, I think that the mention of the fact that orders have been passed over and over again repealing previous orders will be sufficient without taking up the time to refer to them.

Before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, let me call your attention for a few minutes to this amendment proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) and which my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) says is wholly political in its character. I would have thought, had it not been for the remarks of the Solicitor General, that it was one of the most inoffensive amendments that was ever presented in this House of Commons by a member of the Opposition. There is not one word in it, not a breath, of want of confidence in this Government in so far as the present is concerned.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think they ought to accept it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: One would think so. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) says that it was not intended as a party resolution at all. It is not intended as a vote of want of confidence. If it were carried by the unanimous vote of this House, even against the Government, we would not ask the Government to resign because it is not a motion of want of confidence. I am authorized by the acting leader of this side of the House to-night to say that the gentlemen who will be called upon, and who will cheerfully, we hope, vote for this resolution, will not be doing it as expressing any want of confidence in the Government in the ordinary sense. Therefore, if they can support this resolution, they can support it in perfect confidence that it will only express what this House ought to express and that no immediate harm can be done to the Government because we must wait until the people have an opportunity of exercising their judgment in reference to their conduct. Let me read it and see just what it says:

> That all the words after the word "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor.

The hon. gentleman says that it contains a great laudation of the Opposition. It does not. It says:

> This House desires to take the earliest opportunity of expressing its pleasure that the Government has at last yielded to the persistent demands of the Grain Growers of the West as frequently set forth by delegations and resolutions of the representatives of the farming interest, and repeatedly voiced by the Liberal party in this House, by placing wheat, wheat flour and semolina on the free list, and thereby securing a free market for wheat and wheat products in the United States.

Is not every word of that true? Is there any objection to be taken to our expressing our gratification that this has been done? We do not take a childish view of this order. We do not want to gain any political kudos from it. We might seek to embarrass the Government, but what we say in effect is that we as members of the Liberal party in this House and in this country have been for years demanding, in the national interest, that wheat and its products be placed on the free list, we have been calling attention to the opportunities for vast growth, development and increased prosperity in our western country if this were done, and we have been urging that it should be done in the interest of Canada. Well, now, should the Government object to our expressing our gratification that they have at last yielded to our demands and the demands of the people of the West and passed this order? The Solicitor General himself has said that everything here is true, because he says in effect that the western farmers kept agitating and agitating, and that the Liberal party helped them during all these years, that the Liberal party egged them on and encouraged them until it got to be so infernally hot that the Tory Government could no longer resist the demand made upon them. Is not that in effect what the Solicitor General said? Why should we not express pleasure that the Government have at last acted upon our suggestion and placed wheat on the free list? That is all we ask you gentlemen to do. Are you not gratified that you have done it? I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, may I ask, through you, Sir, if they are not gratified that they have done it? We are accustomed to see their smiling faces, but, looking at them this afternoon and seeing how glum and solemn they looked while the Solicitor General was giving utterance to his very eloquent, but, it seemed to me, laboriously conceived speech, it indicated that perhaps they were not so gratified as the Government would like to think them to be. But pretend to be; let me appeal to them to look as if they were gratified, to join with us on this side of the House and as a unanimous Parliament, representing the people of this country, let us declare that we are all gratified that at last this great measure of trade freedom has been passed into law, and that hereafter the farmers of our western country can move ahead with hope and confidence in their farming operations towards the realization of Canada's destiny as the granary, the greatest grain-producing country in the world. Let us all join together so that word will go out to the people of the East, to the people in our western country, to the people in the United States who are casting longing eyes on our fertile prairies and who desire to go there and to live and to help to develop the country that they can continue permanently to have this free market of the United States. What a wonderful effect it would have if we could pass this resolution unanimously declaring our satisfaction, our gratification, that the Government have at last passed this Order in Council giving to the people of this country free wheat and free flour! What a glorious thing it would be! Is it possible that for purely partisan purposes the Government will vote down a resolution that reads like that? Well, to go further:

> This House is of the opinion that if the policy of Free Wheat is made permanent it will enormously increase the prosperity of the West and be to the general advantage of the whole Dominion.

Why do you object to our agreeing in the reason which the Minister of Finance has set forth in his order along with the passing of the order? The minister has said that:

> And whereas if Canada should place wheat, wheat flour and semolina upon the free list our wheat and wheat products would gain free entry to the markets of the United States.
>
> And whereas it is desirable in the national interest that, for the reasons stated above, free access should be obtained to the markets of the United States for Canada's wheat.

All we ask you, as supporters of this Government, as members of this House is to join with us in saying that the Finance Minister was absolutely correct when he stated to His Excellency the Governor General that it is desirable in the national interest that free access should be obtained to the markets of the United States for Canadian wheat. Are you going to vote that down? Are you going to vote down a resolution couched almost in the very words of the Order in Council that you yourselves have passed?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If it is in the words of the order why pass it again?

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend says that the people are divided in opinion as to the desirability in the national interest of placing wheat on the free list.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I do not say that—it was of placing wheat and wheat flour on the free list.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, the hon. gentleman said that while he thought in the west they were strongly for it, he thought that would not be the opinion of the majority of the people of Canada.

If we all believe in it as I think we do, let us unanimously declare that it is in the national interest to place wheat and wheat products on the free list. Let us take this question, not as the Minister of Trade and Commerce says out of the realm of trade, but out of the realm of politics and make it part of the permanent policy of this country, and by our legislation say to the Government of the United States: So long as that provision remains in your tariff, so long will it remain the policy of the people of Canada; so far as we, a united Parliament, can speak for the people of Canada, so long will it remain on the Statute-book of this country. I hope that will commend itself to hon. gentlemen. The concluding paragraph of the amendment of my hon. friend from Assinaboia (Mr. Turriff) reads:

> In order that the country may be assured of such permanency and that the action of the Administration is not a mere temporary expedient which may be revoked at any time by the Government without reference to Parliament, this House would urge upon the Government the desirability of submitting early in the present session a measure to place by statute wheat, wheat flour and semolina on the free list, and thereby encourage the farmers to engage in the largest wheat production possible.

Now that is the resolution. Will anybody dispute that? Will anybody dispute that it is desirable? If it is in the national interest, if it is the universal demand of the farmers of the West, is the mere fact that we, the Liberal party, have been in favour of it and have been pleading with gentlemen opposite to finally establish this policy, any reason why we should not to-day give to it the stamp of permanency? Why should it not be permanent if it is good and if it is in the national interest? Why should it be made permanent? Well, that is manifest to everybody. The object of the opening of these markets is, as is alleged by the Order in Council and as we all know, to encourage the farmers to increase production. What does increasing production mean? You cannot go out into the fields —as the Minister of Agriculture, even with his slight knowledge of farming knows— you cannot go out into the field and wave a magic wand and say to the wheat and oats and turnips: Come forth from the ground to feed the people of this world. No, Sir, the farmer has got to get to work to get his ploughs and horses and oxen or his gasolene tractors, he has to get his seed, he has to increase his acreage largely. He has to go to large expense, to borrow money from the his acreage largely. He has to go to heavy expense before he can

10 p.m.

very largely increase his production. It is not desirable that he should know that there is to be permanency about this policy? He will not engage in increased production, he will not go to the increased expense involved unless he knows that this policy is to have the character of permanency. Everybody knows that this is not going to be a bit of good this year so far as increased production is concerned. The land, in order to be available this year, should have been broken up and prepared last year; the seed bed should have been got ready last year in order to give good results this year. Therefore these gentlemen have passed this Order too late to be of any good to the farmers this year, so far as increased production is concerned. If they wanted to pass this by reason of the conditions, which must have been pressed home upon them months and months ago as much as to-day, they should have passed this Order last year if it was intended to operate this year, or they should have passed it as early at least as last July so that the farmer could have got the seed bed ready for the crop of this spring. Therefore, if this is to be made of any value in relation to increased production, the farmers must begin next summer to plough their land and get ready for the seeding of the spring of 1918. And one year would not be enough for them. They want, as I have said, permanency in order to warrant them in going to the expense necessary to insure increased production.

The hon. Solicitor General says that this is a political resolution and that our course is political. I fail to see on what he bases that statement. Is it political in the sense in which the course of my hon. friend and of his colleagues appears to be political? They say in effect that they have swallowed their principes in order to meet the views of the people of the West, even although they are not satisfied that it is going to be of any great advantage. That is what the Solicitor General says to-day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no.

Mr. PUGSLEY: And he has argued for the purpose of convincing the people that he was right last year to take a position di-

rectly opposed to this resolution. But it does seem to me that it is absolutely necessary to make this policy permanent in order that it shall have that beneficial effect that we desire that it should have. In our western country, out of perhaps one hundred million acres or perhaps two hundred million acres of arable land, we have only about twenty million acres under cultivation. We want to encourage settlers to come in from the United States. They form perhaps the best settlers who can be brought into that country. I know one section of our Northwest where up to 1900 or 1902 there was scarcely any settlement at all. There had been a railroad running through that section for six years, but for sixty or seventy miles there was not a settler upon that line. About 1902 American settlers began to come across. They had experts analyze the soil, they undertook the cultivation of the land, and in that section of the country to-day vast areas are sown with wheat, and it is among the very garden spots of the Dominion of Canada. Americans make splendid settlers. Now, if you can show to these people that it is the permanent policy of the people of Canada to have free wheat, you will encourage people to come over from the United States, not by thousands but by hundreds of thousands, because they will look forward to farming in that country becoming very profitable indeed. They know that the large market of the United States is of enormous benefit to the farmer. They will be encouraged to come in, and our country will move ahead with very much greater rapidity and certainty. Leave the matter indefinite, leave it to have a temporary character, leave it so that the Government might tomorrow or three months from now or next fall even, when the war is over or before, cancel this Order, destroy the effect of this Order altogether and re-impose a duty on wheat and wheat products, and you make the farmer timid, you make the settler timid and you will not achieve any important results either in the way of immigration or in the way of development of our country or advancement of prosperity.

Will you allow me, Mr. Speaker, sincerely to apologize to the House. I had not the slightest idea that I had taken up so much time. I hope it has not been entirely useless. I would be well repaid even for all the weariness I have inflicted upon the House if I can do something in the way of convincing our hon. friends to join with us in passing a unanimous resolution in support of their own Order. I should be glad indeed if we could to-morrow send out word to the people of this country that in the opinion of this Parliament this policy is in the national interest, that it would result in enormous benefit to Canada, and that the intention of Parliament is to make the policy one of a permanent character.

Mr. FRANK S. SCOTT (South Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) will pardon me if I do not attempt to follow him in the arguments which he has presented in his speech to-night.

I am an ordinary layman, one not learned in the law, and he will understand how impossible it would be for me to attempt to follow him in a discussion that took such a legal turn as the speech which we have listened to to-night.

There appears to be some difference of opinion on the part of gentlemen of the legal profession on both sides of the House as to the procedure which has been followed in giving free wheat that we have heard so much about to the western farmers. I confess that I am not very greatly concerned about the manner in which free wheat has been brought about. Lawyers may differ about that, but the grain growers of the West, the people who are chiefly interested, will not be deeply concerned about the method by which free wheat was granted. Since April 16 they have realized that free wheat is an accomplished fact, and they will be given an opportunity of observing whether their anticipations respecting the adoption of a policy of this kind will be realized.

In the Budget introduced a few days ago by the Minister of Finance there were no new principles, no new methods of taxation. In the Budget of 1915 a very radical change by way of tariff increase was made. I have noted, however, a very great difference between the way in which the Budget of 1917 has been received by hon. gentlemen opposite and their reception of the Budget of 1915. Hon. gentlemen opposite took very strong exception to the Budget of 1915 and the proposals that were therein made. So strong was their opposition to the Budget of that year that an amendment was introduced. One of their chief objections was that it would not produce revenue. I have not heard any hon. gentleman opposite who has taken part in this debate argue that the present Budget, although there is no change in that respect, will not produce revenue. Another argument that was advanced two

years ago was that the Budget of 1915 would stifle trade. In the discussion that has taken place upon the Budget it has not been argued by hon. gentlemen opposite that the present proposals of the Finance Minister will stifle trade. We know that since 1915 the trade of Canada has been more buoyant than it ever was before. We were told in 1915 that the tariff proposals of that day would be a burden on the people; yet it has not been contended during the last few days by hon. gentlemen opposite that the tariff of to-day, which is identical with the tariff of 1915, would place any undue burden upon the people. The Budget of 1915 produced revenue without parallel in Canada's history. As to the so-called burdens that were imposed upon the people, the taxes were paid willingly and cheerfully, and there has been no undue hardship. In the light of our experience during the past few years, the Minister of Finance can take a great deal of encouragement from his recommendations of 1915, and can look forward with confidence to the future.

Since the bringing down of the Budget a few days ago, another line of argument has been followed by hon. gentlemen opposite. They claim that a sufficient share of the burden of the war is not being borne by the people of to-day; that we are leaving too much to posterity. The words of the chief financial critic of the Opposition were:—

> Are we now doing our full duty, or are we leaving too much to the future to pay? I believe that we are borrowing too much and paying too little.

What are the facts? We were told by the Finance Minister the other day that after paying all expenses for one year and providing for capital expenditure, out of the revenue of this Dominion there still remained a surplus of $60,000,000 to be applied to the carrying on of the war. Included in the ordinary expenditure was $25,000,000 interest upon war expenditure and for pensions. We were told by the member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) the other day that the Canadian public have contributed to the Patriotic Fund, Red Cross and other patriotic organizations the annual sum of $15,000,000 or $20,000,000. Taking the surplus of $60,000,000, the amount of $25,000,000 that has been paid for interest on war debt and for pensions, and the amount at least of $15,000,000 that has been subscribed voluntarily by the Canadian people for patriotic purposes, you have a total of $100,000,000. In 1912 the total revenue of Canada was $135,000,000, and in 1914, $175,000,000. The people of Canada during the last year have contributed directly toward the carrying on of the war a total of $100,000,000, 73 per cent of the total revenue in 1912 or 57 per cent of the total revenue in 1914.

In every country it has always been a difficult question and one which has given rise to much difference of opinion, to decide what proportion of the cost of war should be paid out of current revenue and what proportion should be obtained by borrowing. I think that financial people, the world over, will agree that for a country like Canada so to re-arrange her financial affairs as to be able to make a contribution of this kind directly towards the war, is certainly a splendid record. As this debate has proceeded, there has been perhaps too much of a tendency, one perhaps not confined alone to this House, but a tendency that has been somewhat general throughout the country, to deprecate, to belittle what the Dominion of Canada has done in connection with this war. It is right, of course, that we should keep spurred on, as it were, that we should do all possible in connection with the war; but, from a national standpoint, it seems to me we would make a mistake if we tried to minimize what we have accomplished. It is a good thing for a man sometimes to get an outside view of his own business, and as it is with individuals, may it not be so with a nation? If, as Canadians, we could come in contact with the people of the neighbouring republic to the south, visit the cities of New York and Boston, meet there the average American citizen and hear what he has to say, hear the estimate which he has placed upon what Canada has done in this war, we would have a different idea, and a greater satisfaction than we ever had before, of the appreciation in which we are held by outside observers.

I do not intend to say anything upon the question of free wheat, because that has been so fully dealt with by other speakers. There was, however, one criticism that was made by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) in connection with the action of the Government on this matter of free wheat, and it seemed to me that his point was not well taken. His argument was that the Government of to-day had adopted a policy of free wheat. He went further than some of the other critics of the Opposition in that he very

warmly commended the Government for it; but his criticism was this, that while the Government had adopted this policy, it should have adopted it two years ago, and that great disadvantage had accrued to Canada. His argument was that countries like Sweden, Germany, Austria and other countries, immediately after the outbreak of war, had taken the same action; that they had removed the duties from foodstuffs, and that they had given their people this advantage. As I have understood all this agitation for free wheat, the arguments that have been advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite, and the position taken by the grain growers of the West, their standpoint was, not that it would reduce the price of wheat in the Dominion of Canada, but rather that it would enable them to get a higher price for it in the American market. In my view, an argument or criticism of that kind is quite unjustifiable and illogical. The hon. member for Red Deer also said that the world had learned many lessons as a result of this war. There can be no doubt of that, and that things in general, in Canada and in every other country in the world, will be changed vastly as a result of this war; but the deduction which he drew was that, as a result of this war, the Dominion of Canada, having regard for what free trade Britain had been able to do, her splendid record of achievement, would be well advised to adopt a policy of freedom of trade as they have had it in Great Britain for so many years. He compared Britain's present record with that of Germany. As I said a moment ago, there are many lessons to be learned from this war, but the lesson that Canada should learn from it is directly opposite to the lesson which the hon. member from Red Deer would attempt to apply to Canada. Compare Germany and Russia. This war has demonstrated beyond any possible doubt that no agricultural nation can withstand a war with an industrial nation. Forty years ago Britain was unrivalled as an industrial nation; there was no comparison at all in an industrial sense between Great Britain and Germany. Forty years ago Germany adopted a policy of protection, and under it her industries developed until she became Great Britain's most powerful competitor in all the markets of the world. The comparison I want to draw is this: Russia is a land of great natural resources; her soil is more fertile, and she has a greater population than Germany. Russia continued as she had been doing; she had in effect the conditions as described by the hon. member for Red Deer, namely, absolute freedom of trade. She depended upon agriculture; she bought her manufactured goods in the most convenient and cheapest markets. Yet, if the statesmen of Russia could live over the past forty years, is there any reasonable-minded man to-day, who, in view of the events which have occurred during the last two years, will believe that the statesmen of Russia would abide by a policy of that kind?

It was, I think, the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) who said that we could thank the Kaiser for the prosperous condition that had existed in Canada during the past two years. A statement of that kind is scarcely fair. We can thank the Kaiser for the war, but we can thank the Government, and the late Minister of Militia in particular, in very large measure, for the prosperity which has come to this Dominion, through the manufacture of munitions of war. I would say further than that, that the people of Canada to-day can thank not only the present Government that has founded this great munition work, and the Minister of Finance for the credit of hundreds of millions of dollars which he has established in Canada for the benefit of the British Government, but we must go farther back than that. Almost forty years ago this Dominion of Canada embarked upon the National Policy of Protection, and I ask you, Sir, if the statesmen of Canada had not adopted that policy forty years ago, would Canada to-day be in a position to take the part she has taken in the war during the last two years. A great industrial fabric such as we have in Canada is of slow growth; it cannot be built up in a day, and it is fortunate indeed that when this war came on the Dominion of Canada had a well established system of industries that enabled us not only to provide munitions for the carrying on of the war, but to discharge our heavy financial obligations in a way that we otherwise could not have done.

The hour is late and I do not intend to trespass further on the time of the House, but I wish to take this opportunity of congratulating the Minister of Finance on the splendid statement he has been able to present. From the experience which Canada has already had of the operation of the tariff as laid down in the budget of 1915, and of the special methods of taxation which have been adopted, I am convinced that Canada will be able to carry on success-

fully the part she has chosen for herself in this war, and will win a high and creditable place for herself among the nations of the world in this great struggle.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw): The observations made by ordinary members of the House such as myself on an occasion such as this, when the Budget is being discussed, are in the way of a review of the record of the Government, or so much of it as is already written, and in the way of an analysis of the policy of the Government so far as its future programme is disclosed. This duty which is cast upon a member, and, indeed, upon all sections of our people when they peruse a budget debate, is emphasized and intensified when the occasion is one such as this, when there is the probability of a general election before very long. I am not saying either yes or no to the question whether there should be a general election in the Dominion of Canada this year, but the fact remains that there is a great possibility, and even a probability, of one being held. In analysing the record of this Government one naturally examines it under two distinct heads: their administration during the times of peace, and their administration during the war. You cannot examine these two periods together for they are essentially and organically different, and a separate stewardship has to be rendered for each period. If before we have another Budget speech the people are asked whether this Government shall be continued in office, it will be their duty first and foremost to examine the two periods in a composite way. The first three years the Government were in office was a period during which ordinary normal conditions prevailed, that is to say, it was a time of peace as contrasted with war times. I am not going to dwell on the record of the Government during these three years other than to emphasize that in our perusal of their record during the war period we must not forget that just as much importance, if not more so, should be attached to an examination of their record during the days of peace, because the peace days, after all, are the days when normal conditions prevail.

Let us throw our minds back for a moment to those three years of peace when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, and I think on that score the Government stand almost self-convicted. We are so engrossed in the war that we are sometimes apt to forget what a mighty deliverance it was to hon. gentlemen opposite.

Before the war came they were in sore straits; desperation was written on their brow. They did not know whether to go to the country and dare the worst, or wait a few months longer, when conditions might be still more desperate. You will recall, Sir, that tragic and eventful summer and fall of 1914, when hon. gentlemen opposite had almost got their courage screwed up to the point of taking the plunge, before things got more desperate. The record of the Government during those three years, I say, was one of failure, and we have every reason to believe that the same policy will prevail and the same sort of administration be given in times of peace if hon. gentlemen opposite are returned to power.

Let me recall the condition of affairs in 1914. I do not know whether you live in a city or town, Mr. Speaker, but throughout Canada at that time there prevailed the greatest stagnation; there was a condition of poverty almost in many of our cities and towns. In my own city of Moosejaw, which before that day had always been prosperous, and where the bread-winner of the family never need worry, men walked the streets by the hundreds, if not by the thousands, unable to get work, earnestly as they desired it. Those are the facts, and those were the conditions that prevailed throughout the whole Dominion of Canada. They had said, Let well enough alone; do not encourage the farmer by giving him reciprocity; we will have no truck and trade with the Yankees; and the result was the unfortunate conditions of affairs that we saw throughout the whole Dominion of Canada. At the time these men were walking the streets of our cities looking for work, what did we see in our great agricultural districts? Great zones of land were calling for men to till them, simply crying out for labour, and although there were thousands of men walking the streets of our cities and towns, the two were never brought together. The secret of the development and prosperity of Canada during the fifteen years the Laurier Government was in power was that conditions on the land were made inviting to labour, and the men responded to the call of the soil, and made possible the great development of this Dominion. And if on that occasion reciprocity had been adopted, if encouragement had been given to the husbandmen by the opening of markets, the lowering of tariffs and the making of conditions more inviting, we have every reason to believe, the Dominion of Canada would have continued after 1911

the prosperity that it had experienced for fifteen years before that time. But these hon. gentlemen decided that they had a chance to demonstrate the success or failure of their policy, and they most successfully demonstrated the failure of it. So, I say, the question we shall have to ask ourselves is, whether or not it will be wise for the people to continue the Government in power. We have the experience of three years at least to test them by, and they are very important years to enable us to estimate the profitableness or the reverse of the administration they have given and the policy they have carried into effect. We have had three years of war. All that is fresh in our minds, three sad, bloody years of war. And we have seen sights that have made us ashamed day and night. We have seen men lining their pockets, we have seen men doing things such as those for which, even in Austria, men are lined up against a stone wall and shot—that is, taking advantage of their country's dire distress for their own gain. For things not so bad as we have seen here, men in Manchester, as I read in one account, were sent to penitentiary for five years—men who had some patronage to give and who accepted gifts, though not a word was said about bribing them. We have made such men honorary colonels or have given them other honours. But, as I say, when we come to ascertain whether this Administration is worthy of our confidence because of its record in the war years, we shall have to consider two things if nothing more —the Ross rifle, and the case of John Wesley Allison. These are enough, in my opinion, to drive ten governments out of power. I do not lay these things at the door of the late Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) but I lay them at the door of the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden). He was warned—I heard him warned in this Chamber and in the old House, again and again over a period of eighteen months —that he was putting into the soldier's hands a weapon that was useless. But for some reason, I will not say what the reason was, the lives of our soldiers were counted as nothing against the desire to continue the Ross rifle.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Does the hon. gentleman know that the Liberal press of Quebec, French and English, have published strong protests against this Government because they had ceased to manufacture Ross rifles in the factory?

Mr. KNOWLES: I join in the same condemnation. The Ross rifle factory should be running, should have been kept running, to make rifles, not to help the German Empire, but to help the British Empire. And what I have just been saying with regard to the case of the Ross rifle is true of the case of John Wesley Allison. Warning was given by no less a person than the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder)—and there is no more honourable member than he—as to the nature of John Wesley Allison—that he was a man who had never done a day's work in his life, a pure parasite, leaving, as has been said, his slimy trail wherever he went. But we entrusted him with millions and millions of dollars in the service of the country. And when any one criticised the Ross rifle or John Wesley Allison he was declared to be disloyal; it was said that he did not love the Empire, and again they shouted "God Save the King."

I say that when we come to present to the electors the record of this Government that has been in office for nearly six years there will be a sorry story to be told. I will not deny that certain ministers have had to work hard, but the others have had a very easy time, indeed. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche) told us: There are no scandals in the Interior Department. I admit it. There are no scandals in the cemeteries. And there is the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell)—but do not let me say anything that would be misunderstood. I have not said that the hon. gentleman knows anything about agriculture; I say he holds the official position of Minister of Agriculture. I come from a province that abounds in agricultural potentialities. A Minister of Agriculture who was really filling the position would be found in that province, mingling with our grain-growers, attending their association meetings, making himself known, and studying the problems of the people with a view to helping in developing the possibilities of that province. But we can only class him with the majority of the heads of departments who are only nominally, technically and professionally holding their portfolios, which is about all you can say of them. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) has made a few trips backwards and forwards, and has trouble of his own. I am brought into contact with a great number of labour men, office-holders in their unions, and others as well. The Minister of Labour is known to these people, and they have their opinion about him. He has that honour at least—that they have taken the trouble to form an

estimate of him; I do not think that the farmers of Saskatchewan have ever troubled to form an estimate of the Minister of Agriculture. The labour men have formed their estimate of the Minister of Labour, and it is one that I would rather they themselves should tell him. The whole Government, in fact, apart from a few departments, have had the snap of their lives, and they have not risen to the occasion—except to enjoy the snap. The Minister of Militia (Sir Edward Kemp) has to work, and so has the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), and the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), of course, is a busy man. But the others have an easy time. This is the time of testing—not in the drawing of salaries and having a good time because no public buildings are going up and no immigration coming in; it is the testing time to show whether a minister has the good of the country at heart. And, so far as I can observe conditions, none of the ministers are working except those that have to work, perhaps three out of the fifteen. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) has done a little, because, as I understand, he has doubled up in the absence of other ministers, but even at that he is having the time of his life.

The amendment before the House has particular reference to the question of wheat. I regret that the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) is not in his place at the moment. He has spoken on this subject, but the only reason he has given for the change that has been made is that there was so much fuss and threatening on the part of the farmers that he decided to let them have their way because he did not want any more bother with them. That, I take to be his argument. He says the war is raging in Europe and he wants peace on earth here in Canada; consequently, he thinks he had better let them have free wheat. He has scriptural authority for that. An unjust judge once was persuaded to do something only because a woman was importunate and rather than be bothered and have his rest disturbed he let her have what she wanted. But, if that be his reeason, then there is justice for our keeping this debate going till doomsday, because we want to keep bothering the Solicitor General until we can be assured of permanent free wheat. If he is only going to give us our rights because he is bothered, and cannot withhold justice from us any longer, we must keep on bothering him until out of his majestic condescension he will give us permanent free wheat.

The resolution is such a harmless one that I do not see how any person can take any exception to it. As my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) said, it merely asks that we join together and say that we are gratified at getting what we have got. If hon. gentlemen opposite are not satisfied, they will have to vote accordingly, but surely they should be ready to take their leader's word for it. If their leaders are going to have peace now, and if they are not friendly enough to be gratified because the Solicitor General and others are going to have peace they are not very friendly amongst themselves. I notice that every magazine you pick up is looking for permanent peace. We will give the Government permanent peace if they will give us permanent justice in this matter.

It is remarkable that no longer than a year ago the Solicitor General was not so strongly influenced by this desire; nor was the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), nor the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) as they are now. I have before me Hansard containing the speeches of these hon. gentlemen, and without exception they expressed the view that it would be a very wrong thing to give us free wheat. The Minister of Finance put it on different grounds, but he had two main objections. One of the two main grounds was that the United States exported fifty per cent more wheat than we and that therefore we had better stay out of that country altogether. He has not said that he receded from that belief, and I presume it stands as a orrect statement of what he said; yet, we find no recantation of his views other than that he has simply done the reverse of what he says. Then, there is the further reason, to use his own words, that he was against any interlocking of our tariff. These words will be found at page 868 of last year's Hansard:

> And for another thing, there was the fact of the pact itself, the fact that it was an agreement, an interlocking of our tariff with the tariff of the country to the south.

He did not believe in an interlocking tariff last year. He said it would be a wrong to the country, and yet we find that although Parliament was to meet on a Thursday, the minister, sitting in his office on a Monday, could not wait seventy-two hours to do the thing in a constitutional way. Talk about swallowing himself; he was in such a hurry that he bolted himself,

because he could not wait seventy-two hours to make this change constitutionally, but rushed it through by an Order in Council under the War Measures Act. If, a year ago, this was an outrageous thing to do, it is hard to take the minister seriously when he says that it was urgent, immediate, pressing, that the Government could not wait until Parliament met seventy-two hours afterwards. No sooner is it done than the same afternoon it is hustled off to Mr. Foster, the representative of the Yankees, and wired into Washington, in order that they might have it in force if possible next morning at ten o'clock when the customs offices opened. Talk about truck and trade with the Yankees; if the hon. gentleman experienced a conversion, it came to him with terrible suddenness, it came to him like a bolt, because he could not wait until the House met when the matter might have been attended to by Parliament.

An hon. MEMBER: He might have lost the inspiration.

Mr. KNOWLES: We would like him to make it permanent lest he get another inspiration and take it away from us just as suddenly. The views of the hon. Minister of Public Works were along the same lines. The minister used these words, Hansard, 1916, page 884. He says that Canadian wheat has such a high name that it would be wrong to detract from that high standard, and he goes on:

> The fact is that Canadian wheat commands a price at the American seaboard of from twenty to twenty-five cents a bushel more than the American wheat. That is one of the reasons why I say this House would fail in its duty to the farming community of Western Canada if it did not reject the resolution of my hon. friend.

And the same hon gentleman a few days later spoke along similar lines, Hansard, 1916, page 1049:

> We have to-day a position of great advantage with our wheat, a position which we have won gradually by our own efforts. Beyond question of doubt all these conditions justify us, having in view the interests of the farmers themselves, in rejecting this resolution, and thereby permitting these favourable conditions to continue.

His view was that if that resolution was adopted those favourable conditions would be taken away and a serious wrong would be done to the people of the West. At page 1050 he said:

> Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is our plain duty, having in regard the best interests of the Canadian farming community, to adhere to our good old traditional policy of keeping Canada for the Canadians.

And he goes on at page 1051 and says:—

> I say that we should appreciate the advantage of our position and that we would fail in our duty, especially to the farming community of Canada, and more especially of Western Canada, if we did not reject the resolution of my hon. friend for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), in which he proposes to divert our wheat into American channels as much as possible and thereby allow it to be mixed with American wheat, in which case we would have to go over again all the work that we have done in the past to establish our own transcendent identity in the markets of the world.

Similarly, the hon. Solicitor General expressed himself on different pages, for instance pages 1071 and 1073; I shall not take the time to read what he said. But one thing he said was that of the desire for free wheat, 90 per cent was politics and 10 per cent falsehood, and now he is going to give us the whole 100 per cent for no other reason than that he may get a little peace. So, I wish to emphasize the point that we are driven to the conclusion that the Government are not sincere in dealing with the question on its merits. It is remarkable that a Government, elected to power as that Government was, should come out plainly and flatly and announce a change of view on this question of the tariff and of trading with the Yankees. We should know where we are. We are not content with a mere bone thrown to us while they still deny the underlying principle which is the subject of division between the two parties. Hon. gentlemen opposite would like to make it appear that there is nothing between the Liberals and the Conservatives. That is their stock argument especially in the West. I would say frankly that I regret there is not more difference between them, but there is enough difference between them to make it clear that the Liberal party is the one we should support. The Liberal party favours a lower tariff and open markets, and these are grand British doctrines. I believe that the hon. the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell), with his knowledge of agriculture, will agree that an open market is not a bad thing for a farmer who has things to sell. And so I say there is that cleavage between the two parties. But we in the West are not satisfied with what has been given to us. Do not let any one suppose that we are. We are not content with this moiety that is given to us, much less than a moiety. We want the rights that are ours. We want the open market in all things we

have to sell, above all things in our flax. We raise great quantities of flax. Hon gentlemen opposite said in 1911 that if we sold our flax to the Americans, which we did in any event and paid twenty-five cents a bushel duty on it, into the treasury of the United States we remained loyal Britishers; but if we got our flax into the United States without paying twenty-five cents a bushel to Uncle Sam's treasury our British blood would all go away with our flax and we would become Yankees. By what reasoning we know not, they tried to get away with this kind of argument, and did largely get away with it in Ontario. We are not content, we want free flax into the United States. Our flax goes there anyway, and it is simply a matter of enriching the American treasury. We want free trade in fruit and many things that are denied to us which we would have secured under reciprocity. Let me say that whatever the policy of the Liberal party may be, and I am not high enough up in it to give a lecture on that policy, my policy is everything free that you can get free and a great many more things than were free under Liberals or Conservatives. Our own side were in power for fifteen years. I have said and repeat that my mind is clear as to which party it is my duty in the interest of my constituents to support. But my mind is just as clear in saying that neither party is anywhere near what I should like to see. Both parties, I think, have too many Conservatives in them, whether you call them Liberals or Conservatives. There are too many Conservative-Liberals in our party to suit me. I wish that a committee of western Canadians could be allowed to nominate all candidates for the Liberal party in the next election. That would ensure the selection of true Liberals; there would be no reactionaries in the party, but as the Liberal party ought to do, it would come out frankly and say what its policy was. There are forty-two seats and will be forty-two candidates in the Prairie Provinces, and I have counselled—and I hope it will be done—that the forty-two candidates of the Liberal party should act as one unit and have their arrangements to act as a unit before the election, and then they will come down here with the power they ought to have. I am not for separating from the rest of Canada, as yet certainly. So far as the money goes, we are paying all right for our connection with Canada. There is no protection to us. We are paying for protection at every turn we make, and it is a terrible burden on our poor homesteaders, and there are many of them in my own riding. There have been more homesteaders come into my riding than into any other two ridings in the West during the ten years I have been a member. Therefore I say that the western members in the future should lay down a policy to act as one unit, and if they cannot make the two parties sit up and take notice it will be a strange thing. We have the numbers now and we are going to have them. I think it time the people in this House understood that the people of western Canada are not tied up to either party eternally, but they are tied up with the principle of low tariff and open markets, and for my part, whether I should be a member of the next House or not—and I do not expect I shall because I do not expect to be a candidate—I believe the time has come when the Dominion of Canada should realize that the best prosperity of the whole Dominion is synonymous and parallel with the prosperity of western Canada. Which has made the whole of Canada prosperous to-day is that the late Laurier Government adopted a policy which made conditions so attractive in our great undeveloped prairies that people went in by hundreds of thousands, and having gone in they developed the country and made national wealth; and it is by a resumption and restoration of that policy and further development of it that the same good, prosperous conditions will be restored to the Dominion of Canada.

We want freedom of foodstuffs, freedom of fruit, freedom of lumber, of agricultural implements, and we want all the open markets of the world which we can get. If one party will not get those advantages for us it is time we made a party in the West and gave the people to understand that we are really in earnest in our desire to get what we believe to be justice in these matters. We believe that justice was denied us in 1911. We believe that a political trick was played on the people of Canada, in Ontario by making one cry, in Quebec by making another. A false, spurious un-British cry was made there, one that was a disgrace to the whole Dominion of Canada. But it turned the trick for the time being. But the people of the West are not the kind to give up on one election, and they will continue to fight. Even if they have free wheat temporarily, they are not satisfied with it but are determined to keep up the

struggle to the end that they may receive justice at the hands of the whole Parliament of Canada, from which legislation must come. They are not secessionists, but their belief is that the prosperity of the Dominion of Canada will be found to be synonymous with the prosperity of western Canada.

Nothing can be more sane and reasonable than the resolution before the House; and if our friends opposite will not even agree to remove the doubt, and there certainly is a doubt, it seems to me that they are not desirous of meeting us half way. It seems to me beyond question that it is the purpose of the Government, according to their plausible statement, to give free wheat, and, if so, why not set the matter beyond peradventure and agree to this resolution in the House when it comes to a vote. I regret that I shall not be able to be here for the vote. I hope, however, that hon. gentlemen opposite will then have reconsidered this matter, and that they will show a united front with us in agreeing to this resolution and making it unanimous.

On motion of Mr. Barnard the debate was adjourned.

On the motion of Sir Thomas White for the adjournment of the House:

Mr. GRAHAM: Monday is Private Members day, but if we finish with private business what will be taken up?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In that event we will either resume this debate or take up Supply.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is there anything to report with regard to the proposed invitation to the Anglo-French Commission to visit Canada?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have no further information with respect to the matter, which is in the hands of Sir George Foster.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Monday, April 30, 1917.

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

REQUISITIONING OF CANADIAN SHIPS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. J. D. REID: In accordance with the request of the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy), I lay on the Table several Orders in Council in connection with the transfer of ships.

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I notice by the press a report—I do not know whether it is correct or not—that representations have been made by the Canadian Government to the Government of the United States suggesting the appointment of a commission to take into consideration matters of dispute between the two countries in reference to fisheries. I should like to inquire of the Government if there is any foundation for this press report, and if so, what matters in dispute it is proposed shall be referred to a commission for settlement.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This matter was brought to my attention the other day by an hon. member—I think the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), but perhaps by my hon. friend from Halifax. I communicated with Sir George Foster who is at present at Washington representing the Government, and I am informed that there is no truth in the report.

HEAD TAX ON CANADIANS ENTERING UNITED STATES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): It was rumoured a long time ago that the United States proposed exacting a head tax of $8 upon Canadian citizens entering that country. Will the Government inform the House if this rumour is correct and, if so, if they are taking any steps to remove this exaction which will be very irritating to Canadians?

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Minister of the Interior): I understand that a new Immigration Act passed by the United States Congress does levy a tax of $8 on Canadians as well as those from other countries. The matter has been taken up by Sir George Foster with the United States Government.

Mr. NESBITT: They do not levy a head tax on travellers.

Mr. ROCHE: The head tax is levied on those who enter the United States to reside there permanently; but according to the Act, if it is in force, $8 head tax will be levied even on Canadians who go into the

United States temporarily, the amount to be refunded upon their leaving the country again.

Mr. NESBITT: They do not exact that.

Mr. ROCHE: The Act does not come into force until the 3rd of May.

Mr. NESBITT: They have not exacted the tax so far.

MISUSE OF MAILS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. TURRIFF: I have here a clipping, which I just received this morning, from the Carlyle Herald, Carlyle being a town in my constituency. The clipping reads:

> Here is a begging letter which is being circulated in "chain" form by the responsible officials of one of the largest corporations in Canada:—
>
> Mr. T. E. Kirkpatrick, of the New York Central Railway Company, has sent me the following letter, which I pass on to you:—
>
> Owing to the scarcity of anesthetics, operations that cause indescribable pain have to be performed without their aid to mitigate suffering. We make a complete appeal to you to contribute 24 cents towards the purchase of chloroform to use in the hospitals of the Allies.
>
> Please send five copies of the appeal to your friends and put No. 148 on your letters. Do not fail or the chain will be broken.
>
> Please send the money to Miss Elizabeth Whitman, Superintendent of Nurses, New York Eye and Ear Infirmary, 218 Second Avenue, New York City.
>
> Now, the above letter, hinting as it does, of conditions of indescribable misery among the boys at the front, is one of two things. It is either the meanest, most despicable fake yet exposed or the most damnable disgrace to our Government that could very well be imagined. Personally, we feel sure it is a fake. In spite of the size of the corporation circulating the appeal, and the undoubted integrity of the signatory, we would refuse to send even two cents—to New York—on the strength of the appeal. We refuse to believe that the Allies have to cadge shillings in Carlyle for chloroform.

I have no doubt that this is a fake; but if it is a fake, then our Canadian mails are being used to extend this fake in order to collect money. It is possible on the other hand that this nurse, Miss Elizabeth Whitman, may be all right, but I think the matter is of such importance that the Postmaster General and the Minister of Militia should look into it.

Mr. PATENAUDE: I will make inquiries into the matter.

CONSCRIPTION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MACDONALD: In view of the position taken by the Government through the Premier last year that they were emphatically not in favour of conscription, and of the letter of the Minister of the Interior published in the western United States, and of advertisements published by the Interior Department to the effect that conscription was not deemed either advisable or necessary in Canada, I would like to ask the Minister of Militia and Defence whether it is the intention of the Government to change their policy in regard to enlistment and provide for a policy of conscription, or whether they intend to put in force compulsorily the provisions of the Militia Act.

Mr. KEMP: The question to which my hon. friend refers has not yet had the consideration of the Government.

PRIVATE JOSEPH MARCIL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL: I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Militia and Defence to a letter that I received from Louis Marcil, 1425 St. Dennis Street, Montreal, stating that his son, Joseph Marcil, who is the only support of an aged father and mother, has enlisted in the Forestry Battalion and gone to the front. He has assigned $25 a month to his parents but they have received nothing since he has gone. Mr. Ross of the Patriotic Fund, Montreal, and Major Hudon have communicated with the department, but no reply has been received. I will send the letter over to the minister and shall be glad if he will look into the matter.

Mr. KEMP: I shall be very glad to have the letter.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READING.

Bill No. 8, to incorporate The Bishop of Mackenzie River.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

UNITED GRAIN GROWERS.

Further consideration in Committee—Mr. Rainville in the chair—of Bill No. 14, respecting the Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited, and to authorize it to change its name to "United Grain Growers, Limited."—Mr. Bradbury.

On section 6—grouping of shareholders in local societies based on territorial districts.

Mr. BRADBURY: There does not seem to be anything very unusual about this section, which provides for the abolition, by by-law, of the right to vote by proxy. Under the proposed form of government the shareholders will be grouped in local societies based on territorial districts, and the societies will be represented at the meetings of the company by delegates. The reason for this change is that in such a large company as the Grain Growers' Grain Company, with something like 18,000 members, there is danger of a few men collecting a large number of proxies, and then it would not be a fair representation at all, so the proposal is to have delegates. I am authorized to say that this form of government is not a new one. It is now applicable and applied in the Alberta Co-operative Elevator Company, with which the Grain Growers' Grain Company proposes to amalgamate, and has been found to work very satisfactorily. It is also the form of government applicable to the Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Company. As this form of government has already been adopted by these two companies with which the Grain Growers' Grain Company proposes to amalgamate, I do not think the committee will make any serious objection to this section. I might quote the following from the last Annual Report of the directors of the Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited:—

At the present time out of 18,000 shareholders not more than 300 attend the meetings in person; not more than 2,000 of the remaining shareholders are represented by proxy, and a great many of these send their proxies in to the annual meeting to be distributed among the delegates present. The effect of this is that not more than 20 per cent of the shareholders are represented in any way at shareholders' meetings, and this unquestionably leaves the way open for a group of designing shareholders to secure control of an annual meeting. It is a notorious fact that a few years ago one shareholder came to the meeting with over 250 proxies which he was entitled to vote. Half a dozen shareholders coming armed with a similar amount of proxies could at our annual meeting do just as they pleased. Discussions have frequently taken place in the past at our annual meetings as to the advisability of doing away with proxy voting, and opinions have been expressed of the danger that lay in this system. This was particularly discussed at the annual meeting two years ago when the following resolution was unanimously passed:

"That in connection with By-law No. 51 dealing with the proposed amendments to the Act incorporating the Company, the Board of Directors are hereby instructed to take the necessary steps, and to use their fullest possible powers to have deleted from the charter those sections of the Act permitting proxy voting."

The above resolution was passed at the annual meeting held November 4, 1914.

By the substitution of delegate voting a great many more of the shareholders can be directly represented than is possible at the present time, the idea being that the shareholders, when formed into a local group, will have an organization as a group that would be registered in the head office books of the Company. They will meet once a year, or oftener, and select a delegate or delegates to represent them at the annual meeting. The expenses of the delegates to the meeting will be paid by the Company, and when they return to their locals they will be expected to report to the shareholders composing them the result of the Company's Annual Meeting, and to give them any information they can as to what business has been done in the past year. This is the same principle as that by which delegates are appointed to attend the Annual conventions of the Grain Growers' Associations and the United Farmers of Alberta.

As pointed out this is the form of government in the Alberta Farmers Co-operative and the Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Companies. The Directors of the Alberta Farmers Co-operative Elevator Company are firmly convinced that it is a much superior method to that at present in practice in The Grain Growers' Grain Company, and your Directors are in unanimous agreement with them in this respect.

This is part of the report made at the meeting of the Grain Growers' Association, and I think it covers the point.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know whether I am in favour of this Bill or against it, for I do not understand it. If some legal gentleman would tell us the effect of the changes proposed to be made in the by-laws by omitting certain words and inscribing others, we should know better what we are doing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am much in the same state of mind as the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham). I observe, for instance, that section 5 may be acted upon without section 6 being acted upon. That is, the company would have the power to abolish voting by proxy altogether without adopting any substitute, and if this were done shareholders would have to be present in person if they wished to have a share in the management of the company. Personally, I should like to hear from the Chairman of the Private Bills Committee, by which the Bill has been considered, as to the effect of these changes and the reasons for them.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The point taken by the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) I think is of some importance. I am not objecting to the Bill, nor to the provision now under consideration, but I think it very desirable that sections 5 and 6 should be very carefully considered in order that we may be sure that the shareholders are not

deprived of any right which they now enjoy. I understand that, on account of the large number of shareholders, it may be deemed advisable to enact a by-law providing that the shareholders shall not vote by proxy. It is clear that it is anticipated that the shareholders cannot be present at the meetings, and as there seems to be objection to the proxy principle applying, it is proposed that the shareholders shall be grouped in local societies, the grouping to be determined by the directors, if they are authorized to do so by by-law of the shareholders. Now the question that arises—it may be provided for elsewhere in the Bill, but I do not see it in this section—is how the delegates from the local society are to be chosen. It seems that the warrant for this legislation is that no step can be taken except under by-law approved by a vote of the shareholders. The other question that arises is that mentioned by the Solicitor General, that we shall be taking away the right of voting by proxy, because it is not clear that section 5 is dependent upon the action taken under section 6. I do not desire to delay the passage of the Bill, but think it might be well, as several members appear to be in doubt as to the effect of the provision and as it is desirable that the legislation, when passed, should be complete, that the Bill should be allowed to stand until we get an explanation covering these and any other points that may call for consideration.

Mr. GRAHAM: As some words of the old statute are omitted and others substituted, there should be some person to tell us what the old statute is and what the effects of each change will be. Otherwise, we are working in the dark.

Mr. NESBITT: Personally, I do not see the object of doing away with voting by proxy—the fact that the Company is a large one does not seem to me a sufficient reason, for there are many companies in the world much larger than this that vote by proxy. Under the Bill, power is given to the directors to vary the districts for which representatives shall be chosen. Is not that putting a great deal of power in the hands of the directors? They might not give proper notice of changes, and I think that provision should be made that notice shall be given before the districts are varied. I tried to follow the statement of the promoter of the Bill (Mr. Bradbury), but did not quite catch why this change from proxies to delegates is wanted.

Mr. BRADBURY: The reasons were given by Mr. Crerar, the President of the Association, before the Private Bills Committee the other day. He seemed to convince the committee that everything was all right. He handed me the statement which I have read to this committee. The main reason why they want proxies done away with, I think, is because of the two companies with which they are amalgamating. Neither of these companies allow proxies and the Grain Growers are asking to be amalgamated with these two companies.

Mr. NESBITT: What are the other companies?

Mr. BRADBURY: The Alberta Co-operative Elevator Company and the Grain Growers Company amalgamated with the Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Company and with the United Farmers.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is not a delegate a proxy? What is the difference?

Mr. BRADBURY: I presume that would be so, but a delegate would be chosen at a meeting of shareholders.

Mr. GRAHAM: A shareholder acting as a delegate will vote for a certain number of shareholders besides himself. Really he will have a proxy for the society he represents.

Mr. BRADBURY: That question was asked and the understanding is that a delegate would only have one vote.

Mr. NESBITT: He will not have a written proxy but he will represent a certain number of shareholders.

Mr. BRADBURY: He will only have one vote.

Mr. NESBITT: But every delegate having one vote will represent a number of others who would vote if there were proxies.

Mr. BRADBURY: Perhaps. I think this will appeal to some hon. gentlemen who know how proxies work out at political conventions. It is really on the same principle. The proxies might come in the pocket of one man and the Grain Growers are trying to protect themselves against that sort of thing. However, I accept the suggestion of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance.

Mr. TURRIFF: I think I should point out the principal reason why the Grain Growers Grain Company are asking for

this change in their form of Government in order to do away with proxy voting. There are over 18,000 shareholders. Each of these shareholders has a vote; that is a man with one share has the same voting power as a man with ten shares. There have not yet been at any of their annual or other meetings, I understand, over 300 shareholders out of 18,000. On one occasion a man came in with some 400 proxies. It would be the easiest matter in the world for three or four men to spend a little time or a little money, in writing for proxies, come to the annual meeting, vote the president and directors out of business, change the whole system and set aside the wishes of the great majority of shareholders. This has been found to work well in actual practice with the Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Company, another huge company, not connected with the Grain Growers Grain Company, but a company that handles between 10,000,000 and 20,000,000 bushels of wheat a year. They have some 230 elevators throughout Saskatchewan and applications are in for some 300 more. They adopt the same system in their government. The Alberta Co-operative Elevator Company also adopt the same principle, and it has been found to work very well. This request comes from the Grain Growers Grain Company, and it is based on a resolution passed unanimously by their directors. Personally, I think it is in the interest of the individual shareholders that this change in the government should be made, when you consider the fact that under the amalgamation their shareholders will extend from here to Banff. While I think it is right, I am quite agreeable to the suggestion made by the hon. Minister of Finance that the matter should stand over until another day in case there is any real objection. At the present time I do not know of any real objection to it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the wording the same as in the provincial statutes, which enable them to appoint delegates for these two Alberta and Saskatchewan companies?

Mr. TURRIFF: I could not say.

Progress reported.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 40, to incorporate La Société des Artisans Canadiens Français.—Mr. Achim.

Bill No. 41, respecting The Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—Mr. Currie.

[Mr. Turriff.]

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

THE RACING FORM.

Mr. McKENZIE:

1. Is the Minister of Justice aware as to whether or not the Post Office Department excluded from the mails The Racing Form, published in the United States?

2. Is the Government aware as to whether or not the said publication is finding its way into Canada through the agency of the express companies?

3. Is it the intention of the Minister of Justice to take such steps as may be necessary to prevent the coming into Canada of the said publication through the agency of the Express Companies?

Mr. DOHERTY: The Minister of Justice has no information upon the subject of these questions except that upon inquiry of the Deputy Postmaster General he is informed that the attention of the Post Office Department was called to the fact that the Daily Racing Form was publishing racing tips, so-called stable information, and practicing other incitements to betting, and an order prohibiting the paper was therefore issued by the Post Office Department on 25th February, 1916. Subsequently, however, the publishers of the Daily Racing Form wrote to say that the issues which had been specially objected to as containing racing tips had been sent by mistake to Canadian subscribers; that the Canadian edition was not intended to contain advertisements of sellers of tips, and that it was the intention of the publishers to conform scrupulously to the terms of the Miller Bill as regards this Canadian edition. In view of this assurance the order prohibiting the paper was withdrawn. So far as known to the Post Office Department the promise has been faithfully lived up to, and there would now appear to be no reason under the post office regulations why this paper should be excluded from the Canadian mails. In view of the above information, the minister does not feel called upon to take any steps against this paper at present.

TREATMENT OF THOMAS KELLY IN PENITENTIARY.

Mr. MOLLOY:

1. Has Thomas Kelly, who is confined in the penitentiary in Manitoba for offences committed in Winnipeg in connection with contracts with the former Provincial Government there, been given any special treatment different from the other prisoners?

2. If so, what are the concessions given him, and for what reason are they given?

3. Has any request been made for his discharge?

4. If so, what reasons are alleged why he should be discharged?

5. What action has the Minister of Justice taken in respect to the request?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1 and 2. When Kelly was received at the penitentiary the cutting of his hair, his criminal identification and his wearing of prison clothing was postponed upon the erroneous understanding that judicial proceedings were still pending affecting the finality of his sentence. It was represented that he had considerable business pending which required his personal direction, and for that reason his solicitors and members of his family were permitted to converse with him at reasonable times in the presence of the warden. He was in a very critical state of health as certified by the prison surgeon and by a consulting physician who was on that account called in upon the advice of the prison surgeon. For that reason his wife was permitted to provide a chair for him, and his diet was regulated according to the recommendation of the prison surgeon. When it was ascertained that there were no longer judicial proceedings pending affecting his case directions were given for his identification, hair cutting and prison clothing, but the execution of these was postponed upon the recommendation of the prison surgeon, who certified his belief that in view of Kelly's condition, bordering upon a complete nervous breakdown, any change in his treatment with regard to accommodation, diet, exercise, etc., would precipitate this threatened breakdown, and strongly advising in consideration of Kelly's health, no changes of treatment for the present. Subject to the above Kelly received no special treatment different from other prisoners, nor did the treatment which he so received differ from that which would have been accorded to other prisoners in the like condition.

3. Yes.

4. His advanced age; very bad state of his health; large family; two of his sons at the front; his expressed willingness to make restitution of any money which it may be legally ascertained he is liable for; and that though he was sentenced on the 18th November last he has been imprisoned in connection with the offence, continuously since 1st October, 1915.

5. Matter is awaiting receipt of further information, which steps have been taken to obtain, before it is submitted to Governor General.

HARBOUR MASTER OF QUEBEC.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. What is the salary of Captain Murray, Harbour Master of Quebec?

2. What was the salary of his predecessor?

Mr. REID:

1. $3,500 per annum. Captain Murray up to the time of his appointment was master of the Canadian Pacific Railway liner Empress of Britain. He was selected for the position by reason of the special qualifications he was known to possess, and was appointed at the time extensive works were authorized in connection with the new organization of the Harbour Commission.

2. $1,750 per annum.

CAPT. HOLLOCODY.

* Mr. CARVELL:

1. When was Captain Hollocody appointed by the Quebec Harbour Commission?

2. What are his functions?

3. What is his salary?

Mr. REID:

1, 2 and 3. The Quebec Harbour Commissioners, with whom the appointment of a harbour master for that port rests, have advised the Department of Marine and Fisheries that no such man as Captain Hollocody is in their employ, and there is no record of such man ever having been employed by that commission.

POSTMASTER AT STELLARTON, N.S.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. When was W. G. Miller made postmaster of Stellarton, N.S.?

2. Is he a returned soldier?

3. Why was the change made in the postmastership from Alex. Inglis to W. G. Miller?

Mr. PATENAUDE:

1. 13th March, 1917.

2. No.

3. It became necessary to make a change in the postmastership owing to the conduct of the postmaster. The postmaster was guilty of tampering with correspondence passing through his office. The post office inspector reported that it was not possible to receive any reply to communications sent from his office on official matters, and it was only by writing to the assistant postmaster that results could possibly be obtained. He was reported to the department as openly insubordinate both to the public and to the department. His failure to recognize the sacredness of correspondence passing through his office and his refusal to answer official correspondence in regard to matters pertaining to the department con-

stitutes an insubordination which it was impossible to gloss over and the postmaster was changed.

PASPEBIAC WHARF.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Has any work been done by the Department of Public Works on the wharf at Paspebiac, Quebec, belonging to Robin, Jones and Whitman?
2. If so, what was the nature of the work, and the cost of same?

Mr. REID:

1. Yes.
2. (a) Repairs. (b) In 1914 planks were renewed at a cost of $98.54, and $15.75 was paid for the transportation and installation of a pile driver.

SHIGAWAKE POST OFFICE.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Is a new Post Office being opened in Shigawake, Township of Hope, Bonaventure County, or has one been lately opened there?
2. If so, at whose request, where is the office situated, and who is the postmaster?
3. What is the distance between the new office and existing offices?

Mr. PATENAUDE:

1. Yes, a new post office has been authorized under the name of "Shigawake East."
2. (a) Mr. D. Champoux. (b) On lot 356, Front Concession No. 1, township of Hope. (c) Mr. W. D. Sullivan.
3. (a) 1⅝ miles east of Shigawake. (b) 3 miles west of Port Daniel West.

NEW RICHMOND WEST POST OFFICE.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. On what date was the New Richmond West Post Office re-opened?
2. How long had it been closed?
3. On whose report, or at whose request was it re-opened?
4. What is the nature of the service given at that office?

Mr. PATENAUDE:

The New Richmond West post office was closed on the 14th February, 1916, and has not since been reopened.

ST. CHARLES DE CAPLAN WHARF.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Has the public wharf at St. Charles de Caplan, Quebec, been damaged lately by ice?
2. If so, to what extent, and when will such damage be repaired?

Mr. REID:

1. Yes.
2. (a) About $2,500 will repair the damage. (b) As soon as Parliament has voted the necessary appropriation.

[Mr. Patenaude.]

MARIA BEACH PROTECTION.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. What was the total amount expended on the work for the protection of the beach at Maria, Quebec (a) previous to 1911, and (b) since that date, respectively?
2. Is the work completed?
3. If not, is it the intention of the Government to go on with the uncompleted part of the work?

Mr. REID:

1. (a) $1,916.13; (b) $2,398.98.
2 and 3. The work is completed.

RUISSEAU LE BLANC BREAKWATER.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. What amount of money has been spent on the breakwater at Ruisseau le Blanc, Bonaventure County, since 1911?
2. How much, if any, of the said work has been carried away by the ice and tide?
3. How much of this work, if any, is still to be completed?

Mr. REID:

1. $4,985.99.
2. No information that any part has been carried away.
3. This work is completed.

PAYMENTS TO SIR CHARLES DAVIDSON.

*Mr. LANCTOT:

1. What is the annual amount paid to Sir Charles P. Davidson of Montreal, as pension as retired Judge of the Superior Court?
2. What amount, if any, did he receive as a Commissioner since his appointment by the Dominion Government?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. $8,000.
2. So far as Department of Justice is aware, $5,225 as Commissioner re Army Contracts.

Mr. PAPINEAU:

1. Has Sir Charles P. Davidson been paid anything by the Government as Commissioner entrusted with the inquiry on war contracts since 1st December, 1915, to 1st April, 1917?
2. If so, how much has he received as fees or remuneration and expenses, respectively?
3. Have all the claims requested by him been granted or settled?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1 and 2. Yes. $1,000 on account of fees.
3. Final settlement has not yet been made.

PAYMENTS TO HON. MR. DOHERTY.

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. What is the total amount received by the Hon. Mr. Doherty, Minister of Justice, since 1908, for his pension as a retired Judge; as a member of the House of Commons and as Minister of Justice, respectively?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Hon. Mr. Doherty has received the amounts authorized by the statute in each case.

ELROSE MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. McCRANEY:

1. Has the Post Office Department received any correspondence with reference to the establishment of a Mail Car service on the Elrose branch of the Canadian Northern Railway, Province of Saskatchewan?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to grant a Mail Car service on this line?

Mr. PATENAUDE:

1. Yes, a petition was received from the patrons of the different offices asking for the establishment of a mail car service on this branch of the Canadian Northern railway.

2. Authority has been given for the placing of a mail car service on this line. As soon as the necessary arrangements can be made the new service will be inaugurated.

ST. JEROME POST OFFICE.

Mr. ETHIER:

1. Was the Minister of Public Works authorized to spend a certain amount for improvements and embellishment of the post office site in the town of St. Jerome, Terrebonne County, Quebec?

2. If so, when was the amount voted, and how much did it amount to?

3. How much of this amount has been spent to date, and for what purpose?

4. Out of the total vote, how much has the Government spent from May, 1915, to date?

5. Have the projected improvements and embellishments been finished? If not, why?

6. Will they soon be completed?

Mr. REID:

1 and 2. Yes; a vote for $1,400 was granted through the Main Estimates for 1914-15 to complete grading of grounds, etc.

3. Filling $648, levelling $334.21, grading $380.40, trees $35; $1,397.61. The cost of the retaining wall on the river front was paid out of the General Vote for Quebec Dominion Buildings.

4. $35 for trees.

5 and 6. The improvements have been finished.

LOUISEVILLE POST OFFICE.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Who recommended Mr. Bourque, of Hull, as contractor for the construction of the post office at Louiseville?

2. Has Mr. Bellemare, member for the County of Maskinonge, where this post office is situated, given a letter of recommendation in favor of Mr. Bourque?

Mr. REID:

1 and 2. No one; only one tender was received after public advertisement, that of Mr. Bourque, and the contract was awarded to him. There is no letter from Mr. Bellemare recommending that the contract be awarded to Mr. Bourque.

57½

BUTTER AND CHEESE PURCHASES.

Mr. BOYER:

1. What quantity of butter and cheese has been bought by the Government of Canada for the British Government?

2. What dates were these purchases made?

3. What are the names of the parties who have acted on behalf of the Government in the matter of said purchases?

4. What was the price paid the producers for each purchase of butter and cheese?

5. What commission, if any, has been paid to or drawn by the Government agents for their services?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. None.

2, 3, 4 and 5. Answered by No. 1.

TRAINING CAMPS IN CANADA.

Mr. McCOIG:

1. How many Military Training Camps does the Government own in Canada?

2. How many acres of land does each camp contain?

3. How many are in use for training purposes at the present time?

4. Has the Government taken any steps to produce food stuff on any of these lands not being used for training purposes?

Mr. KEMP:

1. The Government owns fifteen military training camps in Canada.

2. The acreage of each is as follows:

Ontario—Barriefield (including rifle range), 581·79 acres; Borden, 14,872·6 acres; Niagara (Ft. Mississauga and Ft. George), 421 acres; Niagara (Camp ground and rifle range), 380 acres, London, 80·73 acres; Petawawa, 70,400 acres.

Quebec—Three Rivers rifle range site, 307·48 acres; Valcartier, 12,480 acres; Farnham, 1,318·44 acres; Levis, 1,308·69 acres.

Nova Scotia—Kentville (Aldershot), 966·66 acres.

New Brunswick—Sussex, 300 acres.

Manitoba—Camp Hughes, 89,400 acres.

Saskatchewan—Area set aside for training purposes, 69,269·3 acres.

Alberta—Area set aside for training purposes, 65,120 acres.

Note.—Calgary Camp (Sarcee Indian Reserve).

3. Aldershot, N. S., Camp Borden, Ont., are in use by the Imperial Government for Royal Flying Corps. Camps are not in use generally, as weather is considered too cold.

4. No. It has not yet been decided to what extent these camp grounds will be required during 1917.

IMMIGRATION FORMS.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Is the Minister of Interior aware that Form 23, which is handed to passengers com-

ing to Canada from New York, Boston or other United States points by the railroad officials, is not printed in French?

2. Will the minister kindly give the necessary instructions to the department so that said Form 23 be printed in both languages?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes.

2. Department has been instructed to print Form 23 in both languages.

PICTOU RURAL ROUTES.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. How many rural mail routes have been opened in the County of Pictou since January 1, 1916?

2. Where are these routes?

3. Who are the contractors in each case?

4. What is the amount paid to each contractor?

5. What Post Offices have been closed in the County during the same period?

Mr. PATENAUDE:

1. Three.

2. Little Harbour No. 1, as follows: Leave the Junction of the McGregor and J. W. Reid roads (Reidway) daily, at 2 p.m. and proceed south and west by the Reidway road to the Chance Harbour Road, thence east by the Chance Harbour Road to the Little Harbour Post Office, thence returning by the same route leaving the Little Harbour Post Office at 3 p.m., or as soon as possible after arrival of mail from New Glasgow, round trip to be performed in 2¼ hours.

Loganville No. 1, as follows: Leave Loganville Post Office on Monday, Wednesday and Friday at 7.15 a.m., from October 1 to April 1, and on Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday at 5 p.m., or as soon as possible after the arrival of the mail from Scotsburn Station from April 1 to October 1, and proceed south by the South Loganville Road to the Gunn Road, thence East by the Gunn Road to the Glen Road, thence south by the Glen Road to Daniel Bezanson's Lane, thence returning by the same route to Loganville Post Office, round trip to be performed in 2¾ hours.

Pictou No. 3, as follows: Leave Pictou Post Office daily at 1 p.m., or as soon as possible after the arrival of mail train from Halifax, from May 1 to October 1, and at 8.45 a.m. from October 1 to May 1, and proceed westerly by the Cape John Road to Mr. Murray's Road, thence by Mr. Murray's Road to T. Harris Corner, thence north to Cape John Road, thence westerly by Cape John Road to the Three Brooks Road, thence east by the Three Brooks Road to the Waterside Road (Nichol's Corner) thence north and west by the Waterside Road to the Urquhart Road (Urquhart's Corner) thence south by the Urquhart Road to the Cape John Road, thence north to the Cariboo River Post Office, thence southerly by the Cape John Road to the Protection Road (Chisholm's Corner) thence west by the Protection Road to Battist's Corner, thence south to the River John Road (Sundridge Corner) thence east by the River John and Cape John roads to Pictou Post Office, round trip to be performed in 5½ hours.

3 and 4. Little Harbour No. 1, Stanley Powell, $230 per annum; Loganville No. 1, John M. Baillie, $200 per annum; Pictou No. 3, James J. Stikes, $4.50 per trip (pending the importation of tenders).

5. The following post offices have been closed in the County of Pictou, since January 1, 1916: Broookland, Brookville, Central Cariboo, Coalburn, Durham, Four Mile Brook, McLellan's Brook, Plainfield, Reidway, Rogers Hill Centre, Six Mile Brook, South Loganville, Three Brooks, West River.

FALSE CREEK DREDGING.

Mr. KYTE:

1. How much has been paid the Pacific Dredging Company for work performed at False Creek, Vancouver, to date?

2. When was said Company incorporated?

3. Who is its President?

4. Who is its Secretary?

Mr. REID:

1. $796,070.57.

2. No information.

3 and 4. Contract was signed by John Lynn Davidson, President, and Stuart Cameron, Secretary.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. What amount has been spent on the Hudson Bay Railway and approaches thereto in the Bay, since January 1, 1912?

2. Is the work going on?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. $17,790,587.74.

2. Yes.

UNIFORM INTEREST ON JUDGMENTS.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Has the Government been asked to fix by statute a uniform interest rate of six per cent per annum on judgments in all the Western Provinces?

2. Has the Government taken any action on this request?

3. If not, does it purpose doing so?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes.

2. Legislation fixing a uniform rate is under consideration.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. How many Americans have enrolled in Canadian Regiments since the commencement of the War?

2. How many natives of the British Isles are so enrolled in Canada since the 1st of August, 1914?

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. What is the total number of men who have offered for Overseas Service in all branches of the force since the war commenced?

2. How many have been accepted and how many rejected?

3. Have any new regulations been adopted in connection with the medical examination of men offering for service?

4. If so, what is the percentage of rejections since such regulations were adopted compared with the rejections prior to their adoption?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

For a copy of all reports, correspondence, recommendations and other papers in the possession of the Department of Marine and Fisheries relating to the life-saving station at Whitehead, N.S., since October 15, 1911, including copies of all reports, evidence and other documents, if any, relating to an investigation relative to loss of life in the wreck of the dredge Cape Breton.

Mr. LANCTOT;

For a copy of all documents, correspondence, letters, telegrams, memoranda and reports exchanged between the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Commons and the Honourable Albert Sévigny; the Sergeant-at-Arms and the Justice Department, and between the Department of Justice and the Honourable Albert Sévigny, concerning certain effects, furniture and ornaments connected with the Speaker's Apartments. Also, copy of all accounts, receipts, bills of lading and transportation accounts concerning the said effects, furniture and ornaments.

Mr. LEMIEUX;

For a copy of all papers, records and other documents concerning the reference by the Dominion Government to the questions relating to the exclusive right of fishing in the tidal waters of the Province of Quebec.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

For a copy of all correspondence in the Department of Public Works bearing date after September 1, 1915, relating to wharves, breakwaters and other public works in the County of Guysborough, Nova Scotia.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

For a copy of all correspondence in the possession of the Department of Public Works bearing date after September 1, 1915, relating to wharves, breakwaters and other public works situate in the County of Antigonish, Nova Scotia.

Mr. HUGHES:

For a copy of the correspondence between the Prime Minister and the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence, which led to the latter's resignation or dismissal from the Government.

Mr. BOYER:

For a copy of all letters, petitions, correspondence, telegrams and reports exchanged between the Government, the resident engineer of the district, and all other persons, concerning the dredging work done since 1904 at the wharf of Ile Perrot North, South and the Church, Dorion Bay channel, Vaudreuil Village channel, Pointe Cavagnale, Como, Hudson Heights channel, Graham channel, Rigaud River channel, Ottawa River, Iles aux Poires channel, Pointe Fortune and Ste. Anne de Bellevue channel. Also a statement showing the amount of money paid to divers persons, companies, etc., for such works, along with copy of statements already presented at my request in connection with the same work, previous to 1904.

Mr. BOYER:

For a copy of all letters, petitions, correspondence and telegrams exchanged between the Government, the District Engineer, and any other persons concerning either the construction, repairing or purchase of the wharves at Ile Perrot South, the Church in the village of Ile Perrot, Village of Vaudreuil, Pointe Cavignale, Hudson, Rigaud, Graham, Pointe Fortune and Ile Perrot North, since 1904. Also a copy of all specifications and reports already brought down at my request in relation to above prior to, and since 1904, giving a statement of the amounts that have been paid for such construction or repairs, showing to whom they were paid.

Mr. BOYER:

For a copy of all letters, petitions, correspondence and telegrams exchanged between the Government, the resident engineer and all other persons concerning the dredging work done at Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Pointe Fortune, Ottawa River Channel between Ile au Foin and Ile Paquin, Graham channel, Rigaud channel, Hudson Heights channel, Ile Perrot Church, Ile Perrot South wharf and Ile Perrot North wharf, since 1904. Also a statement showing the amounts paid to different persons or companies for such work, giving the dates of payment, along with a copy of the estimates already brought down at my request regarding the above, previous to 1904.

Mr. BOYER:

For a copy of all letters, petitions, correspondence, telegrams and reports exchanged between the Government, the resident engineer and all other persons, concerning the construction and repairing done to the wharves at Ile Perrot North, South and at the Church; Village of Vaudreuil, Pointe Cavagnale, Hudson, Graham, Rigaud and Pointe Fortune since 1904. Also a copy of all data and reports regarding above already produced at my request relating to documents prior to 1904, showing the amounts of money paid for such construction and repairing, and to whom paid.

Mr. MACDONALD:

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to Stellarton Post Office, Pictou County, and any changes or proposed changes in the Postmastership at that place.

Mr. MACDONALD:

For a copy of all letters, papers, telegrams and other documents relative to the establishment of the Canadian Government Railway Employees magazine, showing the circulation thereof, the cost of production, receipts, and the persons employed in connection therewith, giving a statement of the amount received by said persons from the Railway in any capacity.

Mr. KYTE:

For a copy of the applications for Arbitration Boards made to the Labour Department by the Provincial Workman's Association or its officers and the United Mines Workmen of Nova Scotia or its officers. Also a copy of all letters, copies of letters and other documents relating to this matter, along with all letters, papers, other documents and Orders in Council relative to the appointment of a Commission to investigate labour and other conditions in the County of Cape Breton.

Mr. MACDONALD:

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams and documents relative to the purchase of land in Vancouver, B.C., for the purpose of an armoury, since January 1, 1913.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the necessary legislation should be enacted to provide that members of the House of Commons should be elected by a system of proportional representation.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is with a good deal of hesitation that I bring this subject to the attention of the House, particularly for the reason that when a member brings up a motion of this kind he should be better posted on the subject than I am.

This subject is coming very much to the front in all democratic countries. Not only in the British Isles, but in the overseas dominions as well, the matter is being discussed and in many of the British dependencies the principle of proportional representation is being adopted. Even in Canada a good deal has already been accomplished. In the city of Ottawa a few years ago a vote was taken on the subject as applied to the elections for the city government, and on that occasion a majority of two to one declared itself in favour of proportional representation. Application was made to the Ontario Legislature that the city charter be so amended as to permit the application of the principle, but so far that has not been done. In Alberta the United Farmers elect their officers under the principle of proportional representation, and the city of Calgary has passed the necessary legislation to enable it to use the system in electing its municipal government.

This question is absolutely free from political bias. The adoption of a system of proportional representation would have no effect on the standing of the parties, except, possibly, that both parties might lose a few members, due to the fact that other groups of thought throughout the country would be enabled to elect a certain number of representatives to the House. I know that this subject is one that the average member is not very familiar with. I knew nothing whatever about it until two months ago, when I decided to bring the matter up. I have spent some little time looking into it, and it might be just as well for me to endeavour to explain to the House what proportional representation would involve.

4 p.m.

The object of proportional representation is that the majority should rule in every case, that the minority should be represented in the House in proportion to its support throughout the country, and that any considerable body of opinion—labour socialists, our nationalist friends, or the farmers—would, if they felt that no other party carried out their views, be enabled to elect to the House a number of members in proportion to their strength.

In order to bring about proportional representation certain methods have to be adopted. First of all, you have to do away with the single-member constituency. You cannot have proportional representation as long as you have constituencies that return only one member to the House, or two members, as in the case of Ottawa. It would be necessary to arrange the present constituencies in groups of three, five, seven, nine, or any number which might be deemed expedient. From what I have read, I think that five or seven of the constituencies as arranged at present would form the ideal constituency for purposes of proportional representation.

Many members of the House may be more familiar with the subject than I am, and all that I expect to accomplish at the present time is this: after there has been a debate I would consider it advisable that a committee be appointed to look into the matter and report to the House. I do not desire or anticipate that the principle of proportional representation should be applied at the next Dominion election, nor do I consider that it would be advisable to go so fast as to adopt proportional representation for the whole of Canada at the next following Dominion election. If the committee should investigate the matter and

report that the present system is not altogether satisfactory and that some improvements could be made by adopting a system of proportional representation, then it might be advisable before the second election comes round to do what they are now doing in Great Britain—adopt it in certain cases; apply it to large cities or to groups of constituencies that are not too large and where the population is somewhat dense.

The method of voting under a system of proportional representation is not an untried one.

Proportional representation has been in force in many European countries and in some of our own British overseas dominions, and in no case where that system of one man, one vote has been tried, has it been abandoned and the old system brought in again. There may be one exception to that statement. The system was tried in the municipalities of Australia, although not in the form that is usually adopted now, and I understand that it was not continued, but that is the only case of that kind that I ever heard of. In order to carry out a system of proportional representation, four or five of the present constituences would be joined together, one of the advantages of the system being that a candidate does not require to secure a majority of the votes in that large constituency. As an illustration, let us suppose that Ottawa, with its two seats, and the counties of Carleton and Russell were joined together, four ridings to elect four members. Were it not for the dividing line of the Ottawa river between the two provinces, I would add the county of Wright to make five; but let us take the four, and let us suppose that 20,000 votes were cast in those four ridings. All that any candidate has to get to be elected will be one-fifth of that vote plus one, because there are only four men who can get 4,001 out of 20,000 votes.

Mr. GRAHAM: That one shuts them out.

Mr. TURRIFF: The short system adopted to ascertain the number of votes necessary to elect a candidate is to add one to the number of seats, divide the number of votes cast by that and add one to the result. Under proportional representation, the system of marking the ballot is somewhat different from what it is at present. The ballot would be printed with the names of all the candidates. In a constituency such as I have described, including Ottawa, Carleton and Russell, there would be four Liberal condidates, no doubt, four Conservatives, and there would also likely be a labour candidate, a socialist candidate, a Nationalist candidate or an Imperialist candidate. There might be several different groups of thought throughout the constituency and they would each nominate their candidate.

Hon. CHAS. MARCIL: What about women candidates?

Mr. TURRIFF: There might be some women candidates. I hope to see the present Government shortly adopt the principle of equal suffrage, and in that case we may have some women candidates, but let us leave that out of the question at the present time. Under proportional representation every vote counts; no man loses his vote. Let us say that in this four-seated constituency of Ottawa, Carleton and Russell, my leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, is one of the Liberal candidates, his right hand man, Mr. Graham, another candidate, Mr. Lemieux the third candidate and Mr. Murphy, the present member for Russell, the fourth candidate.

Mr. GRAHAM: Those would be all the candidates you would need.

Mr. TURRIFF: I am sure my hon. friends on the other side would have four candidates also, including doubtless Sir Robert Borden; and Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Sir Robert Borden being the leaders of their respective parties, there is no doubt that both of them would poll many more first-choice votes than the necessary quota. Out of 20,000, they would require only 4,001. Sir Wilfrid Laurier might easily poll 6,000 votes, or 2,000 more than he required. My hon. friend Mr. Graham—

Mr. GRAHAM: I would need votes in Carleton.

Mr. TURRIFF:—might not get very many votes in Carleton, and he would require a few extra votes. This is the way in which that would be remedied. Each man has four choices. He marks on the ballot the figure one after his first choice, the figure two after his second choice, the figure three after his third choice, and the figure four after his fourth choice. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, we will say, gets 6,000 votes, or two thousand more than he requires. After Sir Wilfrid Laurier was declared elected, the balance of the votes over 6,000 would be divided amongst the other candidates. One-third of the ballots on which Mr. Graham was marked second choice.

would go to him. For instance, if there were 1,000 ballots marked Mr. Graham for second choice, 333 votes would be credited to him, and if that was sufficient to elect him, well and good. But if Mr. Graham had received 4,001 ballots on which he was marked first choice, he would be declared elected, and the balance over and above the number of votes necessary to elect Sir Wilfrid Laurier would go to the next choice, Mr. Lemieux or Mr. Murphy, and so on down through the whole list, the over-plus, after one man was elected, being transferred to the next man; and similarly with the Conservative candidates.

In a constituency such as I have described, the labour men would be able to elect at least one man if 4,000 voters or anything like that number, marked the labour man as their first choice. If the labour candidate was short a few hundred votes, he might still be elected by the ballots on which he was marked as second or third or even fourth choice. In discussing this question, people have occasionally asked me, what better off should we be if we had in the House more labour men, or Socialists or Independents, instead of representatives of the two big parties that have always ruled in this country, Liberals and Conservatives? Well, my idea is this, and I think my right hon. leader would agree with me if he were here, and the Prime Minister also, or any other man who has had experience in governing in Canada. I think it would be better for the people of Canada, and immeasurably better for the Government, whichever party happened to be in power, if instead of having a certain amount of dissatisfied public opinion throughout the Dominion, which never in the past has found itself properly represented in proportion to its strength in our legislatures or on the floor of this House—in my opinion it would be better to have that body of opinion represented in the House, rather than remain unrepresented and dissatisfied outside, because all who have been any time in the House know there is no place like the House of Commons to rub the corners off a man, and where a man of extreme views so quickly finds his level; it does not take them very long to find out what can and what cannot be done by Parliament. If the labour party were represented in this House according to its strength in the country, if instead of having one labour man in this House, we had ten, I am quite satisfied that it would be of advantage to the House and of advantage to the labour party,

because they would soon find out that it was not the easiest thing in the world with the legislative machinery we have at present to put their theories all into practice.

There are other advantages in this system, and one of the main ones is this: proportional representation in my judgment would strike a heavy blow, a body blow, to bribery and corruption in elections, and for this reason. We all know that in single-member constituencies where the vote is close and the majority around one or two hundred, particularly in the older-settled parts of the country, the politics of the voters is pretty well fixed; you can generally tell about how many Liberal and how many Conservative votes there will be at any election. In a constituency like that it is possible for some interests, or a combination of interests, who were able to swing say one hundred or two hundred votes, probably one hundred votes would be sufficient, to go to a candidate and say: "You only have a narrow margin, but if you will vote in our interests on certain lines, or vote against certain other interests, we will swing our full support in your favour. If not, we will vote against you." Under proportional representation that kind of thing could not be done to anything like the same extent, and the candidate would be freed from that sort of pressure. That, to my mind, would be one very, very great advantage. Under proportional representation, if I have sized it up correctly, you would get a better class of candidates. Lots of good men have been kept out of politics for the simple reason that they did not want the strenuous work of fighting a close election, with all the unpleasantness that it involves. But in a five or seven-member constituency a big man who was well known in the district might put up as a candidate, because if five members were to be elected he would only require one-sixth of the vote, plus one, or if seven were to be elected one-eighth of the vote plus one, and that would do away with the necessity of making a close personal canvass like many of us have to make at the present time, because every one of us has to get one more than half the total number of votes polled to be elected. But under proportional representation, where only a percentage of the vote is required to elect a man, you would get a better class of candidates, and that would be to the advantage of the electors, and of advantage to the country as a whole.

Proportional representation would also do away with certain anomalies that exist

at the present time, but before dealing with that I will take up one or two other objections that are sometimes made. One objection is that under proportional representation the parties in Parliament would be very evenly divided. That is true, you would have it more evenly divided than at the present time. But in every case you would have the majority ruling. We are not exempt from the possibility of a very even division of the House under the present system. In the province of Ontario a comparatively few years ago, the Hardy Government was returned by a very small majority. When the late Sir George Ross became Prime Minister and went to the country, he had a majority of only three, as I recollect it, and yet he held office for several years. And we see the same thing to-day. In the province of New Brunswick there is a very small majority—

Mr. CARVELL: It is big enough.

Mr. TURRIFF: My own opinion is that we have better government when the majority is not too large, whatever party may be in power.

Mr. GRAHAM: The majority in New Brunswick is bigger than that in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. TURRIFF: But under the present system we face the possibility of a still worse evil, for you may have a majority in the House when that majority is representative of an actual minority of the popular vote. This could not happen under proportional representation; it is one of the anomalies that this reform would do away with.

This is not a new proposal. It was brought up in this House by the late Mr. Monk, who was a very ardent supporter of proportional representation. The late Sir Richard Cartwright was also strongly in favour of this reform, and made a speech on the subject in the Senate, of which he was then a member. Sir Richard Cartwright gave some very striking instances of small majorities in the country being represented by large majorities in the House. He said:

> Let me suppose that one side controls 100,000 voters, and the other side controls 90,000, and that there are 190 representatives to be elected. It is perfectly just and right, it appears to me, that 100,000 voters should return 100 representatives, and that those who control 90,000 should return 90 representatives; but it is not fair that those who control 100,000 voters should return 150 representatives, and that those who control 90,000 should return but 40. Yet that is what I have seen.

He then gives the following table:

Statement showing the total Liberal and total Conservative vote in the Province of Ontario in the Commons general elections for the years 1882, 1887, 1891, 1896 and 1900:

Year.	Total Vote. Lib.	Con.	Majority Per Cent.	Members Elected. Lib.	Con.
1882	131,618	132,615	½ of 1	37	55
1887	170,371	174,080	1	40	52
1891	179,451	175,639	1	44	48
1896	185,415	179,181	Nearly 2	48	44
1900	193,417	199,138	1½	37	55

So it will be seen that our present system, while it has worked fairly well in a general way, may result in very great anomalies. This misrepresentation in the House of the votes cast in the country has not been one-sided by any means, for in many cases the Liberals have had the advantage. The year I entered this House, 1904, our friends came up from Nova Scotia with eighteen members, and not a single Conservative, though the Conservatives had polled one-third of the votes. Had we had proportional representation the members from Nova Scotia would have been twelve Liberals and six Conservatives, and I am sure that everybody will agree, whether on this side of the House or on the other, that it would have been much better to have had the parties in Nova Scotia represented in proportion to their voting strength. Look at the present representation of the province from which I come, Saskatchewan. We on this side have nine out of ten of the members elected from that province. Nobody will say that on the basis of the votes cast we are entitled to nine members and the Conservatives to only one. Had we voted under the proportional representation system the returns would have been about three Conservatives to seven Liberals. And the same is practically true of Alberta. But when we come to British Columbia we find that in this same election of 1911 our friends on the other side of the House elected seven members, and we did not elect one. Were the Liberals of that province fairly represented we should have on this side of the House at least two or three members from that province. It would be much better if there were two or three Liberals from British Columbia and three or four Conservatives from Alberta and Saskatchewan. There would be a better representation all around.

I could read many more figures on this phase of the question, but I think I have read enough to make the point clear that under our present system parties are not represented in accordance with the popular vote. Now, I may be asked where propor-

tional representation is in operation. Let me read one paragraph from a little journal called Representation, one of the issues of the year 1908:—

It cannot be too often impressed upon politicians at home that, in one form or another, proportional representation is in force in Belgium, Switzerland, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Wurtemberg, Japan, Cuba, and Tasmania.

I may say that in Finland, while they have constituencies electing as few as three members, there is one constituency that elects twenty-three members. And, of course, the larger the constituency the more exact the representation, for there is less waste, in the division of the vote. Then, in addition, when the Government in Great Britain, a few years ago, was struggling with the Bill to give Home Rule to Ireland, it was found that there would be difficulty because in the southern part of Ireland, where the Nationalists are in force, in a single member constituency, the Unionists would not get in at all. They would not have a single member from the southern portion of Ireland. Practically the same thing would occur in some of the northern portions of Ireland; the Unionists would have absolute control where they were in the majority and the Nationalist would not have a look-in. Therefore, you would have Ireland divided north and south. The British Government, seeing the difficulty there, adopted the principle of proportional representation for the election of senators in Ireland. I am speaking now subject to correction because I have not followed this very closely, but I have been told that later on, when it was expected that the Bill was going to be put in force, it was amended so that the principle of proportional representation should be applied to the election of members of the Legislature as well as to the election of senators.

An hon. MEMBER: What Bill is that?

Mr. TURRIFF: The Home Rule Bill that has not yet been put into force. But what is far more important, to my mind, as showing the trend of public opinion in Great Britain even at the present time with all the troubles of the great war on their hands, is that the whole subject of elections has been dealt with and dealt with very vigorously by a committee known as the Speaker's Committee and this committee has been selected to represent the Liberals, the Unionists, the Nationalists and the Laborites—the two main parties and the two main groups. They have brought in a report. I have a copy of that report under my hand. This was a conference on electoral reform and I have here the findings of that committee. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that outside of the question of proportional representation, they have brought in a very drastic report, a report that is of a very radical character when you consider the present existing conditions in Great Britain. This committee represented all the parties in the House of Commons. It is expected that the report will be adopted by Parliament and that in the next election in Great Britain the principle of proportional representation will be applied to a considerable extent. They deal with the metropolitan district excluding the city of London. Well, the city of London proper is only a small constituency a mile square which elects two members. They say:

For the purpose of this rule the Metropolis, (excluding the city of London,) shall be treated as a single area and divided into constituencies returning not less than three nor more than five members.

The Metropolis, as I understand, returns some fifty odd members and now they will all, with the exception of the city proper, which returns two members, be elected under the proportional representation system. They further say:

Provided that constituency entitled to return more than five members shall be divided into two or more constituencies each returning not less than three nor more than five members.

That is in the large counties that return a number of members and in which the population is somewhat dense. I am perfectly well aware that it has been argued, and argued with some force, that England is a small country geographically as compared with ours and is densely populated and that what might work very satisfactorily in Great Britain might not work satisfactorily here. Personally, I would not like to see proportional representation put suddenly into force all over Canada. I think that would be going too fast. I would like to see it tried in a district represented by a number of members; try it, for instance, in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. GRAHAM: Try it in Toronto.

Mr. TURRIFF: In Toronto, Montreal, Winnipeg, Vancouver, St. John or any of the large cities. It could be tried out there and if it is found to work well then it might be adapted to other constituencies.

Another objection has been raised that it would be expensive for the candidate. I do not believe that. I represent a considerable area. Personally I would like to see Saskatchewan divided into three constituencies, a southern with five seats, a central with six seats and a northern with five seats. I would much rather campaign the whole of the southern portion of Saskatchewan containing five constituencies, some of them very large, and I could do it on a good deal less money than it costs me to canvass one local constituency as closely as you have to canvass it if you want to be sure of election.

Mr. WILCOX: How much does it cost you now?

Mr. TURRIFF: Seventy-eight dollars.

Mr. M. CLARK: No, cents.

Mr. TURRIFF: Leave it at that. As to the matter of cost, I feel sure that the objection is not a good one. We do know that where there is a big constituency we have to spend months in driving around either in livery rigs or in automobiles. I do not know whether my hon. friends on this and the other side of the House have had the same experience with liveries as I have had but they are very expensive in election times when you are driving around and going to meetings. I am satisfied that in a large constituency, composed of three or five of the present constituencies, any candidate could canvass it fully as cheaply, and in my judgment, more cheaply than the present single member constituency. I do not think that the objection is a very valid one. Another objection, and I think possibly it has more to it than the one I have just dealt with, is that the candidate could not become so well acquainted with the electors in a three or four constituency seat. That is an objection but I think that most men representing a large constituency geographically do not know anything like all the electors as it is. Then, instead of having one man around a constituency, you would have three or five candidates on each side and others besides. So that the electors would become more conversant with the questions of the day in constituencies where there were half a dozen or a dozen candidates canvassing than where there were only two. Another thing that has been urged against the system is that it would affect party Government. Well, I have read everything I can get my hands on in this connection, and to my mind the great bulk of the argument is exactly the other way. It would not affect party Government at all; the parties would remain just the same, except that I think the two main parties would be somewhat less numerous in the House, and there would be groups that might affiliate with one or the other, and that in my judgment would not be a bad thing for the country. It is absolutely non-political in that respect.

The objection that I think would appeal more than anything else to the general public is that you could not get the returns of the elections on the night of the election as quickly as we get them at the present time. If you had large constituencies electing five members, in all probability it would be the next day before you would have the final returns. I have here an account of a test election taken in Great Britain, in which something over 21,000 votes were cast, and in six hours they had the returns completed absolutely. In very large constituencies like Manchester, where there would be 70,000 votes cast, it was suggested that they would have all the returns completed within twenty-four hours. Thus the delay in getting the final returns would probably be one day. I think that is not a very serious matter, and that it would be better to wait for one day for final returns if, by waiting for that day, you had a better election and a better representation. So that that objection, to my mind, although it is the most serious that has been raised, is not by any means a grave objection. I have a number of leaflets illustrating how a test election is held, and shall be glad to give one to any member who wishes to examine further into the subject. There is no doubt that when you first look at the system it appears very complicated. But if you handed the rules of the game of baseball to a man unacquainted with that game, they would look very complicated to him. I admit that it looked very complicated to me when I first looked into it two or three months ago; but the more I have examined it and the more familiar I have become with the working out of the scheme, the more simple I have found it. In Tasmania they have a local Legislature of thirty members, and since 1896 those members have all been elected under the proportional system of representation I am here advocating, one man one vote, a transferable vote. They have tested this scheme and have found it to work very well. They have there three different systems of electing members. They elect their members to the Federal House by the or-

dinary system of the single constituency, such as we have here. It has been found that there are fewer spoiled ballots with proportional representation than with single constituencies, so that the objection that the system is too complicated does not hold at all. In Belgium they have found that this system works extremely well, and they would not think of going back to the old system.

I would suggest to my hon. friend who is leading the House (Sir Thomas White) that if he thinks the subject is worthy of any further consideration it might be advisable to appoint a committee and gather information on it. There is a proportional representation association in the city of Ottawa that is capable of supplying a great deal of information, and any committee of this House that might be appointed would be able to get all the information necessary. I know that if we had a committee the association in the Old Country would probably be willing to send a man over to explain the system; but that would not be necessary as I think there are men here who have for years been working in connection with this matter of proportional representation and who could give all the information that could be desired, and all that would be necessary to enable us to come to a conclusion whether or not it would be a good thing for Canada to try to bring about a change. It might be that after looking into this question a committee might decide that it would be better not to adopt the new scheme, that there would not be sufficient virtue in it to make it worth while changing the system. There is no doubt that it is quite a serious matter to change the whole method of electing members of Parliament. I leave the matter with the House, and my hon. friend who leads the House (Sir Thomas White) will decide whether or not it is desirable to go further with the matter.

Hon. Sir THOMAS WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I am sure we have all, on both sides of the House, listened with much interest to the presentation of this important subject by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). It is a matter with which the general public has not greatly concerned itself, and, as my hon. friend has said, it is an unfamiliar subject, except as a public question that has engaged the attention of political thinkers—to most members of the House. But we cannot disguise from ourselves the fact that it has attracted a great deal of attention and has been given a great deal of thought by men interested in the subject of constitutional and electoral reform, and therefore it is a proper subject for the consideration of this House. As my hon. friend has stated, it is not a party question. He is actuated by no partisan motive in bringing it to our attention, and I think we may all congratulate him upon the fairness with which he has presented it. The hon. member has pointed out that the matter has been and is being considered by many of the most advanced countries in the world. It has been considered in Great Britain and France; it has been adopted, as the hon. gentleman has pointed out, by Belgium, Finland, Switzerland and Japan. The hon. gentleman has told us, also, that the principle has been adopted by municipalities. I do not know that the argument that it has been adopted by those countries and by municipalities is of much service to us in reaching a conclusion upon the merits of the system as applied to a country such as this, because their constitutional system differs from ours. In very few continental countries, indeed, does the assembly in which gather the representatives of the people take the part in government that is taken by a deliberative body such as this, or by the British Parliament. In some cases in Europe a representative assembly is a sort of glorified debating society. The executive carries on the work of the government. It has the benefit of discussions in the representative assembly, but the representative assembly has not the power, the influence or the supreme control of affairs which is exercised by the British House of Commons and by a House such as this, which is modelled upon the British principle. However, there must be merit in the system, or it would not have been adopted by the countries to which my hon. friend refers.

There is this to be said with respect to municipalities. Municipalities are usually governed by councils, and the distinction between the Government and a municipality, generally speaking, of a government such as ours, is this: that the municipal government lacks a cabinet system. Representatives of the people meet together in a council—county council or city council. They debate the affairs of the municipality and they reach certain conclusions, which are translated into action. That is essentially different from the system of government under which the affairs of Canada are administered, because the essential

feature of a government such as ours—and the remark applies also to the British Government—is the cabinet system. According to Bagehot, who used to be regarded as a very high constitutional authority, the essential feature of the British constitutional system is that the cabinet forms an efficient link between the executive and the legislative branches of government. Parliament, while supreme, does not rule. The real ruler, I take it, under the British constitutional system, subject of course to the limitations of the constitution, is the Prime Minister, subject to his being able to maintain a majority in the House of Commons. We all know that Parliament is supreme, but it is a mistake to assume that Parliament is in any sense an executive. Parliament is the legislative branch; the Prime Minister and his ministers constituting the cabinet, are the executive. According to Bagehot, the link between the legislative and the executive is the cabinet. I do not know that Bagehot's view would be concurred in to-day by all constitutional authorities, but he did advance thought considerably upon the subject when he drew attention to the fact that the cabinet was really a link between the executive and the legislature, and that the real ruler under a constitutional system is the Prime Minister so long as he continues to maintain a majority in the House of Commons. So that it is not a conclusive argument—it may not be a weighty argument—to say that a system which is found advantageous under the constitutions of the European governments or in municipal administration, would be equally advisable in connection with an administration such as ours. The object of proportional representation as pointed out by my hon. friend—I may say that I have not turned my mind upon the matter, except in a very academic way, until to-day—is to ensure that minorities will be represented. Well, I have had a more limited experience in this House than most of the members who are here, but I cannot help thinking that minorities are pretty well represented in this House. I can hardly imagine any interest that is not discussed in this House in the course of our deliberations during a session of Parliament. I rather incline to the view that many
5 p.m. opinions are put forward in this House that are not supported by any interest in the country. One of the functions of a House undoubtedly is to discuss all manner of questions which may have the support of individuals, may be few in number, through the country. That is one of the safeguards of our constitution, and it is one of the most important functions of the House of Commons. That is one reason why I think we should have patience in debates upon subjects in which most of us may not be very much interested. Sections of the community may think they have grievances. The grievances may not be real, but they are aired in the House of Commons and debate usually discloses whether they are real grievances or not. The mere fact of their being brought forward in the House of Commons is regarded with satisfaction by those who think they have those grievances, and the result is that Parliament discharges one of its most essential functions in providing a deliberative body in which the opinions of various minds, the views held by different sections of the community, may be discussed and their merits tested. I am the first to admit the desirability of all interests in the community having, I will not say a specific representation, but at least representation in this House. This House is a great educative body. I do not care what man comes into this House, what his experience may have been, how able he may have been, what his professional or business attainments—he is learning all the time in this House. He gets opinions from all parts of the Dominion of Canada; he could not possibly have got them in connection with his own business. After all the greatest business of this country is, in a sense, a narrow business. Parliament in its scope is much wider than business. Parliament is much wider than any or all professions. Parliament deals with everything that pertains to human affairs; everything that concerns the rights and interests of mankind. The subjects dealt with in Parliament are wider than those that come before any man or any set of men outside of Parliament.

My hon. friend is of the opinion that under proportional representation, more special interests would be represented in Parliament. While there is a good deal to be said as to the desirability of that, we must bear in mind that under the British system, government can only be carried on if the Government of the day has a working majority, and that is where the party system comes in. At present, so far as I can see, it is indispensable.

When an election takes place there is an issue either on some great public question or on the record of the Government of the day. The issue is presented in a broad,

general way; we do not get down to details. There is a rough judgment of the electorate upon the Government of the day and upon the Opposition as they are viewed by the electorate, and the result is that the Government is sustained or the Government is defeated. One naturally inquires, in connection with the subject, what would be the advantage of departing from the present system and adopting the system of proportional representation. By our present system, under the British North America Act, there is a fixed number of representatives returned from each province, the basis being the population as determined by the decennial census and having relation to the fixed number of 65 provided by the constitution for the province of Quebec. The anomalies of our system are many; the defects are many. In a city such as Toronto or Montreal you may have a representative with a constituency of 100,000 or 150,000 people; on the other hand, you may have a constituency of only a few thousand in population returning its member to the House of Commons. The result is an inequality of representation, although I believe there is a great deal to be said for the rural part of the community having a greater representation, in proportion to population, than the cities, and that principle, I think, has been generally recognized in connection with the question of representation in the House of Commons. Under our system, as I have pointed out, the public affairs of the country and of every department thereof are pretty thoroughly discussed in Parliament. Every section is represented. One would naturally like to see a more equal representation, but that is not something to be accomplished at an early date, because changes of this nature, very far reaching in their character, are not likely to be brought about suddenly. Any change involving disturbance in the limits of constituencies and the representation of those constituencies must, like an organic change, come very slowly, that is, having regard to practical considerations of which we must never lose sight. The public, after all, are not governed very much by academic arguments; it is practical considerations that appeal to them. They seldom take or support a step until the wisdom of it is clearly seen and appreciated.

My hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) has mentioned that he thinks it is an advantage for a Government to have a small majority. I do not agree, and I doubt if many men in this House agree with him in that. On the one hand, I think it would be a great misfortune if an opposition should be unduly weak; on the other, I think it would be a misfortune that a Government should have an overwhelming majority. But that a Government should have a substantial working majority is essential to government in a country such as ours. A Government that is dependent upon merely two or three votes for a majority is at the mercy of conditions that do not make for good government. The two extremes are objectionable; the medium, a good substantial working majority, is the thing to be desired.

This question was brought up in the House, I understand, in the session of 1909 at the instance of the late Hon. Mr. Monk. It was debated at some length, and finally referred to a select committee of the House. I have made inquiry, but I have not been able to ascertain that the committee held any meetings, much less made any study or investigation into the subject. That showed that there was not a very great deal of interest in the subject at that time, and I think there must necessarily be still less interest in it at this time when we are engaged in a war that is engrossing our attention and absorbing our energies from day to day. As the matter, however, is one that is attracting a great deal of attention and has many strong advocates, I see no objection to the appointment of a select committee, provided that my hon. friend thinks that course is advisable. For myself, if I were bringing the matter to the attention of the House, I should be content at this time, with a war on, and with the House engaged as it is, with bringing the subject to the attention of the House and having it discussed. If my hon. friend desires that a select committee should be appointed, the Government is entirely agreeable to that course. I leave that to my hon. friend to consider. If he desires to have a select committee appointed, then I would suggest that he alter his motion to this effect:

> That a select committee of five members of this House be appointed to consider and report on the advisability of enacting legislation to provide for the election of members of the House of Commons by a system of proportional representation, and that such committee have power to send for persons, papers and documents.

My hon. friend must have observed that it is not necessary to call experts and political thinkers who have had this question under consideration in Great Britain, to aid the committee in its study and investigation of this subject. There are many in

this country who have made this question a special subject of study, and who, without doubt, could give the committee useful information; but I would submit to my hon. friend that unless he is reasonably certain that if a committee be appointed, it will take up this subject, will study it, will investigate it, will call before it those men who may be able to give it advice and assistance, he might better just content himself with bringing the matter to the attention of the House. I do not think there is anything further I can usefully add. We have all listened with much interest to my hon. friend and are indebted to him for the very fair manner in which he has expounded this subject for our consideration.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (South Renfrew): Mr. Speaker, it is possible for a Government and even for a Parliament to get into such a frame of mind that it is afraid of everything new. We have not to go so far as Russia to find out that the world is moving along very distinct democratic lines, and unless the Government or Parliament keeps slightly ahead of the movement, it will get pushed off the national map as a party. We have come to the point in Canada when we have to be more radical in all our legislation than we have been in the past. The war has taught us and is teaching us certain lessons; but above all things it is teaching us that our ideas on any subject are not as immovable as they were a few months ago. We are looking at things from a new view point, and he, whether he be in a high position or in a low one, who refuses to yield to this pressure, will, I think, find himself away behind in the advancement of everything that is for the national good and for the personal good as well. We have had our fixed theories on tariff; we have had our fixed theories on forms of government, and we have had our fixed theories on taxation. But, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the mind of the public, yes, the mind of the entire world, is in a state of evolution, and before very long we shall find ourselves considering things from altogether different viewpoints than ever before. If the war do not bring about that result, then one of the results which I look for will not have been attained. In western Canada, for instance, from which my hon. friend comes, we have people from the various countries of the Old World. They are not slow people; they have come to our new country looking for better things than they found at home; they are in this country looking not only for better opportunities for making a living, but looking also to Parliament for more advanced ideas, and we will have to meet these views, not only by tariffs, by special taxation, but with just such measures as my hon. friend has brought before the House to-day. That we have succeeded under our present form of government, which is based on what we have always thought the best form of government in the world, is not a sufficient guarantee that the same form of government is the best for the future. Our basic principle has always been representation by population. Now, under our present method, as it works out under the Redistribution arrangement, this Parliament is not based on representation by population. I will give the Minister of Finance a concrete case. Take the constituency which he or some one else will represent after the next general election, the riding of Leeds and Brockville. The adjoining riding is represented by the Minister of Customs. Now, the riding represented by the Minister of Customs has about 17,000 people, whereas the riding represented, or to be represented, perhaps, by the Minister of Finance, has over 35,000 people. Now, that is not representation by population, but in this House, and in the Government —no, I would not like to say in the Government—but in the House at all events the Minister of Customs has as much to say as the Minister of Finance; that is to say, he is an entity in the House. Now, that is not representation by population. Either the constituency of Grenville will be over-represented, or Leeds and Brockville is going to be under-represented. When we make our redistribution after the decennial census, as my hon. friend says, we should keep as close as possible, and that is largely done now, to a certain unit representation. but there are cases such as I have pointed out where one member represents twice as many people as the member in the adjoining constituency. Under proportional representation that condition would not exist; not only a part of the population, but all the population would be represented. The two ridings I have mentioned, and I only cite them because I know the conditions, are not represented at all from the viewpoint of Liberalism, to put it mildly. But there are a large number of people in those ridings who entertain those views, and their representative in this House does not repre-

sent those views. I would not for a moment suggest that representatives in the House here do not look after the interests of their constituents, whether Liberal or Conservative; I do not mean that at all, but I say that the principles which they hold have no mouth-piece in this House.

Take the city of Toronto as another example. Now, it will be admitted that there are in that city many thousands of men who are opposed to the general policy of this Government, and who have no mouth-piece in this House. There are also in that city thousands of men who believe in the principles of the labour movement more thoroughly than in the principles of the two great parties, and under the present system these men have not a direct voice in the legislation of this country. Again, the province of Ontario, for instance, has only fourteen Liberal members in this House, but no one will say for a moment that that represents the Liberal view of the province of Ontario from the number of votes cast, and the same applies to the other side of the House in other places.

What I want to point out is this: The conditions that will arise in this country in the near future, and which may be present with us even now, are such that we must not hang our hats on what has been in existence heretofore. Canada is a new country full of democratic thought, and into this country are coming men of democratic and advanced views. It is because of those views that they have left their own countries and come to us, and we will have to enact legislation that will in a measure meet those views, and I am inclined to think that the legislation in this particular instance is of the proper character. Something along that line ought to be done. My hon. friend says that municipalities have not the cabinet form of government. Some place have, in a measure. In Montreal, Toronto and Ottawa, for instance, they have what is called a Board of Control, which although elected at large, is really the executive of the municipal body; they prepare and bring before that body matters for legislation, matters of policy, and matters of practice for the carrying out of what is best for the municipality. In a minor degree the board of control is a cabinet, and the principle of cabinet government seems to be evolving more and more. So the objection raised by the Minister of Finance does not apply, because the larger cities already have a form of cabinet government.

On the question raised by the Minister of Finance as to the connection between the people and the Executive, I am not going to say much. In discussing these matters we must not forget that we are in an altogether different position from our friends across the line. Their Cabinet has no seat at all in Congress or in the House of Representatives. In this country the members of the Cabinet are not only directly responsible to Parliament, but to a group of electors as well. They have a seat in our legislative body, where they answer directly to the representatives of the people. The Cabinet of the United States has no seat at all, either in the Upper or Lower House, and does not have to meet the representatives of the people face to face to discuss public matters, except that the President occasionally goes on the floor of the House and makes a statement.

Proportional representation, in my opinion, would do two things: First, it would give to minorities an opportunity to be represented according to the democratic age in which we live, an opportunity which they do not now possess. I might say in passing that the different viewpoints represented in this House—I am not speaking of men who are merely in sympathy with certain views, but of men who are actually the advocates of principles—these principles are our chief concern, and the views of these men expressed on the floor of Parliament would have a two-fold effect. They would have an effect on the men who heard them and on the country generally, and the arguments that would be advanced and the discussion that would take place, and in which these men would have a prominent part, would have a direct influence on their own minds, and by co-ordination we would get the best from these different viewpoints thus brought together.

And men with extreme views might see that there are other angles from which these questions might be discussed. This would lead to better legislation on the whole than we have at the present time. Another great advantage is that it would do away with the grievances that certain classes have because they are not represented on the floor of this House. You may ask: why do they not get representation? It is easier to ask the question than for these parties to elect representatives. In many cities labour organizations run candidates. But even though these candidates have the unanim-

ous support of the labour organizations, they find themselves opposed by the candidates of the two strong parties, one of whom is pretty sure to win. Such minorities are apt to think that there is something unfair in our election methods, and I think there is some justification for that complaint. Proportional representation, in practice, I believe, would go far to justify itself by bringing into this House men voicing different views, which would result in better legislation. The Minister of Finance touches a very vital point when he speaks of the question of majorities in the House. Conditions might arise when the best interests of the country might not be advanced by men who had not the interests of the country supreme in their minds taking advantage of the fact that the majority in the House was very small. Suppose that through some peculiar forgetfulness on the part of the electorate three or four men got into the House who were not strong in their views as to what was best for the country. Even in a House with 250 members these three or four might decide the fate of a government. I think it would not be well for the people to have a system that would bring about that result. On the other hand, we know that a government with a small majority behaves itself better than one with a large majority. Besides, I do not believe that the difficulty indicated by the Finance Minister would arise in practice. I do not think the majority could be, in practice, so reduced as to make this a real difficulty. We have a country of such vast extent, and the membership of the House after next election will be so large that there is no practical danger that the majority of one party or the other would be so small as to be influenced in that way.

Proportional representation, I believe, would make for cleaner elections. There would be many candidates in a constituency, and so the clash between two men only, which is now the rule would be avoided. In some cases, when this clash is on, money is expended—so I have heard. But I am of opinion that when the number of candidates is large, as would be the case under proportional representation, there would not be the opportunity for illegal expenditure that there is now. Further than that, the territory covered would be so vast that there would be less concentration of effort along the lines I have indicated.

The one objection that I see to proportional representation is that pointed out by the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White). That objection is that our territory is so large and our population so sparse that, with larger constituencies, great labour would be entailed upon the candidates. Certainly, it would make it impossible for the candidate to canvass every man in his riding as he sometimes thinks he has to do now. But would that be an unmixed evil? I believe that the system that we have fallen into in this country under which the candidate feels it necessary to meet every man personally and say, "How do you do," without reference to the great principles which divides the parties, does not uplift public life. Many men are elected because they are good fellows. I am not taking objection to that, for that is one qualification of a public man that he can get along with quite well. But I fear that we have to a certain extent failed to grow, on lines of public sentiment, public principles, public opportunities, and public policy. We get down too often to the question of which candidate is the better chap, which will shake hands with the larger number of people, who will attend the more quilting-bees and give more to this or that object. With proportional representation, I believe, we should rise above that, and candidates would not be judged by these smaller things, but first by the policies they advocate, and secondly by their character and ability to carry those policies into effect.

I believe this matter should be further investigated and more widely discussed. This is a splendid subject for discussion before our Canadian clubs and by public men everywhere. I would suggest that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) allow his motion to stand for a day or two, that he may decide what course it is best to pursue.

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Medicine Hat): I cannot say absolutely, from the study I have given proportional representation, that it would wipe out all the evils existing under our present system of representation, but I think it certainly would aid in that direction.

Within my own recollection political parties have not been represented in the legislatures of the provinces and in this House in proportion to the votes recorded in the elections. I have found our friends across this floor complaining in years gone by that they did not have the representation in this House which the popular vote entitled them to, and as to the election of 1911, we on this side have the right to make the same complaint. This evil would be

largely removed under a system of proportional representation. That system would not wipe out the rule of the majority, but at least it aims in the direction of securing proper representation for minorities. In nearly every country cases also have arisen where minorities in the popular vote actually returned majorities to the representative body. That should not be. To remove the possibility of these evils and bring about more representative government, and what we are aiming at is to have as perfect a system of representative government as possible, proportional representation provides a solution. We recollect the recent election in the United States. While the system there is entirely different from that existing in this country, still I might mention that for a few days it was possible that a president would be elected who did not represent the majority of the voters. The electoral vote in two states practically returned the popular candidate. If the electoral vote in these two states had gone Republican, the minority candidate would have been elected President of the United States. A system of that kind should not exist and we should try to avoid it. I want also to mention the city of Toronto, not because it sends at the present time all representatives of the Conservative party, but for the purpose of pointing out that by this system it would be possible for the minority in that city to elect at least one representative. There are also cases where our Conservative friends are in the minority, where they do not secure any representation, and where, under this system, it would be possible for them to do so.

I believe that by the adoption of the principle of proportional representation we would secure a better class of representatives because under the existing system, as my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) has said, public life does not appeal to many men to whom it should appeal and whom it would be to the greatest advantage of this country to have in the House. There is the question of the personal canvass. That is largely due to our small constituencies. We are forced into it largely but under the larger constituency plan that practice would be more or less put out of business. In that way we would remove one of the weaknesses of our present system and there would be an appeal to better and bigger men to come into public life and serve their country.

The hon. Finance Minister (Sir Thomas White) has entered into a defence of the party system. I believe in the party system. I do not know of any better system, but if we could introduce some system that would give independence a greater opportunity for expression of opinion in this House it would be better for Canada. While we have the party system, we have far too much partisanship. If we could get rid of some of our partisanship by giving an opportunity to independent men to come into this Parliament, and into the legislatures of the provinces, it would be better for Canada and for the provinces. I presume I can call myself a partisan. At the same time I sometimes agree with my opponents and I believe there are hon. members on the other side of the House who sometimes agree with expressions of opinion from this side of the House. But under our party systems we do not always express ourselves as we think. Under this new system, we would have men in this House who would express themselves as they think and who would be more or less independent. It may be possible even for strong advocates of the party system to see evils in it but if under some other system of electing representatives, we could do something to remove these evils, to improve public life and to bring into public affairs a higher type of men, we would be doing something for the advantage of our country.

I have not made a very close study of proportional representation, but, as I said at the beginning, the very little information I have about it, appeals to me as something that would bring about an improvement in the character of our representation in this House and in the provincial legislature. In my own city we have what we call a commission form of government. We have no city council. We have three paid commissioners who control the affairs of the city. I think it is the only government of its kind in Canada. There are other forms of commission government in Canada but of this particular type the city of Lethbridge has the only one. Each year one of these commissioners retires and we have a preferential ballot for use in these elections. In the municipal election two years ago, on the first ballot, the retiring commissioner would have been elected by a majority of vote but by counting the preference ballots he was defeated. He would have been elected over the second candidate but he would have been the minority representative, taking into consideration the total vote. By this system under which there are first, second and third choices

another candidate was returned who was the majority representative of the people voting. Our people are satisfied with the system. It is somewhat the same as proportional representation. The man who has a majority on the first ballot but who is in the minority as compared with the popular vote does not like the system. This system, in my judgment, is the best means of getting the opinion of the electors as to the most suitable man for the office. That is our system of electing this commission government and it works out well. I believe we will find it worth while to take up the proportional representation system in Canada in order to bring about a proper representation of the opinion of the people of Canada in our Parliaments.

Mr. G. W. KYTE (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, the subject of proportional representation received its first impetus in Canada through the interest and activity of Earl Grey, one of our distinguished Governors General. It is well known that for many years he had manifested a very lively enthusiasm on this question and to him is due credit for the interest in the subject that was manifested at that time throughout this country. I was a member of the committee that was appointed by Parliament in the session of 1910 for the purpose of inquiring into this question with a view of ascertaining if it might be made applicable to our conditions in Canada. The late Hon. Mr. Monk, who was a strong advocate of the principle, was elected chairman of the committee. After the committee was appointed, we organized and held our first meeting, but unfortunately before a second meeting of the committee could be convened Mr. Monk became ill. He was obliged to go south for his health, and he did not ag in appear in the House during that session. Next session another question arose which for the moment transcended all other questions that engaged the attention of this country, and the consequence was that for the time being the subject of proportional representation was set aside. I am glad my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has taken this opportunity of bringing it to the attention of the House. I listened very attentively to the speech of the Minister of Finance in which he expressed the belief that proportional representation, while it might be suited to the forms of government in force in European countries, was not of a nature to fit in very well with the constitution of Great Britain and her dependencies.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I said it might not.

Mr. KYTE: It might not fit in. I might recall once more the name of Lord Grey. He is a gentleman who is certainly familiar with the workings of the British constitution. He is not only a stateman who has occupied a high and distinguished place in the British House of Commons, but he is descended from a long line of eminent statesmen who during the last one hundred years took a very prominent part in the government of Great Britain. Lord Grey could not find in the principle of proportional representation anything inconsistent with the ideas of the British form of government as it exists at the present time, and I can scarcely imagine that if such an objection should exist in regard to it, it would not appeal to the imagination of Lord Grey himself. There are, however, other objections which might be urged, perhaps successfully, to the principle. It might be said that while the system of proportional representation may work out very well in the more densely populated countries of Europe, it could not be as successfully worked out in Canada. It is pointed out by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) that in order to apply the system successfully it would be necessary to enlarge our constituencies. Unfortunately in Canada we have not as dense a population as there is in countries of Europe where the principle has been adopted, Belgium, Switzerland and Finland. Some of our constituencies in Canada are already very large, and if we were to apply the principle of proportional representation to our rural constituencies and enlarge the area of some of those now existing in order to have four or five candidates voted upon by the electors, we would be imposing upon the candidates obligations which under present circumstances and conditions they could scarcely discharge. With regard, however, to our cities, I think the principle might be well worked out. There are cities in Canada that at the next general election will return five, six or seven representatives each, and it does seem to me that if we take into consideration the benefits that could be achieved under the improvement suggested by my hon. friend for Assiniboia, we might well seek to apply it to those cities. I do not think it could be successfully urged

that we ought not to take up consideration of this question because it is a new one or one that has not been pressed strongly on the minds and imaginations of the people of this country. There is one subject that appertains to the election of members of the House of Commons that has made rapid strides in the last few years; I refer to women suffrage. Not so many years ago women suffrage did not find an advocate in the House of Commons. Certainly it did not find an advocate in many of the legislatures of the provinces of Canada which within the last two years have adopted the principle of women suffrage. The adoption of that principle by these legislatures has given encouragement to its advocates, and it is hoped that it will bring about great reforms, advantages and benefits to the people of this country. So it is with proportional representation; a beginning has to be made with all reforms, and I know of no better time than the present to begin to take into account the benefits and advantages that might be involved in the principle of this resolution.

I shall refer for a moment to a speech delivered by Mr. Asquith, the former Premier of England,in the British House of Commons, a year ago last August, when the subject of electoral reform was discussed. He said:

> With regard to the Parliament which is going to undertake the work of reconstruction after the war, it is eminently desirable that you should provide an electoral basis which will make that Parliament reflective and representative of the general opinion of the country, and give to its decisions a moral authority which you cannot obtain from what I may call a scratch, improvised, and makeshift electorate. Let us by all means use the time—those of us who are not absolutely absorbed in the conduct of the war—in those months to see if we cannot work out by general agreement some scheme under which, both as regards the electorate and the distribution of electoral power, a Parliament can be created at the end of the war capable and adequate for discharging these tasks, and commanding the confidence of the country.

I submit that those statements might very well be translated by the members of this House in respect to problems that will arise here after the war, and for the purpose of conceiving the best possible means of meeting the changed conditions that will arise therefrom. The speech of Mr. Asquith was made upon a resolution moved by a member of the House of Commons who sought to bring the question of proportional representation once more to the attention of Parliament. As a result of that motion a strong committee was appointed to take up the question. As was to be expected, our respected ex-Governor-General, Earl Grey, was made chairman of that committee; and among the names on it we find those of such well known statesmen as Viscount Gladstone, Sir Frederick Banbury, the Right Hon. Lloyd George, the Right Hon. Sir Harry Samuel, and Sir R. Finlay, the present Lord Chancellor of England. The movement is making great headway in Great Britain, and I think it might well receive some attention from the members of this House. The advantages that will be derived from the adoption of that system have been elaborated by hon. gentlemen who have already spoken, but two features appeal to me as being especially important. These are the diminution of charges of bribery in elections, and the putting of the party political machine out of existence. Any scheme of reform which would have those two results we should heartily support. It will be impossible for the corruptionist, the man who has a personal interest in seeking the election of a particular candidate, to successfully effect his purpose under proportional representation, because he would not know whose vote it would be in his interests to purchase, whereas where there are only two candidates and two parties, as at present, every elector is bound to vote for one or the other, if he votes at all. So the man who has a personal and dishonest interest in seeking the election of one candidate has only to go to an elector and seek by means of the influence, corrupt or otherwise, which may be at his command, to secure the support of that elector for his particular candidate. But under proportional representation, where there is a first, second, third or fourth choice, it will be absolutely impossible for the man with a corrupt intent to direct his energies to the elector in such a way that his vote will be cast for the particular candidate whom the corruptionist is seeking to elect.

Another advantage would be that it would put the political party machine out of commission. I do not know that there is anything in the public life of this country that has done more to impoverish it than the existence of the party political machine. The results of this are not quite as apparent in Canada as in some parts of the United States. In the United States the party caucus and the party primary are a part of the recognized legal machinery in relation to the selection of candidates and the holding of an election. Some years ago I

happened to be in a town in one of the states of the American Union upon the day on which both political parties held their caucuses. According to American law, a man who votes at the primary of one party must swear before he is permitted to vote that he has not voted in the primaries of the other political party within a year. In this particular town I first visited the caucus of the Democratic party. I found that the number of votes being polled was exceedingly small, out of all proportion in its minority to the number of voters supporting the Democratic party in that town. I asked my friend: Is it possible that the voters here to-day fairly represent the number of Democrats in this district? He said: No, you will find the Democratic voters at present over in the Republican caucus. There is one man seeking to get on the Republican ticket. He is not persona grata to his political friends, so he has hired the Democratic vote for the day in order that his name may be put on the Republican ballot. I went over to the Republican caucus and I found an enormous number of men lined up to the ballot box. My friend pointed out to me a throng of people seeking another way up to the aisle towards the platform where the ballot boxes were. He said: "You see all those men going up to the ballot box? They are all Democrats who have been asked by the Republican candidate to poll their votes in his behalf." I said to him: "That probably explains why the Democratic vote is so small." He said: "Certainly. These men could not go to the Democratic caucus, because if they did they would be challenged and would have been unable to vote here, as they would then have voted in the opposite caucus during the year." I said: "When it comes to an election, will these Democratic voters vote for the Republican candidate whom they are now nominating?" "Oh, certainly not; when the election comes around they will vote for the Democratic party." The party machine is not quite as bad in Canada as this illustration shows it to be in some parts of the United States, but it is bad enough in all conscience. A man who seeks public honours in this country must in many places undertake all expenses and go through all the worry of two elections. If he is actually determined to obtain a position in public life and is seeking these honours, he must first go out and make terms with the party machine in order that the party machine will support his nomination. It very often happens that a man who is most competent, most deserving and who would be the most effective representative, is not the one who is most anxious to seek the party nomination. As a matter of fact, in many instances the very reverse is the case. The person who seeks a nomination, who has time upon his hands, and who has the money to spend to secure the nomination, is not always the man who would make the best representative if he were elected to Parliament. Under this system of proportionate representation the party machine would not be as successful in placing its candidates in Parliament as it is at the present time. The choice of electors for the first, second, third or fourth candidates that are to be elected under this system absolutely prevents the possibility of the party machine ultimately electing its candidate should it succeed in getting its candidate selected in one of the party caucuses.

These considerations have come to me in the course of a casual study of the subject of proportional representation. At the time when I was selected as a member of the committee I gave some attention to it, and I was extremely sorry that the illness of the late Mr. Monk prevented us from resuming our meetings. If we had been able to resume them, I am quite sure, from the interest that Mr. Monk took in the matter and from the stimulus which Lord Grey gave to the movement, that a very comprehensive and interesting report upon the subject of proportional representation would have been presented to Parliament as a result of the deliberations of that committee.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. A. B. COPP (Westmorland): Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I was about to say a word or two in reference to the proposed motion of my hon. friend from Assiniboia. As the question, however, is somewhat new to myself and, I believe, new to a number of other hon. gentlemen, it may be well for us to have a little further time for reflection, and I therefore move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and the debate adjourned.

BRITISH EMBARGO ON CANADIAN CATTLE.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, an early opportunity should be taken to endeavour to have removed the embargo on Canadian cattle entering the British Isles.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to detain the House for more than a few moments in regard to this question of the removal of the embargo which has existed since 1892 on Canadian cattle entering the British market. Although this question has not been before the House of Commons recently, it is by no means a new one. Immediately after the embargo was placed upon Canadian cattle in 1892, members of the Federal House, some of whom are still members, brought forward long and very effective arguments why this embargo should never have existed, and why, after it was put into force, it should be removed. In 1905, the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. William Smith), who is still member for that Riding, Mr. T. S. Sproule, the then member for East Grey, and the hon. member for the St. Lawrence Division of Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) who is also still member for that constituency, made long and what should have been conclusive arguments why this embargo should cease to exist. I do not purpose repeating those arguments to-night, because I do not think that is necessary, but the time would be well spent if the House were to discuss this question once more.

Previous to 1892, a very large cattle trade had grown up, especially in Ontario and western Canada, and in looking over the history of what has occurred since the embargo was put into force, I was surprised at the effect which that embargo had upon the raising of stock in this country. Farmers and others who are engaged in this particular industry seem to have become discouraged, and it is remarkable how the number of cattle has diminished, and how discouraged the people have become in producing more stock. It may be argued that this is not an opportune time to discuss this question when prices are so high.

I notice in to-day's paper the statement that even the packers of this country are suggesting that Canada should have two meatless days a week. I maintain—and I have maintained for a year or two—that it is high time that the Canadian people and their representatives in this House began to think of the conditions which must occur after the termination of the war. I believe that a short discussion on this question of the removal of the embargo and a request to the Government and the Minister of Agriculture, in particular, that special measures be taken for the removal of the embargo, will do much to enhance Canada's prosperity. There seems never to have been any good reason for the imposition of the embargo. The stated cause is that our cattle contain a disease called contagious pleuro-pneumonia, but I believe that one old cow out of all the cattle shipped to the old country was responsible and has been responsible for the condition in which we have been placed so far as our market for cattle in Great Britain is concerned. This subject is important as an after-the-war question, because I believe, so far as the raising of cattle is concerned, we are going to return to conditions somewhat similar to those which existed before 1892. A great many young men from western Canada and Ontario have gone out of banks and out of stores and have gone to the front, and I feel convinced that such young men, when they return, will not be content to go back to their indoor occupations, but will desire to go on the farms. Although that is not the opinion of every one, it is certainly mine. We have heard members of this Government and gentlemen who are not in the Government advocating a great increase in production. I am one of those who are very much pleased that we have free wheat, but I am also one of those who believe that in the future, when all our soldiers return and agriculture at once becomes, as it ought to be, the supreme occupation of Canada, the high prices that the farmer is receiving to-day will not be maintained. Just before the war the farmers in the West were not getting, by any means, paying prices for wheat, because 70 or 80 or 90 cents a bushel will not, under any condition, prove a paying proposition. We hear some members of the Government, and some gentlemen who are outside of the Government and outside of this House continually advocating mixed farming. No one can gainsay the advantages of mixed farming, because the argument is absolutely sound that we should not put all our efforts into the raising of wheat—and I am speaking now more particularly of western Canada, although perhaps the same argument applies to Ontario and the eastern provinces. After the war wheat will not remain at the present high price, and perhaps it will not command even a paying price.

Thus it may become necessary for us to go in for mixed farming, which, to speak plainly, consists of growing wheat and raising different kinds of stock, and it is up to us right now to have this embargo removed if possible.

Before taking my seat, I should like to quote something that was placed on Hansard many years ago, in 1893, in reference to this poor old cow that was accused of having had pleuro-pneumonia, and which has been responsible for the embargo ever since; and while on this point, let me say it was proved by my hon. friend from St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike) and by others who spoke at that time, that Canada possessed the cleanest record in regard to the health of our cattle of any country in the world, and the same is true to-day. I took the pains of consulting Dr. Torrance, the Veterinary Director General of Canada, and he told me that we have not, and never have had, any pleuro-pneumonia among our cattle.

What was the cause of all this trouble? It seems that the cattle that we call stockers were formerly taken over to Great Britain, where, on the splendid English pastures, they developed into the very finest of beef. Our cattle when finished were superior to any that came from Ireland, that great agricultural country which has produced so many cattle; and I am convinced, after reading all the arguments, and according to the best information that I can get, that the embargo was purely a case of self-interest and self-protection on the part of the Irish rather than because of any danger of pleuro-pneumonia. In the Sessional Papers of 1893 we learn that:

> A portion of the lungs of the affected animal was sent to Principal Williams and Professor W. G. Williams of the new veterinary college, Edinburgh, and naked-eye microscopic examination convinced those experts that broncho-pneumonia, (the well-known cornstalk disease of America,) had been mistaken for pleuro-pneumonia contagiosa. I have subsequently examined the lungs and microscopic sections made from them, and I had no difficulty in recognizing that the pathological appearances presented were identical with those of the cornstalk disease, which I had the opportunity of seeing in Washington in 1890 by the courtesy of Dr. D. E. Salmon, the distinguished chief of the bureau of animal industry of the United States. The differences in the post-mortem appearances and in the actual seats of the two diseases, make it extremely unlikely for any one versed in morbid anatomy to mistake the one for the other. In pleuro-pneumonia contagiosa the true seat of the disease is not in the bronchial tubes, although the smaller of these become gorged with an inflammatory coagulated exudate.
>
> Broncho-pneumonia, not unknown in this country, is not a specific disease like pleuro-pneumonia contagiosa, but one which originates spontaneously when animals are exposed to cold and wet, especially after being heated, as cattle are during transit by rail and sea. It may fitly be compared with influenza in the human species, not of the recent epidemic type, but of the old and familiar form of a severe cold.

That was the opinion of one of the most eminent scientific men in England at that time. The embargo, however, was put on, and it was impossible for us to send our cattle over to England to be finished as we had done formerly. Our farmers used to have a very profitable market in the Old Country not only for finished beef, but also for short-keeps, which were sent over to England and finished on the splendid pasturage there.

What happened when this embargo was put on by England? A large number of breeders in Ontario and the West were at that time raising short-keep cattle for export, and they were compelled to hold them here as they were not finished sufficiently for export. Trainloads of calves were shipped to Winnipeg, killed and placed in cold storage. The same thing occurred in Calgary and Toronto. Great numbers of our young cattle have been shipped across the line to the United States in recent years. Our American friends realize how excellent and profitable Canadian-raised cattle are, and American buyers are to be found on the Toronto and Winnipeg stock yards buying all the young cattle they can get. I have some figures here of the Toronto and Winnipeg stock yards and find that from Winnipeg 1,306 head were shipped in the month of June, 1916; in July, 1,564; in August, 4,895; in September, 6,977; in October, 9,087; a total from Winnipeg to the United States of 23,829 in five months.

It might be asked why I am bringing up this question now, with prices so high and cattle so scarce. My object is entirely for the benefit of the farmers of this country and of our young men. As you know, Sir, Canada is to-day sending thousands of her best young men overseas to fight in the cause of freedom. They are over in France to-day fighting the battle of liberty By-and-by they will come back. I feel that I should be remiss in my duty if I did not raise my voice, if I did not do the best I can in my humble way, to make provision for the occupation for these young men when they return. I say this resolution is opportune, for, it seems to me, never in the history of the Empire did Great Britain recognize as she does to-day what Canada is and what the

name Canada means. I believe that Great Britain can be approached to-day in the interest of this great Dominion as never before, and, perhaps, no such opportunity will ever offer again. I am sure that it is the opinion of every member of this House that this Government, through the Minister of Agriculture, should put forth every effort to the end that this embargo upon our Canadian cattle, which has existed since 1892, and, as I claim, has existed unjustly, should be removed, and that we may once more have the freedom of the markets of Great Britain.

Mr. ROBERT BICKERDIKE (Montreal, St. Lawrence): I congratulate the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) on the stand he has taken, but I am afraid he will find that we shall be received as we have always been received in England on this subject. I have been fighting this cause ever since it needed a champion in this House and out of it. I do not exactly accept what the hon. member for Souris says, that there was no disease amongst our cattle, for I claim that there was a disease and a very bad one, but they gave it the wrong name. They called it in Great Britain pleuro-pneumonia; they should have called it protection, because it was as a matter of protection for the British agriculturist that this embargo was first put on and continued to this day. There is no doubt about that. What the hon. gentleman says is perfectly true—the herds in Canada are the healthiest in the world. I probably know as much about the cattle business as any hon. member of this House, for I think I was the largest shipper of cattle from Canada; I shipped 40,000 head the last year our cattle were allowed to go into England—and that was 40,000 too many. No question about it, the poor old cow was used as an excuse to get the votes of the Irish and English farmers. It was represented that we had disease in our cattle, but as the hon. member has said, there was no disease—except the one I have just mentioned.

Mr. WILCOX: As the hon. member (Mr. Bickerdike) is familiar with this subject, can he say how much the price of cattle in Ireland was reduced by the competition of the Canadian cattle?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I could not answer that question. Of course, it must have been reduced, for in some years we shipped as many as 150,000 head, and these, being store cattle, they would come into competition with the Irish cattle, as the hon. member for Souris has said, Mr. Long, who was then Minister of Agriculture, refused to take any steps in the matter. This subject has been up in this House many times, as the hon. member has said, and it has been brought forward by the Scotch farmers, deputation after deputation having been sent to make representations to the British Minister of Agriculture in favour of removing the embargo. But all this has been without success, and I am afraid we shall have no better results now.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (Oxford North): I have no desire to oppose the resolution, but like my hon. friend from Montreal, (Mr. Bickerdike) I have no hope that it will lead to anything. There has been a great change in the cattle industry of this country since the embargo was put on. The putting on of the embargo was a shock to our people, but, as so often happens, they have adapted themselves to the change. Our people now finish their own cattle and the slaughter-houses in Canada have greatly increased. The hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) talked about Americans coming in and buying cattle. That is purely a mattter of competition. If Americans will pay more for the stockers, as they are called, than the English or Canadians do, the Americans will get them. The farmer is a peculiar individual, he is going to sell where he can get the best terms; but perhaps he is not more peculiar in that than any other class of the community. I am glad that nearly all our people in Ontario who formerly sold stockers in the Old Country to be finished by the Scotch farmer, now finish their cattle themselves. One result of this is that the resultant fertilizer is kept for the farms of Ontario. The embargo seemed a great misfortune at the time, but it did not altogether prove to be a misfortune. Many of our people are in favour of having the embargo lifted, but many others are not in favour of it.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: It would not do any harm.

Mr. NESBITT: No, it would not do any harm, I have already said I am not opposing the resolution. To lift the embargo would mean that the Englishmen would come in to buy our stockers, and unless he offers a better market than the Americans can offer, or better terms than the Canadian farmer can secure by finishing the stockers for himself, he will not get them. Taking off the embargo will mean three markets for our cattle instead of two.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Minister of Agriculture): Though this question is an old one, as the hon. member for Souris has said, it is a question that is very much alive. The facts are substantially as my hon. friend has related them, and as they have been touched upon by the hon. member for St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike). There was an alleged case of pleuro-pneumonia in 1892, but I do not think that there has been any doubt in men's minds since then that it was only an alleged case, and that the examination which took place proved absolutely that there was no case of contagious pleuro-pneumonia. Within the next few years after the imposition of the embargo, no fewer than 3,000,000 head of Canadian cattle were sent to the British market and slaughtered on arrival, and not one of them showed evidences of disease. Since then, as has been pointed out, not only has the case been debated in this House, but representations have been made by the Canadian Government on various occasions, and also, as my hon. friend has pointed out, by delegations from Scotland and various parts of England, in favour of the removal of the embargo as being against the interests even of the Scotch and English agriculturists. However, the several British Governments have seen fit to retain the embargo, which I might say was made statutory within two or three years after it was first placed, and has been kept in that position ever since. It did not seem worth while to argue very much, for the authorities there took the ground the embargo was justified by the danger to their own herds of the disease being brought from this country. It was spoken of as purely a matter of health. I am not going to touch on the point raised by my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Lawrence, because I do not think it is my business to say what motives may or may not be imputed to our kinsmen on the other side of the water. But I can say that the ground they took, that the embargo was justified as a health measure, was not sound. The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) when Prime Minister, took up this matter at one of the Imperial Conferences, and brought it before the Minister of Agriculture, that office being held at that time, I think, by Mr. Long. The British authorities took the position that, with a border line three thousand miles long for Canada to guard, and there being many cattle diseases in the United States, it was especially necessary that they should take any necessary means to safeguard the health of their animals against any possible importation of disease from the United States via Canada. I might point out to the House that while we have never had a disease of the first class and contagious character, such as pleuro-pneumonia, or foot and mouth disease, in Canada, our friends on the other side of the water, who embargo us, have a great many times had serious diseases for which we have been compelled to embargo them. In reference to the condition of our cattle and the danger of disease from the United States, I would like to point out to the House, because it is interesting, that they have had no less than three outbreaks of foot and mouth disease in the United States, the last of which was of an extraordinarily serious character, lasting nearly a year, and entailing the slaughter of thousands of cattle and inflicting a loss of millions of dollars on the various states and the federal authorities of the United States. In spite of that, owing to the vigilance of our own veterinary service, and the extraordinary precautions which we thought we were justified in taking, we came out at the end of the outbreak with absolutely not a single case in the whole of Canada. That is why I say that the argument that they have tried to sustain has proved absolutely unsound. There has been nothing gained practically by pressing this matter very much of late years from the fact that it was taken up on a number of occasions, but the attitude of the British Government was such that it became scarcely a dignified matter to press it further, because it was a matter entirely within their own jurisdiction. The last time that it was taken up was, I think, in 1913, when I had an informal talk with the Right Honourable Walter Runciman, who was president of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries. We discussed the question pretty thoroughly, but it was quite obvious that there was no good in pressing the matter officially any further, and so we let it drop.

There will be no two opinions as to the desirability of removing this embargo in so far as the embargo reflects upon the health of the herds of this country. It does reflect upon them to a certain extent. While there cannot be any two opinions on that point, because there is no justification for the embargo on that ground, I am quite aware that there may possibly be a difference of opinion as to the economic results

which followed the imposition of the embargo and the economic results which may follow its removal. It is true, as the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) pointed out, that there are some people in this country who think that the embargo was perhaps not an unmixed evil in that it led to the finishing of our cattle and therefore helped the fertility of the farm. I am sure also that it helped to build up our great packing industry, and led undoubtedly to the strengthening of the big export trade in meats which also is a very important question. Nevertheless, I would like to put myself on record in this House as believing that the stability of our cattle industry, which, I think is of supreme importance to the agriculture of this country, would be benefited by the removal of the embargo because it is desirable that the farmer should have two outlets, that he should be able to sell his product for export as well as to the packing houses. As a matter of fact, the western farmer and the eastern farmer have sold a good many stockers to the United States which trade we have tried to counteract this year as far as we could and I am glad to say that there has been a notable change in that regard and that a very large number of cattle at the Winnipeg and other markets which otherwise would have been disposed for slaughter, or have gone to the United States, have been bought in and sent back to the Canadian western farms.

I believe it would be a permanent benefit to have the embargo removed. The depletion of the herds of Europe that is going on now is appalling and must have its effect in every part of the world. In France, especially, and, of course, in Belgium, Serbia, and other countries which have been ravished by our common enemy, that depletion has to be made up and it will take a long time to make it up. I doubt not that in so far as this continent may be able to supply it, there will be a strong demand for cattle of all kinds, especially in France and Belgium, after this war is over, and we hope it will be finished by driving the common foe out of those countries. As France has not been disposed to impose any restriction, they apparently, having no fault to find with our cattle, it would be regrettable if the Government of Great Britain should maintain a restriction against one of her dominions against which France and her other Allies impose no restriction whatever.

May I say to the House, and to my hon. friend who brought up this resolution, that when my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) left for England to take up, first, questions affecting the war, second, questions regarding the making of peace and, third, problems after the war, he asked the various members of the Government to put before him any statement of questions that they thought it important we should have taken up. It seemed to me that from the point of view of agriculture, there was no more important question than the one which my hon. friend has brought up, and so I took the opportunity to prepare a very careful case, or brief, on the whole subject dealing with it from its origin in 1892. I think we left no argument untouched and put the matter in such shape that the Prime Minister would be able to lay it before the British Government in the hope that we would be able to make some headway at this particular time.

I do not altogether agree with my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike), because, although I know that the efforts that he and many others have made, have not met with very much response, I am not altogether as sceptical as he is at this particular time. I believe that this is the psychological moment and for various reasons which I am not now going to touch on, I think there is strong hope that the British Government, at this particular time, may see their way to do what they have not been inclined to do for twenty-four years, and that the result may be the removal of the embargo. I am quite hopeful of it. I want to assure my hon. friend again that the matter has been placed before the Prime Minister in the strongest possible way, and I am confident that he will put it before the Imperial authorities in an equally strong way. I will not say more than that, because, after all, it is within their right and within their power to do as they like; it is a domestic matter, and whatever may be our views we have to abide by their decision. In view of what I have said, I will ask my hon. friend, as this practically fulfils the spirit of his resolution, if he would be good enough to withdraw it, because we have already taken the question up and dealt with it in a way that we hope will give practical results.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I see no reason, why this resolution should not be adopted as expressing the opinion of this House. I am inclined to agree with my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike) that whether we adopt it or not it will have very little effect

upon the results. I would be very sorry, indeed, as a Canadian citizen and a member of the House, if there was any disposition on the part of the people of this country, after this war, to go to Great Britain and use as an argument to get something we want our participation in this great struggle. I do not think that position will be taken. My hon. friend from St. Lawrence is a little bit wrong in his diagnosis of the cause of the trouble. That may be attributed to the fact that he has had little experience along medical lines, and, therefore, is not practised in the art of diagnosis. He said that the trouble was not due to the disease of pleuro-pneumonia, but to a disease called protection. I think he would have been more nearly correct had he said that the disease was free trade as they have it in England. I might remind my hon. friend, if he will accept my correction of his diagnosis along that line, that at one time that was a battle cry of the party he supported. What was really the reason why Great Britain placed this embargo upon our cattle? I think the hon. Minister of Agriculture suggested the reason without putting it in plain words, being a very modest man. Let us look back to the time when the embargo was placed upon our cattle in 1892. In 1891 there was a political party in this country declaring for unrestricted reciprocity, for breaking down all tariff walls between Canada and the United States. British statesmen, whatever may be said of them, cannot be characterized as men who are not alive to what is going on in the world around them. They no doubt looked the situation over as it was in Canada, and while they were not apprehensive of any danger to their herds from any disease in Canada, they naturally thought that if an irresponsible party like the Grit party was to get into power, take down the tariff walls and allow American cattle to come in here free, as that disease was rampant among American cattle they would, by admitting cattle from Canada free, be opening their doors to cattle from both Canada and the United States. At this time when English statesmen were wondering how to get out of this great difficulty some person—I do not attribute this to the hon. member for St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike), who is in the export trade—sent over an old cow showing some symptoms of disease, and the British Government said: Now, this is our opportunity; we are a free trade country and all that, we have to have an excuse to offer, and while the danger that we are apprehensive of is that this Liberal party will get into power and remove the barriers, allowing American diseased cattle to come free into Canada, we must protect ourselves against the possibility of this party coming into power in Canada; this old cow which had been sent over by some exporters from Montreal or elsewhere has provided us with the excuse we want; we will simply raise that as the cry, that we are afraid of disease in Canadian cattle, and we will put an embargo on. I think possibly that is the true estimation of why this was done. It was really a measure of protection on the part of a free trade Government such as they have in England. It was a part of a policy known to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House as free trade as they have it in England which, of course, was inscribed on their banner for one election. They will bear me out when I say that they have had a new motto inscribed on their banner for every election.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: That was since the cow.

Mr. EDWARDS: The best way to get this embargo removed from Canadian cattle—and I am free to say I should like to see it removed—is for hon. gentlemen opposite to announce publicly here on the floor of this House to the country that they have departed from the error of their ways in regard to trade matters, that they are no longer going to hobnob with these free trade principles and doctrines, and that England will not be in any danger from that source in years to come, if, unfortunately for Canada, they should come into power. If they as a party would only give an assurance of that kind, the Minister of Agriculture could go over to England and ask for the removal of the embargo and it would be granted at once, as soon as the authorities there knew that there was no danger of cattle from the United States being mixed with ours and so carrying the disease to England. While I think there is not at the present time as unanimous an opinion in favour of the embargo being removed as there was some years ago, still it can do no harm, and I should be very much in favour of the resolution moved by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner).

Mr. WILLIAM SMITH (Ontario S.): Mr. Speaker, the resolution moved by the hon. member for Souris should appeal to members of this House in a number of ways. My name has been mentioned in connection

with a somewhat similar resolution which was moved a number of years ago; but if I remember rightly that resolution was on the line that the British authorities should appoint a Commission to investigate diseases, if any, to be found in the herds of Canada. At that time Canadian breeders were looking for a market in South America. They were paying enormous prices in Great Britain for pure bred animals and it was thought that it might be possible to gain a footing there. My object was to prove that there was no disease among the herds in Canada. That has been stated very strongly here to-night, and I think it can be borne out in every way. So far as the resolution is concerned, it appears to me that it could do no harm. It will have a bearing rather more in the future than at the present moment. We have not enough cattle in Canada to-day for our own purposes, and it is possible that we will not be looking for a market on the other side of the water. The day may come when mixed farming will play a part and will possibly be the great hope of our western farmers, and they will go in extensively for the breeding of cattle. It appears to me that to-day we would not hear so much about free wheat if the Canadian western farmer had been alive to his larger interests. He has had nearly three years since the war commenced to prepare for the production of cattle, and the wheat for which he complains that he cannot now find a market might have been used for the feeding of live stock in the western provinces. But looking to the future, it appears to me that the number of our cattle may greatly increase, and if this motion were adopted to-night it would not do any harm. I should have preferred had the Minister of Agriculture allowed it to pass.

Mr. BURRELL: In suggesting that it should be dropped, I meant simply that the matter was already under consideration. But there is no objection to the motion being carried.

Motion agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF SENATORS.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that no further appointments be made to the Senate of Canada until after the next Federal elections.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I move this resolution not as an academic question, but rather as a practical question, to be fairly considered by this House, and I would ask for a fair expression of the opinion and judgment of the House upon it. The resolution is a fair, just and timely one and should be accepted by the House; and from the Government we should have a declaration of acceptance of the principles which it sets forth.

On October 7, 1916, the present Parliament would have ended had it not been for the fact that during the last session of Parliament an Act was passed in the form of an amendment to the British North America Act extending the term of this Parliament for the period of one year. Since October 7, 1917, this Parliament has been a war emergency Parliament and the Government a war emergency Government. It was the obvious intention of Parliament and, I think, the opinion of hon. gentlemen of this House who voted upon the resolution favouring the extension of Parliament, that the business which should engage Parliament and the Government during the year's extension should relate entirely to war, the incidents of war, and such civil affairs as, in the interest of the State, required immediate action by Parliament or the Government. It would appear, upon reference to the speech delivered to Parliament upon the opening of the session by His Excellency, that the purpose of the extension was to enable the Government to carry on during that period the affairs relating to the war without encountering the distractions of an election. Upon that ground the question was placed before hon. gentlemen and it was with such circumstances in view that the House consented unanimously to the extension of the twelfth Parliament of Canada for one year beyond the constitutional period. The wisdom of this extension was doubted by some. It was thought by many hon. gentlemen, although that opinion was not expressed in Parliament, that the extension might do violence to the well-settled provisions of the British North America Act, which is our constitution. That was the view held by some hon. gentlemen opposite. During the debate on the extension of Parliament resolution last session, some hon. gentlemen referred to a statement made by the Minister of Public Works, some time previous to the occasion to which I refer. It was his view that the people of Canada were being robbed of their rights and liberties because the Government were not appealing to the people. The statement of the Minister of Public Works, then read to Parliament, was as follows:

Is it, then, any wonder that the cry comes, from every individual that one meets and that understands the conditions, in tones louder than thunder, demanding that this Parliament be dissolved, that the rights and liberties of the people of this Dominion be granted to them under our form of democracy and that that form of democracy be restored to them?

The Minister of Public Works evidently felt very strongly against an extension of Parliament. He thought that to abstain from an appeal to the people was an unjustifiable attack upon democracy. Possibly his views at that time were rather extreme, and were not shared by many hon. gentlemen in this House. In any event, the extension of Parliament was unanimously granted, solely for the purpose, as I have said, of enabling the Government to carry on the affairs of state specifically referable to the war, free from the distractions and turmoil of an election. It was hoped that after the expiration of the extension the situation in Europe would be such as to permit the Government to make an appeal to the people.

Many vacancies have occurred in the House of Commons since the extension of Parliament was granted. During a period arranged between the parliamentary leaders, vacancies caused by death or otherwise were filled by the election of a member holding the same political views as the former representative of the constituency. It is my recollection
9 p.m. that this arrangement, which was a fair one, was not fully carried out. Some differences, I think, occurred between the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government and the right hon. leader of the opposition as to the proper course to be pursued in the event of a voluntary or enforced vacancy. I think they were unable to come to a clear understanding as to the exact meaning of the arrangement they had made in its application to such cases. During the last year and a half or two years no vacancy occurring in the House of Commons has been filled unless it was a vacancy occurring by the elevation of a member to the Cabinet. There are many vacancies to-day in the Commons, but I doubt if anybody feels deeply aggrieved because of that. The rule, just or unjust, applies to both political parties; therefore very little has been said about it.

Hon. gentlemen know that our Parliament is composed of two bodies, a Senate and the House of Commons, the members of the latter being elected by the people and those of the former being appointed by the Crown on the recommendation of the Executive. My resolution asks for a declaration that from now on until the election of a new Parliament no further appointments be made by the Government to the Senate. It is so eminently reasonable that it must impress hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House that no other arrangement is fair to the country or to an Opposition. If no vacancies in the House of Commons are filled by reason of an arrangement between the party leaders, that rule should apply with equal force to vacancies occurring in the Senate, namely, that there should be no appointments made, or, if any are made, that the vacancies should be filled by the nominees of the party leaders, in accordance with the same rule as was in force in this branch of Parliament for a time at least.

An Opposition is a constitutional institution; it is a part of the establishment of the Government; it is a part of the fundamental law of this country and of all other portions of the British Empire. The Opposition is referred to frequently by speakers in and out of Parliament as His Majesty's Loyal Opposition, and its rights have been well established and recognized for a great number of years in the constitutional history of the British Empire. It is unfair that during that period, that is, from the 7th day of October, 1916, up to the dissolution of Parliament, that the party which is in office by the grace of an Opposition party should exercise the right which it would ordinarily properly exercise, of making appointments to the Senate of Canada. I cannot conceive of any argument that can be advanced against my contention; it is simply applying to the Senate the terms of the agreement made between the party leaders in respect of vacancies in this branch of Parliament. It is not fair for the dominant political party, in office by the grace of the Opposition party, under an extension of the Parliamentary term, granted to them for one purpose alone, to take upon themselves the making of appointments to the Senate. I trust that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will look at the matter in the same way as I do, and if so, there will be little doubt as to the course this House should pursue this evening in respect to this resolution. I do not think it is necessary that I should say anything further upon the resolution. It is so eminently fair that I trust some member of the Government, speaking for hon. gentlemen on the other side, will immediately say that

the principle of the resolution is accepted. I cannot ask the Government to revoke appointments that they have recently made to the Senate, although I submit, in all fairness, that those appointments were unfairly made in pursuance of a power which should have been left in abeyance, if justice were to be done to the Opposition party.

My attention has been called to a fact which I had forgotten, namely, that in request to the western provinces, the power has been bestowed upon the Government of making additional appointments to the Senate just prior to dissolution, and I understand that that power was confirmed by an Act of the British Parliament. I am not clear in my mind as to the exact course which Parliament took in respect of this matter; but at least, I assume that hon. gentlemen opposite understand the mattter to which I refer. If by Statute or otherwise the Government had the power granted to them prior to the war and prior to the extension of Parliament, one could not fairly ask that the Government forego the right of making those appointments. That is a power granted to them by Statute prior to the extension of Parliament, and it is one which I hardly think hon. gentlemen on this side of the House could very well ask the Government now to forego. Therefore, I feel that I should amend my resolution by adding to it the following words, which I think express what I have in mind:

> Excepting, however, the additional appointments to be made from the western provinces of Canada prior to the dissolution of Parliament.

I beg to move the resolution as amended.

My attention has just been called to the fact that the Act which provides for the appointment of additional senators to the Senate of Canada to represent the group of western provinces does not take effect until the termination of the now existing Canadian Parliament, and, of course, if that is correct, there is no necessity of my amending the resolution, and consequently I shall not have to amend it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I understand that by the rules of the House, the hon. member cannot amend his own resolution.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I propose withdrawing the suggested amendment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Speaker, the resolution moved by the hon. member is by no means of an ordinary character. There are some phases of the subject which naturally he would not touch on and which would not ordinarily come to the mind of an hon. member whose attitude was wholly favourable to the resolution. The hon. member's resolution seems to be based on the assumption that the prerogative of appointments to the Senate of Canada is purely a matter of party patronage. The appointments to the Senate of Canada are made on the recommendation of the Governor in Council, and under the constitution of Canada are part of the duty of the Government. The Senate of Canada is one of the three factors in the fabric of our constitution, and the matter of appointments to that Senate is by no means on a mere party patronage footing. The appointments are on the footing of appointments to the public service, and would be better compared to the subject of the appointment of judges, the filling of the judiciary caused by vacancies. There is at the present time an unusual situation. The West of this country is inadequately represented in the Senate now.

Mr. GRAHAM: And in the Commons, too.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And in the Commons as well. As the hon. member has his mind on the Commons, I might as well touch on that phase of the subject first. There are at the present time, I believe, about fifteen or sixteen vacancies in the House of Commons. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) is I believe correct that for some time after the outbreak of war vacancies were filled by acclamation, the acclamations taking place in accordance with an understanding that the candidate so elected should be of the party that the retiring or deceased candidate belonged to. That practice was followed for some time. The hon. member states that then there was some misunderstanding as to the continuance of the practice. Well, I do not know that "misunderstanding" is the word that properly describes it. The subject fortunately is dealt with in correspondence that passed between the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition. The leader of the Government proposed that the election of members to this House should continue unconditionally along that line. It was his desire in furtherance of his well-known attitude to prevent schism and federal electoral contests during the war, that by-elections should be avoided. As a consequence he made the proposal, in writing, that vacancies should be filled according to that

method. The leader of the Opposition, in the exercise of his right, did not see fit to accede. As part of another arrangement, however, he did agree that the practice should be followed in part, and part only, namely, in the case of vacanies caused by death, but not in the case of vacancies caused by resignation. That was his election; that was his choice. That being the case, vacancies caused by resignation, if they were to be filled at all, would have to be filled only after election contests, which it was the desire of the Government, and which I think it is the desire of the people of Canada, should be avoided. As to the responsibility for that choice, the leader of the Opposition took it; it was his right; but the responsibility is his, and his alone. As a consequence, there are a number of vacancies in this House. There are a number in the West, a number in the central provinces, and a number in the East, but the West is under-represented in the Commons on that account. Furthermore, Western Canada is under-represented in the Commons by reason of a growth in the population of that country, and the fact that the British North America Act provides for a revision only upon a decennial census. The continuance of this Parliament intensifies that situation, and as a matter of fact there is to-day a very, very substantial under-representation of the four western provinces as a result. I agree with the hon. member for Halifax that in the western country, as in other provinces, we are prepared to forego our rights in that regard with the idea that we achieve a greater object in the avoidance of an election in time of war. However, the fact remains, and it has its import with respect to the resolution.

As to the Senate, the West is again very much under represented, and I do not hesitate to say that the responsibility in this regard lies with hon. gentlemen opposite, or rather I should say with hon. gentlemen above. Some four years ago an address was introduced in this House looking to the amendment of the British North America Act, with the object of securing for the four western provinces a normal approach to a more equitable representation in the Upper House than they had heretofore enjoyed. This, of course, was necessitated by the increase in population, which had been so marked in that section of Canada. Up to then Manitoba was represented in the Senate by four, Saskatchewan by four, Alberta by four, and British Columbia by three; and as against that Ontario had twenty-four representatives in the Senate, and Quebec twenty-four. The Maritime Provinces had their numbers fixed by Confederation, twenty-four for the three provinces, the three together being on a parity with either of the two major provinces. The address at that time was to provide that there should be six representatives from Manitoba, six from Alberta, six from Saskatchewan, and six, I believe, from British Columbia; that is to say, there was an increase of fifty per cent, or of two members for each of the four western provinces. The Bill was introduced in 1912; I may be wrong, it might have been early in 1913, but my recollection would place it in the year 1912—a long time, it will be observed, before the war broke out. The Bill passed this House with the consent of both parties, I believe, and went to the Senate, where, at the dictation of the Senate majority, it was mutilated to this extent: they felt, for some reason that never found any lodgment in my mind as a logical one, or I might use a stronger term, Mr. Speaker, if I were not in the House, that it should not go into effect until the termination of the present Parliament of Canada. Why it would be right on the termination of this Parliament, and wrong at that time, the under-representation being most emphatic when the Bill was before the Senate, is very hard indeed to conceive. The responsibility for that constitutionally is upon the Senate itself, but as a matter of fact the responsibility is on that portion of the Senate of Canada whose political sympathies are in accord with those of hon. gentlemen opposite. On them rests the responsibility of depriving four provinces of this Confederation for four long years of their fair representation in the Upper Chamber. The province of British Columbia, for example, has at the present time one representative in the Senate, and if this resolution were passed that province would have to be content to remain with this solitary representative, while the province of Prince Edward Island, whose population is very small compared to that of British Columbia, and the other provinces east of Manitoba have the representation they have. Surely that could not be argued as just to British Columbia; a more gross and palpable injustice could scarcely be inflicted.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: How long have these vacancies existed?

Mr. MEIGHEN: For some time. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will argue that

they should have been filled. But it does not lie in the mouths of hon. gentlemen to say at one and the same time that these vacancies must not be filled until after this House is dissolved, or after a general election, and also that they should have been filled already.

Mr. MACLEAN: But the Government party have had the opportunity of filling such vacancies.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But hon. gentlemen opposite cannot complain that they were not filled, because the hon. member (Mr. A. K. Maclean) himself is asking that they should not be filled—

Mr. GRAHAM: The Government cannot blame us that the positions have not been filled.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not attaching responsibility to the Opposition for that, but for asking us that the seats shall not be filled until after the general election, something which they themselves seem to feel is a palpable and manifest injustice to British Columbia.

Now, the hon. member argues that the extension of Parliament was given as a matter of grace. I do not think I should comment on that further than to say that when the resolution for extension was introduced, it was stated by the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) in language the purpose of which, if not the words, I remember, that it was not being asked as a matter of grace or because of our needs, but was simply submitted to this House, and particularly to the members of the Opposition, and they were to decide whether they deemed it in the interests of this country that that extension should be granted, having regard to the times we were passing through. I apprehend that it being granted, the rights, duties, and obligations of the Government remain exactly as they were before. One of the duties of the Government is to see to it that the Upper Chamber is, within such reasonable limits as may be allowed, kept at its strength. The hon. gentleman says the extension was given only to enable the Government to conduct such of its business as appertains to the war. I cannot accede to that. The Government was absolved from no duty whatsoever by the extension of the term of Parliament. True, its duties with regard to war were primary and paramount, but it could not be said to be released from its other duties each in its proper order and subordination. Let me cite a plain illustration. One of the duties of the Government is to see to it that the judiciary is properly maintained, numerically and in point of qualification. Can it be said that if vacancies exist on the bench they should not be filled, because the extension of the term of Parliament was given to enable the Government to continue the war? I might give many other illustrations of the same character and which the hon. gentleman must admit are exactly in line with appointments to the Senate, unless he is prepared to say that filling vacancies in the Senate is purely a matter of party patronage. I would suggest that to place the Senate on that footing is not to maintain that respect for the Upper House which the rules of this House call for.

Mr. MACLEAN: I do not care whether you call it party patronage or not, if you admit that the Government has the appointment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We have the appointment, just as we have the appointment of judges, and I put these appointments to the Senate upon the same footing. I did not say this was political patronage, but I say that this resolution can only be justified on the assumption that appointments to the Senate are matters of political patronage, and I do not think that is a fair or dignified position in which to place the Senate. The passing of the resolution would leave a large portion of the country in a condition of gross under-representation, in the Senate even more gross than that which it suffers under by reason of the action of friends of hon. gentlemen opposite in this House. The functions of the Government are still just as wide and as important as they were before the extension, and from those duties the Government cannot absolve itself. Nor could it fulfil its duties as a Government were the resolution to pass.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (South Renfrew): This question, as the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) has said, is a very important one. I am glad he takes the ground that appointments to the Senate are not a matter of party patronage. I think I have heard, perhaps not the hon. gentleman himself, but members who are very close to him insinuate some years ago that these appointments were matters of party patronage. This much, I think, all members of the House will agree to, that, in the

main, whichever party is in power, that party notices that the best men to go into the Senate are its own supporters. Call that by any name you like, but I would not for a moment say that it was derogatory to the Senate, because I am of the opinion that, on the whole, the Upper Chamber of Canada is a great credit to the country, and that its members bring to the consideration of many questions that we discuss in this House a mature experience and unbiased judgment ,which, perhaps, sometimes some of us in the heat of political conflict might not possess. The Solicitor General has referred to the question of the under-representation of the West in the Senate, but I would call his attention to the fact that the West is under-represented also in the House of Commons. My hon. friend argues that a portion of this Parliament ought to have new representation from the West, but the other portion is debarred under the British North America Act from having any similar increase. There is only one way by which Parliament as a whole can give to the West a proper representation, and that is by a general election. But the Solicitor General intimates that that would not be a good thing for the country, and says that the West, like the East, is prepared to get along without its full representation until the war is over. If that argument be good in one case why not in another? If it be good for the House of Commons, why not for the Senate?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We do not need an election in the Senate.

Mr. GRAHAM: But while the hon. member is willing that one section of Parliament should be fully representative, he is willing that the other section, though it represents the people directly, should not be fully representative. In other words, that the branch of Parliament which is appointed by the Government should be filled up to its capacity while the people should be deprived of having their representation sent to the House of Commons. The Government, in the words of my hon. friend, has the right to do that thing, but they say that the people ought to be deprived of their representation in the other Chamber. The reason for which the Senate made a certain amendment, I think, is quite clear. As stated by the Solicitor General, this extra representation comes after the decennial census is taken. That is why there is a shortage of representation in the West in both Houses. The Senate takes the ground, and rightly so, that this new representation would come when Parliament in its entirety would have that representation, when the people would have a chance of voting on the extra representation in the House just as the Government would have the right to complete the representation by appointments to the Senate. They did add an amendment which is not unfair to the people, but which is eminently fair to the people, and much fairer to the people than that the Government should send its appointees to the Senate while the people were deprived of the right to send their representatives to the House of Commons. What does the section say:

> The first section of this Act, paragraphs 1 to 6 inclusive, shall not take effect until the termination of the now existing Canadian Parliament.

I am not going to argue when that time arrives, but one thing is sure, that this Government accepted that amendment when it said that new appointments to the Senate from western Canada could not be made till after the dissolution of Parliament. Some eminent lawyers say that these appointments could not be made until the new Parliament is elected. I leave that to the House to discuss. But, it is certain that new appointments cannot be made until after the dissolution takes place. I think that is not unfair.

The Solicitor General gave an outline of a certain arrangement or understanding that had taken place between the two leaders. In the main I think he was correct although he adroitly attributed—I would not say motives—but a certain frame of mind to the leader of the Opposition, although he admitted that he had a right to be in that frame of mind if he so desired. As I remember, this is what occurred: An arrangement was made by which certain constituencies then vacant should be allowed to return their members to the House of Commons in the bye-elections without a contest, the members so returned to be of the same political stripe as their predecessors. That was fair when the vacancies took place in the ordinary course through the death of the member. But a condition arose—I do not want to go into the horrible details—under which I submit neither the Minister of Finance nor the Solicitor General nor any hon. member on that side of the House would say it was reasonable that the constitutencies of Carleton in Ontario and Kings in Nova Scotia would come under any such arrangement on account of the

manner in which they had become vacant. It was possible—yes, more than possible—that one of the very gentlemen who was asked to retire by the leader of the Government would have again been elected by acclamation in one of these constituencies. Under these circumstances the leader of the Opposition very rightly took the ground that he could not consent to these constituencies having their representatives returned by acclamation. Then, in Manitoba, two members retired, not for appointments to positions, though they both received appointments since. They retired solely for political purposes. Sir James Aikins and now Senator Sharpe, then members of this House, retired for the purpose of accepting the leadership and management of the campaign of the Conservative party in Manitoba. In view of these two retirements for the purposes named, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they think the leader of the Opposition would have been doing his duty to the people of this country had he consented to successors being elected to these two gentlemen without a contest. These are the constituencies that were in question. That being the case, Mr. Speaker, the argument of the Solicitor General as to there being a departure by the leader of the Opposition rather vanishes, because he adhered to his former proposal in so far as vacancies would occur through death to allow successors to be appointed, but this arrangement could not apply to members who had retired under the conditions which I have named.

The Solicitor General says Senate appointments are not party patronage, but appointments have been made for party advantage. It was understood that we were to have no bye-elections and if, under the amendment to the Act made by the Senate itself for the representation in its own body, it having a perfect right to decide that question for itself, these conditions exist both east and west with respect to the Commons, why should the Government take advantage of the situation to appoint their own men to one branch of this Parliament while by general consent on the one hand and by statute on the other there were to be no members elected to the House? Technically speaking, the Government have a perfect right to do it, but I believe if the spirit and intent of the arrangement had been carried out no appointment would have been made to the Senate under the present circumstances. The member for Halifax is not questioning the right, but he is calling the attention of the House and the country to the fact by way of resolution that while no vacancies are filled in the House of Commons except by the consent of the parties, the Government should not exercise its technical right and appoint members to the Upper Chamber.

[Mr. Graham.]

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), in bringing forward this motion, gives the ground on which it is based. As far as I gathered from his remarks, his argument was put forward not for the reason that the general public interest was in any way injured by further appointments to the Senate which this Government might make. I did not understand him either to say that any of the sections of Canada entitled to senatorial representation would be in any way injured by the continuance of appointments to the Senate by the Government. I did understand him to use this argument: that the sole ground upon which he puts forward this motion is that it is to the political disadvantage of the party opposite that the Government should continue to make these appointments.

In other words, he says it is an advantage to the Government to exercise, I should not say this patronage, but the power of appointment which they possess under the British North America Act in filling senatorial vacancies as they occur. My hon. friend said further that this Government was in office by the grace of the Opposition. I submit that that is an unfair, an improper and an erroneous statement as to the existing situation. This Government is in power in the same sense as it was in power in 1912, in 1913, in 1914 and in 1915, precisely in the same sense. It is here exercising all the powers which a Government may exercise under the British North America Act without any exception whatsoever. We are not only carrying on the war, but we are carrying on the civil administration of this country, carrying on all the business in all the departments of Government, and making all appointments which it is within the jurisdiction and province of a Government to make under the constitution. There is no curtailment, so far as I know, in any sense whatever. What does that mean? It means that this Government has the full obligation of carrying on the business of the country, including the making of these appointments to the Senate. That is the obligation devolving upon us, and with that obligation goes the responsibility. The Senate is a branch

of this Legislature, and it is the duty of the Government of the day to fill the vacancies in the Senate as they arise, at all events to fill them within a reasonable time. When the question of this extension was considered, as the Solicitor General said, the Government came down and submitted its views to the House, and the Opposition acquiesced in those views. They properly acquiesced in those views because the country, as a matter of fact, acquiesced in them. It was not only the consensus of opinion in this House that an extension of Parliament should be granted, but it was also the consensus of opinion in the country. So that no question can possibly arise as to the position of this Government under the extension. It is precisely the same as its position was in any year since its accession to power in 1911, all the duties of Government devolving upon us, all the responsibilities of Government, and all the powers. We have not been dispossessed of any.

My hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. Graham) says: If you are unwilling to allow the vacancies in the Senate to go unfilled, why are the vacancies in the House of Commons allowed to go unfilled? He said: Why should the vacancies continue in this House if you fill them in the Upper House?

Mr. GRAHAM: I put it the other way around.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: So long as I put it properly.

Mr. GRAHAM: Improperly from my standpoint.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Will my hon. friend correct me?

Mr. GRAHAM: Put it the reverse way.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend said in substance: You have vacancies in the House of Commons; you do not fill these; but you do fill the vacancies in the Senate, or you are unwilling to say you will not fill them.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is better.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It seems to me that there is a perfectly clear distinction for precisely the same reason that the extension of Parliament was granted. Why was the extension of Parliament granted? Was it because there was any thought of party advantage or disadvantage? Not by any means. The extension was granted because it was the consensus of opinion in this House and in this country that it would be a monstrous thing to hold a general election in Canada in time of war.

Mr. GRAHAM: Notwithstanding the ballots?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That was the reason for extending the life of Parliament.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Who ever said it would be a monstrous thing?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If my hon. friend thinks that the term monstrous is not strong enough, then if he rises to his feet I know his power of language and he will be able to employ a term which will express the proper degree of turpitude of such a suggestion.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is too strong altogether.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Last year we had the greatest war in the history of the world, progressing upon a scale unparalleled in human history. We had our soldiers going overseas; we had them by tens of thousands at the front. We had the papers filled, as they are to-day, with lists of casualties; we had homes darkened with sorrow, and hearts broken with grief. We had this country carrying a burden of care such as never before

Mr. PUGSLEY: Even including this Government.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Prime Minister then came down to this House and said: Our view is that there should be an extension of the life of Parliament. That was acquiesced in by the Opposition. Why? We all realized the situation that would result from a general election at that time. Here were ministers of the Crown engaged practically day and night in the discharge of the onerous duties devolving upon them in this war.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Minister of Labour—

Mr. REID: The Minister of Labour is doing his part.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Minister of Labour has exceedingly heavy duties devolving upon him in connection with this war. How it would be possible to carry on a general election with the duties, urgent, immediate, and all-important, devolving upon ministers of the Crown at the time an extension was granted, I think no one can conceive. Those were the grounds,

and in addition to those grounds the further ground of the public turmoil and the excitement that would take place over this country and the diversion of the activities of the people from the war, the all-important question of the hour, to the hustings and an election campaign, with the ensuing disturbance, not to say the ill-will that might result. All those considerations apply to contested elections to the House of Commons because it is the people's Chamber, but not at all to appointments to the Senate. The Government of the day is empowered, authorized and obligated under the constitution to fill vacancies in the Senate, and that is what this Government has been doing. It is one of the ordinary duties devolving upon Government, and the Government is discharging it, and would not, I think, be justified in undertaking to refrain from discharging it. The mere fact that some party advantage may accrue to this side or some disadvantage to the other side is at this time of no national significance. If hon. gentlemen opposite had chanced to be in power when the war broke out, an extension would have been granted in the same way, and they would have gone ahead exercising the powers of Government, including the power of making appointments to the Senate. It chanced that this Government was in at the time war broke out, and we proceeded and have been proceeding with our duties, carrying on the affairs of the country, including the prosecution of the war, the making of appointments, and all other duties devolving upon us. So that, analyzing this down to the very last analysis, my hon friend's only grievance is not that the public interest is in any way infringed on, not that here is any detriment to any province or any section of Canada entitled to senatorial representation, but simply this: you should not make these appointments because you would probably make them from those who are friendly to the Government and not friendly to us. I do not believe that the public are very much interested in that question at this time. They would probably say: Well, the Conservative Government is in power; if the Liberal Government had been in power they would have continued to carry on the business of government inclusive of making appointments to the Senate. But there is a very clear distinction when it comes to holding election campaigns throughout the country in time of war, and that is the distinction which I believe the public will make. I have been unable to discover any reason whatever, except from a purely party standpoint and the consideration of alleged party advantage, why this resolution should be adopted by the House.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): It will be observed that the Minister of Finance, in speaking to this motion, instead of discussing the resolution of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) has treated us to a homily on the question as to whether or not it is wise to extend the life of Parliament. The question of the extension of Parliament is not before the House at this time; if it is submitted by hon. gentlemen opposite, it will be discussed upon its merits in the light of our duty to the people, and we shall be prepared to take the responsibility of whatever course we decide upon.

The resolution of the hon. member for Halifax affirms the principle that during the period of extension of the term of Parliament beyond the time set forth by the provisions of the British North America Act, this Government should refrain from making appointments to the other Chamber. By consent of the Government itself, the appointment of additional senators in the western provinces has been deferred until after the termination of this Parliament. The Solicitor General has told us that this was done on account of some course that was adopted in the Senate. While the Senate did in 1914 take the action suggested, in 1915 the proposal that the appointment of senators in the western provinces should be deferred until after the termination of this Parliament was accepted by the Prime Minister and the motion to agree to that amendment was put through the House by the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government. The members, therefore, who, by virtue of the Redistribution Act of three years ago, would have been entitled to go to the Senate are not permitted to go by reason of the Act of the Government itself.

The acceptance of that principle by the Government, however, was accompanied by a rather suspicious circumstance. The motion to defer the appointment of senators from western Canada was made by the Government on April 10, 1915, in contemplation of their going to the country immediately afterward. Notwithstanding the war, notwithstanding the homily of the Minister of Finance, when this Government, in 1915, declared that the people of western Canada should not have senatorial repre-

sentation until after the termination of this Parliament, they believed that Parliament was to terminate in a few weeks. My hon. friends have forgotten the words of their colleague, the Minister of Public Works, who is now across the ocean. He said:—

> Is it, then, any wonder that the cry comes from every individual that one meets and that understands the conditions, in tones louder than thunder, demanding that this Parliament be dissolved, that the rights and liberties of the people of this Dominion be granted to them under our form of democracy, and that that form of democracy be restored to them?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: That was in 1915.

Mr. MACDONALD: That was in April, 1915.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Wild applause from the Government benches.

Mr. MACDONALD: At the time my hon. friend the Solicitor General and the Minister of Finance were declaring that the people of Canada should not have senatorial representation until the voice of the people was heard, as their colleague, the Minister of Public Works, said these words.

10 p.m.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We could not help ourselves. We would lose the Bill.

Mr. MACDONALD: If hon. gentlemen wanted to settle the question at that time, and if they were not preparing for an election, all they had to do was to let the matter run a year or two until they should have a majority in the Senate that would have carried the Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM: They printed the ballots; too; what is the good of talking?

Mr. MACDONALD: In 1915, when the Minister of Public Works declared that the people of Canada were crying for an election in tones of thunder, he immediately proceeded to have the ballots printed and sent over to England. After Parliament rose he went to the city of Montreal and, in those thunder-tones in which he usually utters his declamations, he announced that the time had come for the people of Canada to say which party should rule. The Minister of Finance, therefore, should remember when he speaks to us about elections, that, beyond a shadow of a doubt, he and his colleagues had decided in 1915, while war was on—whatever stopped them, we do not know—that there would be an election.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no.

Mr. MACDONALD: Then what did the Minister of Public Works mean when he made the utterances to which I have referred?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I suggest that my hon. friend ask the Minister of Public Works. He is not quoting the Prime Minister, and he is not quoting any of the ministers here to-night.

Mr. PUGSLEY: He spoke in the presence of his colleagues.

Mr. MACDONALD: Surely you are not going back on your colleague. In that very session the Minister of Justice made careful preparations for taking the votes of the soldiers across the seas. Then came the announcement of the Minister of Public Works; then came the printing of the ballots; then came the speech in Montreal —and for some reason the matter ended. I repeat that the Minister of Finance—whatever he may say now—together with his colleagues, decided that there should be an election during war time. When the Solicitor General and his colleagues accepted the amendment of the Senate in April, 1915, declaring that there should be no additional senatorial representation until after the termination of Parliament, they either settled the principle definitely, or they settled it with the full knowledge and belief that there would be an election in 1915 within one or two months. This Government is the only one in all the Dominions of the Empire which has during the war pursued its functions upon purely partisan lines, which has carried out a system of patronage in connection with military and public expenditures, notwithstanding the fact that the extension of time was given, as the member for Halifax very well says, by the grace of the Opposition. In Australia there have been two elections since the war began, and a coalition Government has gone to the country now. In the meantime, in Australia, under the coalition Government, if any appointments are made, such as judges or appointments of that character, they have been made upon lines entirely free of any question of party interest; they have been made for considerations which are behind the existence of the Government as a coalition Government. The same principle applies in South Africa and in Great Britain. The only question that my hon. friend from Halifax has submitted—and he has done so in a very reasonable way—is this: seeing that his Government has had its term of office extended by

the grace of the Opposition; seeing that there is no public interest that will suffer by permitting these vacancies in the Senate to exist any more than any interest suffers by permitting vacancies in the House of Commons to exist, will the Government agree to this principle that, until the termination of this Parliament and until the people of Canada say who shall govern this country after the war is over, the vacancies in the Senate shall not be filled? If hon. gentlemen make an appeal to the country or to this House to sink party considerations on account of any reason they may put forward why such party considerations should be disregarded, is it an unreasonable proposition on the part of my hon. friend to say to hon. gentlemen opposite: Will you not also, pending the termination of the war and the decision of the people of Canada as to who shall govern them, sink party interest, and seeing that no public interest shall suffer, let these vacancies in the Senate remain unfilled? If hon. gentlemen opposite are sincere in asking that the first interest before this country should be the performance of our duty in regard to the war, they should give us an illustration of what they can do in great, big, broad lines, by sinking party considerations and refraining in the public interest from making appointments which can be justified only for partisan reasons. My hon. friend's proposition is a reasonable one, and I fail to see how, if hon. gentlemen opposite do not accept it, they can expect from the opposition in the future that consideration which we have given them in the past. How is it possible for this Government to come before the people of Canada and say: in regard to our administration of the war, in regard to the performance of our several duties we have not acted in a partisan way, we have done that which was broad and generous and big upon this question and therefore we are entitled to favourable consideration from the Canadian people and the party that are opposed to us, if they decline to accept this reasonable request put forward by my hon. friend from Halifax, when manifestly in the judgment of the people of this country there is no public interest which would suffer by holding in abeyance vacancies in the Senate, just as no public interest suffers by holding in abeyance vacancies in the House of Commons?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, from the outbreak of hostilities to the present moment, I think it has been possible to contend that every Canadian whose patriotism was at once strong and enlightened, had one object before him, altogether paramount to anything else that could occupy us as public men in this country, and that object is the winning of the war. Another proposition can be laid down as to the method by which that object could best be obtained. For the winning of the war, it was absolutely necessary for strong and enlightened men to combine, irrespective of previous differences, to preserve the national unity. Those propositions are obvious. They prevail in Germany; they prevail in Britain; they are not questioned there for a moment. When the question of the extension of the term of Parliament came before us last year, these considerations animated both sides of the House. I would not say that the Government are in power by the grace of the Opposition; I do not think that is quite a fair way to put it; the government are in power under an extended term of Parliament because last year the Opposition shared with the Government the two views which I have just said are the views which have prevailed with Canadians whose patriotism was at once strong and enlightened once the war broke out. It was perfectly obvious that for a continuance of those conditions—and I agree with my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) that the general question of extension will be far better discussed when it is again before Parliament—it is necessary that there should be give and take between the two sides of this House, because after all whence does the threat to national unity come? It must come and can come only from an outbreak of partisanship. That is possible on the part of an Opposition; it is obviously equally possible on the part of the Government benches, and the duty to refrain from partisanship on the part of the Opposition must be enforced upon the Opposition by the example and the conduct of the Government and their supporters. I think that my reasoning up to this point would require my hon. friend the Solicitor General in his very best form to puncture it, even by methods of which I am not at all sure that he always approves himself. It is no use speaking to plain men about appointments to the Senate being the same as appointments to the judiciary. Of course, during the war, it goes without saying that the judiciary must go on, and I should be sorry to think that appointments to the judiciary are largely political

at any rate in any British country; but as my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) has pointed out, there is such a uniform course of action in regard to appointments to the Senate that a strong suspicion of partisanship regarding the matter does arise. The two cases are not alike. There is really strong ground for suspicion that appointments to the Senate are very generally political. I do not put this thing on the ground of the interest of the Government. I do not say the Government are in power by the grace of the Opposition; they are in power during an extended term of Parliament on a mutual understanding that party politics should be dropped and that the Government and the Opposition should achieve glory for their position in history as politicians and as statesmen by dropping their politics and uniting for a common purpose of paramount importance. All things are lawful to me, but all things are not expedient. Is it wise for the Government who, I take it, assent to every proposition I have laid down hitherto, to offer provocations to the Opposition that are only human? Is it in accordance with the general principles animating the country, animating the people, and, I hold, animating Parliament last year? I put it on that ground. Is it a wise thing? Is it not certain to have the effect of leading the political parties to lock horns and destroy the national unity, and to that extent interfere, I would say terribly if not monstrously, with Canada's efficiency in the prosecution of the war? I do not want, in the words I am using, to refer to conditions in the spring of 1915 at all. I am too intent, Sir, upon the main objects which I say command the attention of Canadians at this time to want to refer to that. I am glad to be able to say that the Government, for some reason or another, did not have an election anyhow, and I am prepared to give them credit for that. The country knows perfectly well, of course, that there were members of the Government at that time who were thinking in terms of elections. I do not think it possible to convey any other impression to the country than that. I do not want to be unfair to anyone, but that speech on the Senate could not leave any doubt in any reasonable mind as to what the emergency man of the Administration was thinking about anyhow. But I noticed from their countenances that many of the other members of the Administration from the Prime Minister downwards were filled with doubts as to the procedure of the emergency man. That I took to be the psychology of the Cabinet at the moment. I do not think cabinets always agree, not for a moment, but the fact remains and will go down in history that the Government did not have an election, and from that day on they have kept reasonably before them—and I have conceded it fully to them from this side of the House—the objects which I have said ought to command the consensus and agreement of Canadian opinion at this time. Now, in view of that, I would ask the Government to hold over a final decision on this question, if need be, until the Prime Minister returns, and until the subject can be carefully discussed and considered in the Cabinet. Because, after all, if an election comes, tremendous blame will be attached by the country to the party which brings on that election if it comes at a time when our men are falling in thousands, and when it is bound to have the effect of harming to a dreadful extent the national unity.

I think the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) made an admirable speech in presenting this resolution, a speech of very great moderation, and of very strong reason. I do not think that what he advanced has been met by the speeches we have heard from the other side and I would ask the Government to give the most careful consideration to the views I have tried to put before them in these few words.

Motion (Mr. A. K. Maclean) negatived on division.

Mr. GRAHAM: Might I be allowed a word of explanation? We would certainly have asked for a vote on this resolution but for the fact that an arrangement was entered into by the whips on Friday night that there would be no division on Monday.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That was my understanding. The motion is lost on division at the request of the Government. I may be allowed to observe that the motion as it stands includes all appointments from this date forward, which would cover the vacancies at the present time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It includes all since last year.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It includes all.

On the motion of Sir Thomas White, the House adjourned at 10.22 p.m.

Tuesday, May 1, 1917.

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

THE POTATO SUPPLY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. B. McCOIG (West Kent): As there is a very great shortage of potatoes at the present time in different parts of Ontario, both for food and seed purposes, I should be glad if one of the ministers, possibly the Minister of Agriculture, who stated some time ago that there was a large surplus of potatoes in different parts of Canada, would tell us where these surplus potatoes can be obtained.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Minister of Agriculture): The condition of the potato industry, very briefly, is this: When we heard of reported shortages and a scarcity in some parts of the country, I communicated with every provincial Minister of Agriculture in Canada to ascertain as closely as he could the conditions in his own province; this was at the end of February. As nearly as we could ascertain, a conservative estimate put it at about one and a half million bushels surplus over and above the food and seed requirements of the whole country. The surpluses were chiefly in the provinces of Alberta, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick. In some other provinces shortages were reported, and other provinces were not quite sure. We checked up the figures at the end of March by following all the exports from the country, and again up to the 15th of April, and from the time we estimated the amount of potatoes in the country up to the 15th April about half a million bushels were exported, leaving—if our estimate was at all correct, and it was based on the information I have indicated—about one million bushels surplus still in this country. Of course that may be only approximate. I might also say to my hon. friend that a summary of all the replies I received was sent to each Minister of Agriculture in the different provinces, in order that he might know the exact condition throughout the country, together with the suggestion that it might be advisable for those ministers whose provinces were likely to be short, to watch the situation as closely as possible with the idea of doing what they could to supply the needs of their own province.

[Sir Thomas White.]

THE LORD'S DAY OBSERVANCE ACT.

SUSPENSION SUGGESTED.

Mr. S. F. GLASS (East Middlesex): At a meeting of the Ottawa Greater Production Committee yesterday, the following resolution was passed:

> In view of the urgent and pressing need for the production of the largest possible quantity of foods, and by reason of the uncertainty of weather conditions permitting work to be done on land when in a suitable condition for planting and sowing, this committee recommends to the Organization of Resources Committee for Ontario that it petition the Dominion Government to take action under the War Measures Act to suspend the Lord's Day Observance Act as it applies to farm labour for seeding and harvesting work.

I should like to ask if the Government have received representations from any other source as to the desirability of suspending the Lord's Day Act in accordance with this suggestion.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Not to my knowledge. No similar representation has been made. I saw the report in question in this morning's paper, but the matter has not been brought to our attention in any other way.

STATE OF RECRUITING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: I desire to call the attention of the leader of the House (Sir Thomas White) to a statement made by the hon. member for Victoria, Ontario, (Sir Sam Hughes). Speaking in Lindsay on Saturday he said:

> More than one year ago an agitation was begun on the question of labour. We were recruiting too many regiments; we were 'taking too many men away from work'; 'munitions manufacturers and others would be at a standstill'; 'farmers could not put in their crops'; and 'Canada has already done her full duty' were daily recited. They, unfortunately, had an effect upon the Prime Minister. The result was that I was asked in March, 1916, not to press recruiting, and recruiting to-day is and has been dead in Canada for fighting purposes.

Will the hon. gentleman say whether that statement is correct or not?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I would suggest that my hon. friend address that question to the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden). So far as I know the statement referred to has no foundation.

THE BUDGET.

DEBATE ON ANNUAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.

The consideration of the proposed motion of Hon. Sir Thomas White (Minister of

Finance) for the Committee of Ways and Means, and the amendment of Mr. Turriff thereto, was resumed from Friday, April 27.

Hon. Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance): By Order in Council, under authority of the War Measures Act, the Government, on 16th April, placed upon the free list three commodities, wheat, wheat flour and semolina, and by that action brought into operation the provision of the Underwood Tariff under which wheat and wheat products from the country taking such action become entitled to free entry to the markets of the United States. The matter was not referred to in the Budget but my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has moved an amendment, and it is to that amendment and to the subject of free wheat that I purpose for a short time to give consideration. It seems to me that the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite with reference to this action of the Government in placing wheat, wheat flour and semolina on the free list is a most extraordinary one. These hon. gentlemen have asserted for the last three years—the Underwood Tariff having come into effect in October, 1913—that they were in favour of free wheat. One would have thought that when the Government took the action which has been taken these hon. gentlemen would rejoice. One would have thought that the hon. member for Assiniboia, and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) when speaking on the question, would at least have looked pleased. The impression goes out from the House that hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken on this question are glad that the Government has taken this action, but to us in the House they do not look glad, they appear to be sorry. I wonder if the real explanation is not that these hon. gentlemen prefer to have the cry rather than the wool, that they would rather have free wheat as a political issue rather than free wheat as an actuality. At all events, that seems like a reasonable explanation of their attitude on the action of the Government in placing these three commodities on the free list and calling into operation the provision in the Underwood Tariff that I have mentioned.

The criticism of the Opposition upon the action of the Government in this regard proceeds upon several grounds. First, they say it was a departure from the fiscal policy of the Government and of the Conservative party. Second, they say: You have granted it now; why did you not grant it before the war? Third, they say: You grant it now during the war, why did you not grant it earlier in the war? Fourth, they say: The measure is temporary, and with the end of the war the duties are automatically restored. And fifth, they have the temerity to say that the Government was actuated by political consideration in view of an approaching election. I am sure my ears did not fail me and that I distinctly heard my hon. friend from Assiniboia make that last statement.

Mr. TURRIFF: You are quite right.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend admits it. Now let me say—because I desire to discuss this matter seriously and earnestly—that we on this side, ever since the Underwood Tariff came into effect in 1913, have viewed this matter of free wheat upon what we regarded as its merits; we have never declined to grant free wheat on the ground that it involved a departure from the traditional fiscal policy of the Conservative party. I proceed now to prove that what I state is correct. In the Budget speech of 1914, which was the first occasion upon which I discussed the Underwood Tariff in the House of Commons, I set forth the arguments pro and con on the subject of free wheat; I set them out fully, I set them out, I submit, judicially; I did not take the ground that the Government would have nothing to do with this because it was a violation of the fiscal policy of the Conservative party. I examined the whole question from a business, economic, and public standpoint. I said:

> So much for these opposing arguments and contentions. Speaking generally, it is not advisable that a nation's tariff should be so arranged as to fit into the particular features of that of another nation. This, however, would not be a conclusive reason for not making a change clearly in the national interest.

At that time we came to the conclusion, having regard to the fluctuations of price between Winnipeg, Minneapolis and Chicago, that there was not the advantage to the farmer that was claimed in this matter of free wheat, and, having regard to other considerations—industries in Canada of an important character and the condition of our railways—we thought it was not advisable at that time to grant free wheat. But we did not argue it upon the ground that it would be a departure from the fiscal policy of the Conservative party. On the contrary, we said by implication that if it

were in the national interest we were prepared to consider it. I desire to make that perfectly clear. Let us see what I said when this matter was before the House in February, 1916. I spoke on a resolution moved by the hon. member (Mr. Turriff), who now brings forward this amendment. I had been giving the matter my most painstaking attention during the whole of the year. If the Government held the view at that time that it was a departure from the fiscal policy to consider this question, what would be the reason for my giving consideration to the matter in my office continuously as I did? This is what I said, as reported in Hansard on page 861, February 16, 1916:—

> I have caused a record to be kept of prices of grain both in Canada and in the United States, with a view to thoroughly familiarizing myself with the merits of the question in order to reach a sound and just conclusion in the national interest. When I say in the national interest, I need not say how important a factor in the national interest I consider the interest and material well-being of the three great grain-growing provinces of the West. It is in that spirit that I have approached, from time to time, the consideration of this question.

And I expressed the opinion on that occasion, in February, 1916, that it was unwise in the national interest that free wheat should be granted. It was not clear to me that the advantages that would be gained would outweigh the disadvantages, but I repeat, and the point I am making is that we always considered the question upon its merits and had regard, in dealing with it, only to what we regarded as the national interest. The position of the Government, in its view upon the question of free wheat in 1914, in 1916, and in April of this year, when we took action, has been absolutely sound and consistent throughout. I make that statement without the slightest hesitation; I say our action has been sound and consistent throughout. How can it be urged that it was a violation of Conservative fiscal policy? Sir John A. Macdonald was a fairly good Conservative; so I have heard. Sir Leonard Tilley was the finance minister of Sir John A. Macdonald. Sir Leonard Tilley introduced the National Policy budget about 1879. The National Policy budget of 1879 has been the charter of the fiscal policy of the Conservative party from that day to this. Let us see what Sir Leonard Tilley said in regard to reciprocal provisions in the tariff. Sir Leonard Tilley, in 1879, in introducing the National Policy budget, said:—

> The Government, requiring more revenue, have determined to ask this House to impose upon the products of the United States that have been free, such a duty as may seem consistent with our position. But the Government couple with the proposal, in order to show that we approach this question with no unfriendly spirit, a resolution that will be laid on the table containing a proposition to this effect: That, as to articles named, which are the natural products of the country, including lumber, if the United States take off the duties in part or in whole, we are prepared to meet them with equal concessions. The Government believe in a reciprocity tariff, yet may discuss Free Trade or Protection, but the question of to-day is—Shall we have a reciprocity tariff, or a one-sided tariff?

That was the National Policy budget of Sir Leonard Tilley in 1879. Is it contrary to the fiscal policy of the Conservative party either to have a reciprocity provision in the tariff which remains under you control absolutely or to take advantage of a reciprocal provision in the tariff of another country? I submit that the action of Sir Leonard Tilley in 1879 is absolutely conclusive evidence that the attitude we have taken is in no way inconsistent with the fiscal policy of the Conservative party.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No; it was the election that you were thinking of.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have a great personal regard for my right hon. friend. He weathered the storm for many years and he was always on firm ground when he followed the policy of Sir Leonard Tilley. My right hon. friend notwithstanding his free trade professions in 1893, when he got into office followed in the footsteps of Sir John Macdonald and Sir Leonard Tilley and while he continued in that path he got on well in regard to his fiscal policy. But, my right hon. friend instead of continuing to follow the true lights was allured by a will-of-the-wisp and that brings me to the reciprocity agreement of 1911. My right hon. friend I think, would admit, if he would tell us his opinion candidly, that he then made a political mistake of the first magnitude——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: He did nothing of the kind. The policy of Sir Leonard Tilley in 1879 was that reciprocity of tariff would conduce to reciprocity of trade.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am sorry that my right hon. friend has not got over 1911. He tried upon that occasion to prove the impossible. He tried to prove that under reciprocity the farmer would get more for his product but that the consumer would pay less. We all know that when my right hon friend attempted to prove that to the people of Canada he was fore-doomed to

failure. Not even my right hon. friend could do that. He could not prove the impossible. My right hon. friend in connection with the reciprocity agreement, was like a mariner who disregarded the beacon lights. He disregarded the beacon light that was hung up by one of the greatest Liberals of the day, Hon. George Brown. When the Hon. George Brown was a member of the coalition government formed to bring about Confederation, he went to Washington in connection with the matter of reciprocity and he absolutely declined to become a party to an agreement such as was entered into by my right hon. friend's Government with the Government at Washington. Hon. George Brown stated that every tariff agitation over there would find its echo at Ottawa and he actually resigned from the coalition Government upon that ground. You will find authority for that in the letters and memoirs of the Hon. George Brown.

There were many objections to the reciprocity agreement as has been shown by our experience in 1911. Quite a number of articles, which, under the agreement would nave entered the United States, subject to duty, enter the United States to-day free. I repeat there were many objections to the reciprocity agreement. The chief objection was the fact of the agreement. It is true that on its face it was stated that it was not a treaty, but in substance and in fact it was a treaty and when it was entered into the late Government lost to a considerable degree the control of its own tariff. That was the feature of the reciprocity agreement to which chief objection was taken. There were many other objections but that was one of the chief ones, and it was, that when that agreement was entered into the Government of Canada lost in a measure the control of its own tariff. Under the National Policy Budget of 1879, Sir Leonard Tilley did not lose control of his tariff for a moment, and in the action which we have taken under the authority of the War Measures Act, we have not for one moment lost control of our tariff.

Our action was not preceded by any negotiations There was no agreement with the United States. We took action under the War Measures Act, and we placed wheat and wheat flour and semolina on the free list. The tariff is just as much under the control of this Parliament as it was on April fifteenth. There is a clear distinction between taking advantage of reciprocal provisions in the tariff of another country or offering advantages by reciprocal provision in your own tariff, control of which you do not lose for a moment, and negotiating an agreement under which you lose such control. That is a clear distinction that any one can make.

Mr. TURRIFF: If, under the agreement of 1911, Canada would have lost control of her tariff, would the United States have lost control of its tariff under that agreement?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It would to a certain extent, but not to the extent that Canada would. The United States was a very much larger country than Canada and there would not be the same considerations weighing with the Government of the United States contemplating the recision of agreement that there would have been upon the Government of Canada considering recision.

My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) should have made a fresh start after 1911; he should have said: I have made a mistake with regard to reciprocity, and I am going to make a new start. I often think that my right hon. friend was more partial to the reciprocity agreement than to any other child of his political brain. One reason was that it was the youngest. Reciprocity was my right hon. friend's youngest political child, and we must not blame him from being partial to it, because it was his Benjamin. I mention that because, like parents whose children who have been lost, my right hon. friend sees resemblances to reciprocity in many measures brought forward in this House. For example, if I borrow in New York my right hon. friend says: Oh, that is reciprocity.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No, that is truck and trade with the Yankees.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My right hon. friend says that is truck and trade with the Yankees and he has said in this House that it was. But it is not his long lost child, reciprocity; it is a very much more healthy and robust infant; it is legitimate business, borrowing in the United States, just as I might borrow in Great Britain. We sell our securities to the United States just as for generations past we have sold goods to the United States. But my right hon. friend sees in it a far away resemblance to reciprocity.

Then when we, under the War Measures Act, take the action which we have taken and bring into operation the reciprocal provision in the Underwood Tariff of 1913, my

right hon. friend again says: Reciprocity! But it is still a case of mistaken identity. This is a very much more self-respecting child than reciprocity or the reciprocity agreement of 1911 because, as I have pointed out, in this action that we have taken we have not lost for one moment control of our tariff. The fundamental and essential difference between our action respecting free wheat and the reciprocity agreement is that we retain in its fulness and entirety our control over our own tariff. We have not in the slightest degree abridged our freedom of fiscal action or surrendered one jot or tittle of our fiscal independence.

Mr. MACDONALD: Does the hon. gentleman mean by that that the Government can at any moment repeal this provision in regard to free wheat?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I shall later on deal very fully with that criticism, which was made by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley).

The second criticism that is offered is this: Why do you do this now and not be-before the war? I answer: because conditions have been profoundly changed by the war. Conditions affecting trade, international conditions affecting ocean transport have been radically and profoundly changed. There has been a revolution in trade and in transportation methods and conditions since the outbreak of this war. Let us take our condition three years ago, before war broke out. We exported largely to Great Britain. We borrowed largely in Great Britain, that is to say, we exported our securities and sold them there. We were obligated to pay in Great Britain interest upon huge sums which we had borrowed for the development of this country. We imported to a considerable extent from Great Britain. We imported to a large extent from the United States. Our imports from the United States greatly exceeded our exports to the United States. We were, I think, the second best customer of the United States. How did we pay the United States for the balance of trade? We paid the United States for the balance of trade through Great Britain. Great Britain exported to the United States, and those exports would be a set off to her imports from the United States. But in addition to that the United States owed Great Britain vast sums for interest upon securities. In addition to that Great Britain, by the services of her carrying fleet, established a large indebtedness on the part of the United States. The result was, as I have stated, that it was England that paid the United States the balance that we owed the United States upon international trading. Now let us see what has happened since the war has broken out. Our imports from the United States have immensely increased.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear!

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My right hon. friend says "hear, hear."

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Certainly.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes, our imports from the United States have immensely increased. How can we liquidate that adverse balance to-day with existing conditions of transportation and exchange between England and the United States unless we increase the sale of our products to the United States?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear, by all means.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: At last my right hon. friend and I are together in agreement.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is what reciprocity would have done.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: But reciprocity was a peace time measure.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Oh, oh.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am speaking about war conditions, and they have brought this about.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: You seem very much involved.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Let us see what the conditions were in 1911, or even in 1914. My right hon. friend need not take my opinion or my statements; I shall cite to him one whose authority not even my right hon. friend will question. But let us see, just for a moment, the change that has taken place in the exchange of commodities between Great Britain and the United States since the outbreak of this war. In 1914 the exports from the United States to Great Britain were $594,000,000, let us say $600,000,000, merchandise only, and in 1916, last year, those exports had risen to $1,500,000,000 from the United States to the United Kingdom, or an increase of $900,000,000 in favour of the United States as compared with pre-war exports.

At the same time, the exports of Great Britain to the United States had increased only from $293,000,000 to $308,000,000. This means that exchange has

completely broken down between the United Kingdom and the United States; that the conditions which prevailed before the war do not prevail to-day; that an entire change has taken place both as to the channels of trade and the conditions under which trade is carried on.

I told my hon. friend that I would quote an authority to which he would defer. At the Guildhall a few days ago, Mr. Lloyd George, Prime Minister of Great Britain, referring to the transportation situation and the food conditions in Great Britain, made a most important statement Speaking about the shortage of ocean transport and its effect in Great Britain, he said that arrangements were being made whereby imports would be cut down by over 10,000,000 tons yearly without interfering with any essential industry in Great Britain. Why is the Government of the United Kingdom devoting its energies to cutting down imports? Because of the shortage in tonnage brought about by submarine warfare. Sir Edward Carson said yesterday that the losses from submarines were growing. There is no use minimizing or blinking matters; the submarine menace is a terrible one. During the week before last 40 large British and allied vessels and 15 smaller ones were sunk, to say nothing of neutral shipping. That is the condition with which we are confronted to-day: the submarine menace to British and neutral shipping; regulations as to food enforced in the United Kingdom. Mr. Lloyd George further said: "We are placing under cultivation 3,000,000 fresh acres of land so that in 1918 we shall be able to support ourselves within the confines of the United Kingdom." Will that have any effect upon trade or upon imports of foodstuffs? This war has brought about a limitation of ordinary imports into Great Britain, and of exports from Great Britain. Every day of my life I am asked by some interest in Canada to see if I can get the embargo lifted whereby exports from Great Britain of commodities in which they are interested are prohibited from leaving the ports of the United Kingdom—the reason being, of course, the shortage of shipping.

Coming to the wheat question, what does Lloyd George say? I direct the attention of my right hon. friend and of the member for Assiniboia to the following words:

> There are 85,000,000 bushels of wheat in Canada—

That is an under-statement.

> —I would not say for the asking, but for the fetching. It ought to have been here. I believe that about twenty or thirty million bushels of this wheat had to go to the United States for lack of another market. We must cut down our food until we discover a method of destroying this ocean bacillus. That is one thing that has got to be done.

The British Prime Minister then says that there is plenty of wheat in Canada, not for the asking, but for the fetching. He says: It is impossible to fetch it on account of the submarine menace and of the shortage of shipping; consequently it has to find a market in the United States. This indicates that formerly the wheat had found a market in the United Kingdom, and that normally it would find its market there to-day if the British authorities had the shipping to fetch it.

So far as conditions affecting the sale of Canadian wheat were formerly concerned, there was a good export demand from millers and others in the United Kingdom for all grades of our wheat. There was a better demand for the high grades, but there was, nevertheless, a demand for the lower grades. While there is still a certain demand locally and by millers for the low grades of Canadian wheat in our West, it is a fact that the export demand for low grade wheat has diminished—this is precisely what you would expect—because of the food regulations in the United Kingdom and the shortage of cargo space. They adopted regulations in the United Kingdom with a view to getting the greatest amount of food product out of a given amount of grain. For a considerable part of the last few months Stoddart & Company, who have been purchasers for Great Britain of wheat in Canada, have been purchasing the higher grades of wheat—only recently have they been purchasing any of the lower grades—and the result was that while there was a good market for the higher grades of wheat, there was not as good a market for the lower grades. The hon. member for Assiniboia knows that. In addition, it is perfectly clear to me that advantage was being taken of the situation with regard to the lower grades of wheat and that the farmer was not receiving for the lower grades of wheat the money that he should have received. That was the position with which the Government was confronted. If anybody is disposed to challenge that, let him examine the figures for March, which show in most illuminating fashion what has happened with regard to the channels of trade. In the month of March, 1916, 400,000 bushels of wheat only went from Canada to the United States, and in the same month of this year 2,400,000

bushels of wheat went into the United States—six times as much, an excess of 2,000,000 bushels. This occurred, as I have stated, because the exchange situation and the shortage of ocean transportation has given Canadian wheat and other products a tendency to move towards the United States.

Mr. ROBB: Who paid the duty on that wheat going into the United States?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It would have to be paid in every case, but there might be a drawback with respect to a good deal of it. I am unable to say how much, and I am sure that my hon. friend is unable to say how much. The fact remains, however—and it is a most illuminating fact—that the increased amount of wheat going into the United States in the month of March of this year was as I have stated.

The hon. member for Assiniboia then makes his third criticism of the action of the Government. He says: "Why was not free wheat granted early in the war? If you did this owing to war conditions, why did you not do it in 1914?" But even the hon. member for Assiniboia would not have had the temerity to ask the Government in 1914-15 to grant free wheat, because the market at Winnipeg was so very much higher than the market at Minneapolis or Chicago. There was no resolution with regard to free wheat in 1914-15, immediately after the outbreak of war.

Mr. TURRIFF: We advocated it every year.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend could not have advocated it in 1915, because, as a matter of fact, for many months in the fall of 1914 the market at Winnipeg was much higher than the market at Minneapolis or Chicago.

Mr. TURRIFF: No.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend shakes his head—but there is no doubt about it—that the market at Winnipeg was better, and there are reasons for that.

Mr. TURRIFF: Is my hon. friend not contrasting, say, No. 2 Northern Manitoba grade with No. 2 Northern Minneapolis grade?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No, I am familiar with all those distinctions.

Mr. TURRIFF: That is what my hon. friend has done.

[Sir Thomas White.]

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I make the statement that after the outbreak of the war the Winnipeg market was better than either the Minneapolis market or the Chicago market.

Mr. TURRIFF: That is not the case.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There were reasons for that. The exchange, instead of being favourable to the United States, as it is to-day, was unfavourable to the United States. That is sufficient answer to my hon. friend, who says: Well, if it is proper to do it in war time, why did you not do it earlier in the war? The reason was that conditions earlier in the war were such that the exchange was unfavourable to the United States.

We come down now to last year. It was uncertain, during last year, as to what the position was. Sometimes the price at Winnipeg would be a little higher than the price at Minneapolis; sometimes the price would be a little higher at Minneapolis than at Winnipeg. The statement was made here that on the lower grades of wheat there was a considerable spread. There was likely to be a greater spread on the lower grades at that time than on the higher grades, but that argument was put forward last year. There are, however, two considerations to be borne in mind. In the first place, the submarine menace had not yet developed on the scale that it is at the present time. It is a well known fact that during the early part of 1916 it was believed that the submarine menace had been mastered. I am speaking now of the small submarine. What has transpired since that is this: There has appeared upon the scene for many months the super-submarine with an enlarged area of operation, and it is the super-submarine and the multiplication of submarines by Germany devoting the energies of her shipbuilding plants to the building of submarines that has brought about this acute situation. But it took a long time to develop; it was only on February 1 of this year that Germany declared a blockade of the British Isles and announced to the entire world that she would sink the shipping, not only of Great Britain but of neutrals. Up to that point she was sinking the shipping of Great Britain; she had not dared to sink the shipping, at all events, of that great neutral, the United States; but since February 1, she has been sinking, not only British shipping, but neutral shipping, and she has in that way profoundly affected the carrying capacity of the Atlantic fleets, although last year it was not apparent that the situation, which has since developed,

would develop. But there is another very important situation. The United States at that time was not an ally. It 4 p.m. might have been possible that Great Britain would require the entire wheat crop of Canada. What is the position to-day? The United States has taken her place with the Allies in this great war. The wheat and other food products of the United States and of Canada are practically pooled to-day for the use of the Allies. The British buyers, buying for Great Britain and for her Allies, are purchasing the exportable wheat crop of the United States and of Canada.

Mr. TURRIFF: Is that the reason why my hon. friend has put wheat on the free list?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am developing this argument beautifully.

Mr. TURRIFF: Yes.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend cannot fail to understand. He who runs may read. I am giving my reasons why we did not do last year what we did in April this year.

Mr. TURRIFF: There is one you have not yet given.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: And if my hon. friend's mind were open for a moment, he would understand and agree that the course which we have pursued has been, not only consistent, but beneficial.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Giving many reasons and fishing for a good one.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Those reasons do not tally with those given by the Solicitor General.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Our reasons usually tally. The Solicitor General is usually correct in the facts, and I try also to be correct. I was amazed the other night to hear my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) actually jeer—not so much in express words, but by his manner—at the high prices which the farmers of the West are receiving for wheat. I would have thought, if my hon. friend rejoiced, as he stated that he rejoiced, at the placing of wheat, wheat flour and semolina upon the free list, thus giving access to the United States for our wheat and wheat products, he would at least look pleasant; but he did not; he was rather annoyed.

Mr. MACDONALD: He always looks pleasant.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend says that he always looks pleasant. Well, if he looked pleasant the other night, then all I have to say is that I should not like to see him when he looks unpleasant. He looked pleasant in the same sense that a man looks pleasant when he is having his photograph taken. My hon. friend from St. John has just come in. I was saying that if he looked pleasant the other night—and no one in this House can look more pleasant than my hon. friend when he is really pleasant—

Mr. TURRIFF: He is pretty good looking.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: then all I have to say is that I should not like to see him when he is looking unpleasant.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The sadness of the Government's supporters would make anybody feel sad.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend looked pleasant in just the same sense that a man having his photograph taken looks pleasant—my hon. friend knows what I mean by that. He had very little sympathy for the high prices the farmers in the West were getting for their wheat. We often hear statements made as to the energy which Governments should devote in order to bring immigrants into this country, and I agree with all that has been said as to the desirability of the greatest possible activity being shown in bringing immigrants into this country; but the best immigration agent for Canada is a good price for wheat.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The situation was the same last year as it is this year. Is that a new idea?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend the other night from his seat in the House rather jeered at the high prices which the farmers of the West were receiving for their wheat—

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I leave it to you, Sir; you were in the Chair.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Perhaps I had better put it this way: I will not say that my hon. friend jeered at the high price of wheat; I will say that my hon. friend apparently had no sympathy with the high price which the farmer was obtaining for his wheat. The agricultural community is entitled to every possible consideration. Agriculture is the very base of our industrial fabric; the farmers are the real pro-

ducers; the pyramid rests squarely upon the base of agricultural production. There is nothing too good for the farmers because they earn all they get; they are not in any combines. I was raised on a farm; I know what it is to get up at five o'clock in the morning, and I know how the farmer earns his money. I know what he gets, he earns by hard work.

Mr. GRAHAM: Some times he earns what he does not get.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is a good thing then that the farmer is getting a good price for his product. I do not know of anything that will relieve the high cost of living later more than the fact that there is a good price for agricultural products. What stimulates production is a good return for the effort expended and the capital invested; and that principle applies to agriculture as it does to any other business. I have no sympathy with stock exploitation, with stock gamblers or wheat gamblers, but I have great sympathy with the farmer getting a proper price for his product.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would my hon. friend be good enough to elaborate that idea and show how high prices for agricultural products will reduce the cost of living.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend tried and failed in 1911 to establish that very thesis.

Mr. PUGSLEY: And the Minister of Finance argued the other way then.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend was out of the House when I pointed out that among other reasons why my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) signally failed in 1911, was that he attempted to prove to the intelligent people of this country that the farmer would get more for his product and the consumer would pay less. My hon. friend would hardly expect me to embark upon that undertaking after the example of 1911.

Another argument of my hon. friend was: Why should we do this at this time with the price of low grade wheat at a dollar or $1.30, as the case may be, as it only means ten cents a bushel to the farmer? Well, ten cents on fifty million bushels means $5,000,000, and on twenty-five million bushels, $2,500,000. Does my hon. friend mean to say that if this is a proper course for us to take in the national interest at this time of war conditions, the farmer in the West is not entitled to that ten cents? That was practically the argument of my hon. friend the other night, and I was surprised at him making it.

To come to another matter. It was argued in 1914 and in 1916 that the milling industry might be injuriously affected by such a measure as this. Now, there are few industries in Canada that have had greater profits since the outbreak of the war than the milling industry; enormous profits have been made by the large milling companies. It has been suggested on the other side of the House, what about railways, what about the transportation situation? Well, the war has materially changed that also. The war has changed the entire situation in Canada. What is the situation so far as the railways are concerned? My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) knows that wheat is not being taken out of the West to-day as it should be.

Mr. TURRIFF: Why?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Because of the shortage of rolling stock.

Mr. TURRIFF: No.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Because of the shortage of rolling stock and motive power.

Mr. TURRIFF: A farmer in the West told me within the last six weeks that he sold 50,000 bushels of wheat. He went down to New York and made arrangements for shipping it across the ocean, and he said that there were hundreds and hundreds of cars standing on every siding in his part of the country, and the railroads would not take them away.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Because of the shortage of motive power and the blocking of the eastern lines and terminals. If my hon. friend desires information on that point, let him do what I did. I am not talking at random; I consulted the Chairman of the Railway Commission, and I know what the railway situation is in this country. Does my hon. friend mean to say that wheat is coming out of the Goose Lake District to-day, and that there are not millions of bushels in the hands of the farmer that cannot be moved by reason of the blockade on our railways and the shortage of rolling stock? Let my hon. friend ask the Chairman of the Railway Commission what is the greatest need of railways to-day, and he will be told rolling stock.

Mr. TURRIFF: No.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I ask my hon. friend to go and see him.

Mr. TURRIFF: I can only tell my hon. friend that if he travels along the roads in the west he will find hundreds and thousands of cars standing idle on the tracks. It is not a shortage of rolling stock.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: What is my argument? I am showing that the railway situation has materially changed since the war.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The trouble is the want of elevators at the Atlantic terminals. The St. John elevators were burnt three years ago, and have not been rebuilt yet.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: So on all grounds the action of the Government was the right and proper course to take, having regard to the conditions which existed at that time. My hon. friend has a further criticism. He says: Why did you act under the War Measures Act? Why didn't you come down to Parliament and make these changes in your Budget? I think this Budget debate itself is a sufficient answer to that. How long will it be before this debate will close and before the measures which are now before the House will be enacted into law by this House and by the Senate? How long does it take to have Budget proposals translated into legislation? They go into effect immediately, so far as the Customs Department is concerned, but as a matter of fact they do not become law until the legislation is passed by this House and by the Senate and the Governor General has given his consent.

Mr. GRAHAM: They go into practical effect when the Budget speech is made.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: They go into practical effect, but they would not meet the conditions of the tariff of another country. Hon. gentlemen say that we should not have taken this step under the War Measures Act. They say we should have included this free wheat measure in the Budget, and debated it for a month or six weeks, and two months from now the proposals would be enacted into law. Supposing we had done that? It would mean that the farmer of the West would have been deprived all that time of ten cents a bushel in respect of the low grade wheat he exported to the United States. I believe myself that in a clear case, where you are certain as to the propriety of what you are doing, what is called for is action, if you have the power to take that action. My hon. friend's criticism that this action should have not have been taken under the War Measures Act is one that I am sure will not appeal to the people of the West. What the people of the West want in this particular situation is a market for their low grade wheat.

Mr. TURRIFF: A permanent market.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I will come to that later. I will round up the job before I finish, and will answer my hon. friend fully, thoroughly and conclusively. The farmers of the West do not care whether my hon. friend from Assiniboia is deprived of a political cry or not; they do not care two straws about political cries, but I am afraid my hon. friend from Assiniboia does care for political cries. The Government had power to deal with this matter under the provisions and by the authority of the War Measures Act. That is admittted by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley). Sometimes I think he is a good lawyer, and sometimes I think he is not. Sometimes he puts forward sound opinions in this House, and sometimes unsound opinions, and he smiles just as genially when he puts forward one kind as when he puts forward the other; but my hon. friend admits that the Government had the power to act. Well, if we had the power to act and the case was such as I have mentioned, why should not the Government act? And the Government did act. My hon. friend from Assiniboia says, and my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) too and I was amazed at him because he is a real lawyer—

Mr. GRAHAM: That is not an absolute qualification.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: They both put forward the argument, "Under the War Measures Act you have taken off the duties, but those duties are merely suspended, and as soon as the war is over they will jump back again."

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is also what my hon. friend from St. John says.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is what the law says.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: But that is not what the Department of Justice says, and the Department of Justice is right. There has been presented to this House the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice, a man who has absolutely no political reason for misstating the law or the facts, or for

coming to any particular conclusion as opposed to any other conclusion. He is there to advise Liberal Governments and Conservative Governments alike. He is a good counsel, a sound lawyer. And what does he say? He says, as any lawyer who looks at it from a legal standpoint would be bound to say: you have taken the duties off wheat, wheat flour and semolina, and those duties are permanently taken off until fresh duties are imposed by or under the authority of Parliament. That is what he advises the Government, and that is what the Government believes has been done.

Mr. MACDONALD: Will the hon. minister undertake to say that the Deputy Minister of Justice expresses the opinion that the Government could not, by Order in Council, during the pendency of the war, transfer these articles back to where they were before?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No, I do not.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How, then, does it become permanent?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I will explain in a moment. Wheat, wheat flour and semolina are upon the free list in precisely the same sense as any other article is on the free list under the tariff to-day. Any article can be changed from the free list to the dutiable list by or under the authority of Parliament.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does the hon. minister mean to say that any article can be changed from the free list to the dutiable list by Order in Council?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If my hon. friend asks me that question, which embraces this particular case, I express my opinion that it can. But I will say this, speaking now on behalf of the Government, that the Government regard wheat, wheat flour and semolina as upon the free list in the same way that any other articles on the tariff are on the free list, and that fresh duties will not be imposed except by Parliament. Why do I eliminate " or under the authority of Parliament?" For this reason: Under the general legislation, apart altogether from the War Measures Act—

Mr. MACDONALD: Why did not the hon. gentleman submit the proposition to Parliament?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have covered that ground so fully that I thought even a child could understand it. The hon. member (Mr. Macdonald) must have been asleep, or else he was talking to the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) who is a charming companion. But I make the statement that the Government understands what has been done in the same sense that its legal adviser understands it, and I say that if these duties are ever reimposed it will be by Parliament. Why do I say that? Under the general legislation the Governor in Council at any time can place upon the free list any article or commodity that is used in connection with Canadian manufactures. Further than that, the Government can at any time grant remission of the duty under the Audit Act in cases where duty has been paid on articles imported. It is not an unusual thing for a government to reduce a duty, or even to place an article upon the free list. It is not altogether unusual—though power in this respect is more seldom exercised for the Government to grant remission of duty on articles that have been imported. The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), when, in power, remitted the duty on coal; and we remitted the duty on cement on one occasion, because there was a scarcity of cement in the West. It is not an unusual thing, I say, for the Governor in Council to reduce or remove duties. But it is an unprecedented thing, so far as I know to impose duties by Order in Council; and I have no hesitation in saying that this Government, or any Government that succeeds it, if it desires to impose fresh duties upon these articles, will bring the proposal down to Parliament and have it enacted into law in the usual way. So we need not worry ourselves about these legal disquisitions and arguments about the validity of the Government's action under the War Measures Act—that argument entirely disappears.

Let me summarize what I have said: In the first place, there has been no departure from the traditional fiscal policy of the Conservative party, which has meant so much for the prosperity of this country since 1879; the policy of Sir John Macdonald, the policy of Sir Leonard Tilley, the policy of the present leader of the Opposition down to 1911. In the second place, conclusions as to what should be done in this matter has been reached upon the merits at the time decisions were taken, and having regard to the national interest. And when I speak of the national interest I repeat what I said in 1916, that no one can think of the national interest of Can-

ada without thinking of the interest of the three great prairie provinces.

Now, the hon. member (Mr. Turriff) put forth a fifth criticism. It is really as unfounded and as little worth as criticisms one, two, three and four. He says: You are actuated by political considerations. One would hardly suspect my hon. friend from Assiniboia of suggesting that anyone could be actuated by political considerations. It would surprise me to learn that such a thought has ever crossed my hon. friend's mind. He says there is a coming election. What coming election?

Mr. GRAHAM: Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) merely interjects that. What have the Governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan to do with the question of free wheat?

Mr. GRAHAM: Just as much as they had to do with cement.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: And they had nothing to do with cement. But my hon. friend from Assiniboia said "election," he did not say "elections."

Mr. TURRIFF: Yes, and I meant the Dominion elections.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Absolutely. That is what the hon. gentleman meant. What does my hon. friend from South Renfrew say to that?

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. member for Assiniboia makes it stronger than I did, that is all.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: But he puts my hon. friend (Mr. Graham) in error.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not at all. The Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) will tell you.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The hon. member for Assiniboia said that we had acted for political reasons having regard to the "coming election." Now let me say this: the Prime Minister of this country is about to introduce a Bill into this House for the extension of Parliament. We on this side of the House do not believe there should be an election at this time. Should there be an election, who will be responsible for it? Is an election to be apprehended? Did the Government take this action under the War Measures Act by reason of its expectation that there would be an election when, at the same time, it is about to bring down a Bill to extend the term of Parliament? What then, is the force, and weight, and validity of the argument of my hon. friend?

Mr. LEMIEUX: The ballot boxes were sent to England two years ago.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Oh, we have heard all about that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: May I ask my hon. friend a question? My hon. friend has touched upon something that has nothing to do with the free wheat question?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend touched upon it for two hours last week.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend says the Government is going to bring down a Bill for the extension of Parliament. I would ask if the Government intend to deal with that as with other Government measures and carry it through by virtue of the majority they have in this House?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend is an old and experienced parliamentarian, and I am surprised at him asking a question like that. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister is also an old and experienced parliamentarian, and I believe that when he brings down a Bill to this House he will bring it down in such fashion that no fault can be found with his action. My hon. friend from Assiniboia says: You are very blameable, you are really censurable because your action has pleased the West. He spoke with a sob in his voice. He said: Your action has pleased the West. I have to admit frankly to my hon. friend from Assiniboia that the fact that the West is pleased pleases the Government and pleases me. I am glad the West is pleased. We are all glad the West is pleased, and we are glad not as politicians but as Canadians. For the last five years of continuous campaign I have been represented as the sponsor for the big interests. The impression has been sedulously and persistently created through the West that the Government is hostile to the people of the West. I represent the interests in this House, all the interests in Canada, big and little, great and small, industrial, financial and agricultural. That is my conception of my duty. I have never favoured one interest at the expense of others, and if there is any interest in this country which I have favoured in this House, in the Cabinet, and in the councils of the Government, it has been the interest of agriculture. The people of the West and the people of the East are brothers; all the people of Canada are the children of Confederation. We have no

favourites. Any public man who is discharging his duty to the state regards the interest of every individual and every section of the country, and action is taken not in the interest of this section or of that section but in the national interest. That is the policy which we attempt to follow, and have attempted to follow, since our accession to power in 1911.

I desire to say, because this question has been raised, that this Government has done more for the West than all of the Governments that preceded it, and I am glad that we have. It is right that we should. Let me tell you some of the things that we have done. Our first action when we came into power was to enlarge the boundaries of Manitoba. We placed the finances of that province upon a sound basis, we increased her annual subsidy, because we wanted to place her on an equality with the other provinces of the west, by $600,000, and we paid over $2,000,000 of back subsidies. We enlarged the boundaries of Manitoba. It was a proper thing to do and we did it. What have we done for agriculture? My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) introduced a Bill into this House whereby $10,000,000 was set aside for agriculture in the East and agriculture in the West. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) introduced a Bill for the building of highways throughout Canada. That would have been a great boon to agriculture both East and West but the Senate threw out that Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No, no.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Well, they changed the Bill so that it was lost to the country. Then we established a system of interior elevators in the West. We were most interested in that subject. We said: Whatever money is necessary we should spend. Some doubt was raised as to whether these interior elevators would be used. It was thought that the grain would not be detained at these elevators but would find its way to those at the great terminal points. What has happened during the last two years? These elevators have been of the greatest possible value to the people of the West. When the war broke out we appropriated $13,000,000 for seed grain and supplies. It came back four, five and six fold to the people of this country. I am not taking any credit for these things. We do not take credit at all for what we do on this side. If we did less and talked more we would be stronger politically. If my right hon. friend had done one half for the people of the West what we have done since we have been in power he would have gone in annual procession through the West. I say in all sincerity that if we talked more and did less I believe we would be stronger politically in this country. But, we are content with doing.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: You had better sit down then.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have learned in the course of my life that it is not always wise to follow the advice tendered by an opponent. My right hon. friend perhaps remembers the old Latin saying: Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes—I fear the Greeks when they come bearing gifts. When my right hon. friend makes a suggestion it does not necessarily follow that I am wise to carry it out. I have referred to a few of the measures which this Government has introduced. Take the banking legislation. We have amended the Bank Act repeatedly in order that the farmer may be able to pledge his grain and may be able to hypothecate his cattle in order to get advances from the bank. We have continually kept before us the interests of the agricultural industry. Then, take the taxation measures introduced since this war broke out. They are very seldom talked about in this House, although they are criticised sometimes outside of this House by hon. gentlemen opposite. Let us see how our taxation has been raised for this war—$1,000,000 from the banks, taxation upon circulation; a few hundreds of thousands from trust companies, loan companies and insurance companies; taxation upon luxuries; business profits tax. There has been no discrimination against the farmers in our taxation measures to meet the expenditures of this war. I stated in my Budget last year that it would be my object to avoid direct taxation upon the income or effects or property of the farmer. Why did I say that—because I have repeatedly said in this House that agriculture is the very foundation of our national prosperity. When all goes well with agriculture, all goes well with every other class and industry in this country, and all goes well with finance. That is the reason why we have adopted the policy we have in raising revenue for the purpose of meeting the expenditure of the war. It is well for Canada that we should have diversified industries in both East and West. The National Policy is a policy that tends to

promote diversified industry throughout the length and breadth of Canada. It is not well that the East should be wholly industrial; it is not well that the West should be wholly agricultural. There will be boys raised upon farms in the West as well as the East, with a genius for mechanics, boys destined to be captains of industry. Should we not have a policy under which those boys can employ their genius at home, or must we lose them to the great republic to the south? There should be diverse industries in this country, and that is the reason why this Government is devoted to the fiscal policy which has been often enunciated in this House. The population of this country of ours is made up of various races and nationalities. It is a sparse population scattered over half a continent, a country as large as Europe. The policy of any Government should be to promote national unity in this country.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: To promote toleration and harmony—

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Sir THOMAS WHITE:—so that if we are at war, all parts of this country should be as one in the prosecution of the war. Now then, my hon. friend puts forward as a criticism of this Budget that it would please the people of the West. I say again, for myself and the Government, that if the people of the West are pleased with what has been done, they are not more pleased than we are that we have been able to do it for them.

The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) puts forward an amendment. He is not content with what has been done. He puts forward a useless, an unnecessary, a trivial amendment. Is it a genuine amendment? Or is it a political expedient destined to fail of its purpose? Well, we know what it is. My hon. friend from Assiniboia has no doubt as to the validity of what has been done. I have enunciated the policy of the Government to-day, and there has been read to this House the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice as to the effect of our action under the War Measures Act. Why does he put forward this needless amendment? He desires to embarrass the Government, he moves it on a resolution to go into Committee of Ways and Means. His amendment will not deceive the people of the West for one moment, not for one moment. It suggests on its face a want of confidence in the Government. It reflects on our intentions, it asperses our motives, it casts unfounded doubt upon our action under the War Measures Act. It should, without hesitation, be voted down by this House.

Mr. GEO. E. McCRANEY (Saskatoon): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) is entitled to the thanks of this House for introducing the amendment which is now under consideration, if only for the reason that it has brought from the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) a most important statement with regard to this great question, which he did not think it necessary to refer to in his original budget speech, and also for the very definite pledge which he gave to Parliament that there would be no new duties added except by an Act of this House. The Minister of Finance gave us many reasons why free wheat should not have been given before the present Order in Council was passed, and he entirely justified its passage at the present time. He says that he would not have done anything contrary to the national interest. No one would expect a finance minister, of this country, or any person in this House to declare that he would act contrary to the national interest. We agree with him that he is acting in accord with the national interest now. What we say to him is that the Government, in having delayed this relief for so long a time, was not acting in the national interest heretofore. If one reads over the Order in Council he finds that emphasis is laid upon the fact that this is to be a great relief with reference to the lower grades of wheat. That would always have been the case. That was one of the great reasons always urged in this House heretofore for free wheat. And it has been with respect to the lower grades rather than to the higher grades that the farmer heretofore has been losing in great amount. The explanation which the Finance Minister gives as to the change of attitude from then to now matters little, but the conclusion of his Order in Council is very important. He advises the Government that it is desirable in the national interest that free access be obtained for our wheat in the markets of the United States. I heard my hon friend the Solicitor General the other day. In reading over his speech, it seems to me that he took other ground than that of the Finance Minister. He not only proved that free wheat would have been an evil before the Order in Council was passed, but he also proved that it is an

evil now. He laid great stress on public opinion in the West. I think that I am doing him full justice when I say that the conclusion that one would reach after reading over his speech is that there were no economic reasons which would justify the Government in having placed wheat on the free list, and that the reason which appealed to him most and which he put forward with all the force of which he is capable, is that it was a measure to conciliate the West, and that it was in the national interest, to have the West satisfied. When one decides to adopt a policy of which the economic effect is not certain, but in order to satisfy a public sentiment, whether economically sound or not, the inference is very clear that the reason is political; and one is reminded of the statement which the Solicitor General made only a short fourteen months ago that he thought that 90 per cent of the agitation for free wheat was political and that ten per cent was economically unsound. Apparently he holds that the ten per cent is still unsound and he has adopted the ninety per cent to himself. Why? The change was made in response to public sentiment in the West. As we read the war news we find that leaders of armies which have to make great retreats explain their withdrawal as a problem of strategy. They devastate the ground between the old lines and the new, and they claim to have entrapped the enemy and to have shortened their own line. So it is with this Government. Their retreat from the old position to the new is only strategy. They have given up some of their trenches; they have shortened their lines, but they have not saved themselves from defeat. There are more trenches to be taken, and victory will come to the forces which have driven them back. The battle of lower tariffs and freer trade is still going on and will come to a victorious conclusion.

Mr. TURRIFF: I would like to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the Government has abdicated. There is not a minister in the House.

Mr. McCRANEY: The hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) correctly interpreted the spirit in which this measure has been put before the country. He accepted it as a temporary measure and held out the hope that the substitute for it in a short time would be a preference in the British market. We have had the announcement from London that there are to be Imperial preferences, and we have also the statement of Mr. Bonar Law that foodstuffs are not to come within that preference. Agriculture, the growing of foodstuffs, is our basic industry, and the effect of Mr. Bonar Law's statement is that that great industry will have no preference. We do not feel badly about it; our farmers have never asked for a preference and I do not think they want it. They want free trade in that market as they want it in this. One wonders what class of product this country will manufacture that will have a tempting preference in the mother country. One wonders whether our people will be satisfied to abandon the newly-added market for our great products in the United States in order to obtain a market for our manufactured products in the Old country. When this Government wants to do something to mystify the public and to convince a portion of the community that they would not go as far as they actually do, they issue a proclamation under the War Measures Act. When they attempt to raise 50,000 men for home defence, and find that their Nationalist supporters do not want them to have conscription, they use the War Measures Act instead of the Militia Act. Their attitude with regard to free wheat is in much the same class. They are afraid of some of their eastern supporters, and they have not taken the strong stand that they might have taken by legislation; they prefer to give reasons which are only temporary in their character for the introduction of such important legislation. It matters very little to me whether the effect of this Order in Council ceases automatically at the end of the war. I accept the statement of the Minister of Finance that he at least will not repeal the provision of free wheat by Order in Council. I think it is most unfortunate, however, that the public are led to believe that there is hesitation on the part of the Government, and that the course they have adopted in the matter of free wheat, which should be in the line of a permanent principle, is of such a temporary character. One must recall the reasons which were given in the public press for opposing free wheat in order to see how completely those reasons are negatived by the Order in Council. Some of the objections were as follows:

It ships our raw products into another country, there to be manufactured, thus making our Canadian farmers hewers of wood and drawers of water to the Americans.

It permits Washington to fix our tariff for us.

It will lead to the destruction of the reputation now held by our grain by enabling the Americans to mix it with their baser grades.

It will give the United States millers a supply of hard wheat, thus enabling them to chase Canadian flour out of the markets of the world.

It will deflect our grain to United States channels, to the ruin of our transcontinental systems.

It will destroy the Canadian mills.

It will encourage the Canadian farmer to continue wheat mining instead of going into mixed farming.

It will ruin the Canadian farmer by subjecting him to the competition not only of the United States farmer, but of the wheat raisers in the thirteen countries with which Canada has most favoured nation treaties.

It will prevent Canadian farmers from getting preferential treatment under the Chamberlain scheme.

And, Sir, all these reasons, so relied on two years ago by the Government, fall with the passage of the Order in Council conceding free wheat.

In the Budget speech, the Finance Minister placed before us a condition of things for which the public of Canada is to be very highly congratulated. We have an income of $232,000,000. The minister points out that our war debt arising out of the war alone has been increased to the extent of $600,000,000, and that the total is in the neighbourhood of $1,000,000,000. In addition to that, we have been able this year to appropriate $60,000,000 to war expenditure which would otherwise have been added to our national debt. A year ago the minister was able to announce an appropriation of $45,000,000 in the same way, making a total of $105,000,000 by which we have been able to reduce the war expenditure and save the public debt. That is to say, we have added to the debt $600,000,000; we have expended another $100,000,000, a total of $700,000,000, and of that amount of $700,000,000 we have paid on account only $100,000,000, in round figures.

The means which have been adopted by this Government to meet this most extraordinary expenditure are the increasing of the general tariff by 7½ per cent, the lowering of the preference on British goods by 5 per cent, the imposition of the stamp duties and the business tax; and this year the minister announces in his Budget Speech a further addition to the Business Profits War Tax. The minister has pointed out that there is no tax on luxuries, for one reason, namely because the great bulk of imports from France under our treaty with that country are in that class, and that it is necessary, in order to keep up the credit of France on this side of the water that nothing should be done to reduce those imports. One is reminded that while the Minister of Finance of this Government is so solicitous for the credit of France on this side of the water, in respect of luxuries which do us little or no good, the same Government has restricted from the mother country, which is more than our ally, importations of necessaries and not luxuries by the addition of a duty of 5 per cent, and has embarrassed the mother country in that way in the matter of exchange on this side of the water. The additions to taxation are largely out of war profits. If we are carrying on the war with our best energy, we hope that these profits will soon come to an end; and when the war is over, we must turn to altogether new sources of income in order to reduce this tremendous debt. There is to be no income tax, so the minister says, and one of the strong reasons given is that so many people have bought war bonds and that those bonds are not taxable. Those war bonds have been purchased by some 35,000 or 40,000 citizens of Canada, a comparatively small number, and the tendency will be that the bonds of the small holders will get into the hands of the big holder, and thus the poorer part of our population will be paying interest to the more wealthy part; yet instead of taking more from the public, the minister promises that he will borrow more.

Our men in France and Flanders are making tremendous sacrifices. One cannot read in the papers of to-day of their heroism and of the mutilation that is going on there, without thinking that we have never really appreciated what our men at the front are doing. We speak about our volunteer system as though, when men were willing to go to fight,

5 p.m.

they liked to go. I cannot imagine that any man of choice would go into the experiences and scenes that are occurring at the front at this moment. It is only because of the very highest sense of patriotism, of devotion to this Empire and to this country, and of faithfulness to principles that any man would expose himself to the danger of mutilation and death. Perhaps, if when the war began, we had a different conception of what it meant, we might have taken

stronger measures for getting men to go, and those of us who remain in this country, would, I am sure, have been willing to do much more than at this time we can ever hope to do in making provision for the future of those brave men and of their families. We have enlisted 400,000 men, but we are allowing their ranks to be depleted. This Government is not acting courageously in this matter and is not doing fairly by the men who are in France, although I am sure that the people of Canada will be behind this Government or any government that takes radical measures to maintain the strength of our fighting forces.

While we have incurred a war expenditure of $700,000,000 and have paid only $100,000,000 on account of it, we are saying to the men at the front that not only are they doing our fighting for us, but they will be expected to, help ur to do the paying for the munitions which they use. We are reserving for them and their children, along with ourselves, the payment of this debt. We are not even providing them free with the guns and munitions which they use, and I believe that if this Government will adopt a stronger policy; if they will take more from the public and borrow less, they will merit the appreciation of all well thinking citizens.

The minister points out that the future should help to bear this burden. I entirely agree with him. The fight that is being made is being made for humanity's sake, and it is our hope that the results of this war will free the world—we hope, forever—from a campaign of Prussian conquest and world domination, but we must bear in mind that each generation has its own troubles, and that we are not doing much for posterity if those of us who are not fighting are simply handing down a burden. I believe that to a greater extent this generation should relieve the soldiers who are at the front and their families and the generations to come of the burden of this war.

The minister gave us as one reason why we should not now put on more taxes, that we look for immigration after the war, and that our burden of taxation must not be so great as to alarm possible immigrants. I am not afraid of the great public debt which we are piling up. The people of Canada have not felt the effects of this war, apart from those who have their sons at the front or who have lost them on the field, and, from a financial point of view, apart from those who have lost the breadwinner in the family; or that large class, salaried class, of our community, or those who are living on a limited income. These people are feeling the burdens of this war, but in eastern Canada our people are growing more wealthy. The very war itself has brought great contracts for munitions. The capitalist has become wealthy, and the skilled mechanic has been receiving wages that before the war no one would have thought possible. In western Canada, because of war conditions, our great staple, wheat, has reached a high price and our people are better off than they were before.

I am not alarmed, Sir, about the national debt. I am not alarmed at the burdens which incoming immigrants may have to share with us. We can by reducing the cost of living and by personal thrift, with which our people have up to the present time had little concern, place ourselves in an economic condition to meet all these great burdens. In that connection I want to refer to one great movement that has not directly arisen out of the war, but which has been accelerated by it, and that is the abolition of the liquor traffic in so many of our provinces. Apart from the moral results which it may bring about, I believe that it will mean a great saving among our people, and will be of an economic advantage that we cannot at this present time estimate.

After the war, we have been told there are to be preferential tariffs, and special tariffs against those who are now our enemies. We all appreciate the fact that the United States in coming into the war, has re-united herself, after 140 years, with the family of the great Anglo-Saxon mother, and that for humanity's sake, she is now standing on the side of liberty and of freedom; she is also taking up burdens at this time for which she will have to pay, and which are of great benefit to us. But the advantage to us is not only on the material side. There is the great advantage to the United States in having arrived at a moral status which gives the nation self-pride, instead of being as it was—a reproach to some of the best minds in that country. I cannot but rejoice in the fact that the United States has become one of our allies, and we Canadians must treat that country as our economic friend rather than as our economic enemy, as we have been disposed to do in the past. I cannot imagine any-

thing which would gratify our own people more, and be of greater economic advantage to us than that the United States should have a place at the Peace conference, and take part in the mutual arrangements of which such a question as we are discussing to-day is only the forerunner.

There is also a great deal of talk as to what we are going to do with Germany when the war is over, and it is said that we are going to put on such tariffs as will discourage any trade with her; that we will not only see her bankrupt economically, but prevent her increasing her strength, and see to it that for an indefinite time to come she remain in a position of economic helplessness. I allude to that because I feel that those who talk that way are not out to win the war. This "war after the war" means that the present war is not to be won. I want to see this war so thoroughly won that we will be sorry for the Germans, and that our people, as the British have always done, will be willing to lend a hand to the defeated one, and, while fully protecting ourselves, I trust that we will encourage and inspire a spirit of friendship which will be the best guarantee of peaceful relations for the future.

Mr. BURNHAM: Would my hon. friend explain that phrase "fully protecting ourselves"?

Mr. McCRANEY: I do not suppose that my hon. friend understands any other kind of protection than the protection of tariffs. My idea would be a protection of good will, which is the surest foundation of peace.

Mr. JOHN WEBSTER (Brockville): Mr. Speaker, as I do not often impose on the time of honourable members of this House, I feel that I may be permitted to offer to the Minister of Finance my most hearty congratulations on the very successful war-time Budget that he has been able to bring down at this time, being the third year of Canada's participation in this great war. I also wish to express to the hon. gentleman my hearty congratulations on the success that attended his latest war loan, which, like the two former issues, was very largely over-subscribed. I am sure it must be very pleasant for the Minister of Finance to see the confidence that not only the people generally in this country have in him, but also the directors of our financial institutions and the citizens of the great republic to the south of us, who have invested so largely in these loans and helped to make them such a decided success. I am sure that I voice the sentiments of the greater majority of the people of this country when I say that we hope and trust that the Minister of Finance may be spared his usual good health for a long time to come, to guide and direct the financial affairs of this country.

I am going to make a few remarks from the standpoint of the dairy farmer and to endeavour to reply to some of the questions advanced in this debate. I have no brief for the farmers of this country, but as four of the products of the farm of this particular section have been referred to in the discussion, I think it is my duty to endeavour to place the matter in a proper light before those who dwell in our towns and cities. The four articles to which I refer are used in every household—milk, butter, cheese, and bacon. Upon these items the farmers of this section depend for their income at this season. I was amused at the remarks of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville). It seems to me that the dwellers in the cities do not fully understand the position of the farmer. They seem to believe that the farmer is producing these articles to which I have referred at about the same cost as in years gone by. But that is a very wrong conclusion to arrive at. The remarks made by the hon. gentlemen to whom I have referred on the subject of the high cost of living are likely to give what seems to me a very wrong impression. I think the only solution of this very vexing problem is to turn some of the consumers of this and other countries into producers. I gathered from the remarks of these hon. members that they thought that the farmers of this part of Canada were receiving altogether too much hard cash for the products of their dairies. I do not agree with that view. The farmers of this country, as was stated by the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) this afternoon, are the hardest working class we have, and I rejoice that they are coming into their just rights. If the farmers are prosperous to-day I congratulate them, and I also congratulate the Government that has made it possible for them to be prosperous. Any country that has agriculture as its basic industry is bound to be prosperous. That is why Canada enjoys so much prosperity at this time.

Some of the utterances in this debate would go to show that the dwellers in our cities have not yet grasped the true position of the farmers. What is the great need of the farmers of this section to-day? Is it

not labour? Why do the labouring men in the cities refuse to go to work on the farms? They say that the hours of work are altogether too long and that there are no places of amusement for them at the end of their day's labour. But if the farmers of this country were to cease their operations at the end of eight or nine hours' work, as the dwellers in cities and towns do, the production of this country would be much less than it is at the present time. I personally know farmers who are working fifteen long hours a day owing to the scarcity of labour. We have just passed through one of the heaviest winters that this part of Canada has experienced for many a year. Yet what has been the condition of the people in our towns and cities? Is it not a fact that the labouring classes were never so well off as they are to-day? They have money to buy the products of the farm, even at the advanced prices. The charity committees of our municipal councils in this part of Canada never had as little demand upon their aid in any winter as in that which has just passed. This was due to the fact that the labouring classes have their own money to spend, and they live better, I believe, than ever before. But the farmer has to pay double the price for his help that he paid five years ago. Upon what could we depend to stimulate production from the soil if the Government were to interfere with the farmers' prices? Every man loves to dispose of his products at the best possible price.

Now let us consider the cost of producing milk. We have heard a great deal about the high price the farmer is obtaining for this product. But the cost of producing this article is more than double what it was five years ago. It would be unreasonable to suppose that the farmer is not to receive the full benefit of his labour. What are the reasons for the high cost of production to-day? One very important reason is the failure of the corn crop in the Western States as well as here in Canada. Cornmeal to-day is worth $55 a ton; bran, $45 to $48 a ton; oats, 85 cents a bushel, and so on. Compare these prices with prices paid by the farmers five years ago, and you will see that they are now more than double.

Let me say a word now as to cheese. I do not purpose to elaborate on the quality of the cheese made in Canada. I put it briefly but fairly when I say that to-day Canadian cheese stands on the highest rung of the ladder as the finest article of that product in the world. The price of cheese was particularly referred to in this debate the other evening. Coming as I do from the banner dairying county of Ontario, and having been engaged in this particular line of trade for the past forty years, I think I am in a position to speak confidently regarding this particular product. In the town I have the honour to represent we have a weekly meeting of the Dairymen's Board of Trade, where it is no unusual thing, in the flow of the season, to see anywhere from 8,000 to 10,000 boxes registered for sale at the highest price obtainable by auction. At present prices, this represents a value of $160,000 to $200,000 of a cash income for that particular district each week. Now, it is all very well to consider the prices of to-day; they are very, very high, I am free to admit. But, if you compare them with the prices the farmer had to sell this article for in the year 1904 and take the average, you will see that the farmer is only getting what is right. In 1904, the farmers sold their cheese at 6¾ cents a pound at the first meeting of the board in May. The average price for the season of 1904 was 8½ to 9 cents a pound. Owing to the war conditions last year it averaged nearer to 19 cents a pound. While the farmer is obtaining high prices for his product, he is paying nearly double to the manufacturer or proprietor for manufacturing his milk into cheese, and he is paying also extra high prices for feed and labour. I will not detain the House by enumerating all the articles that enter into production, but I will refer to just one. Previous to this war I have sold thousands of gallons of extract of rennet for $1.50 per gallon, but to-day that rennet is worth $10 per gallon, and it cannot always be obtained even at that advanced price. That is one of the reasons why prices are so high to-day. Then take the butter question. What do we find to-day throughout the sections where the butter factories are located? They have to return to the farmer as much money for the milk they receive to make into butter as their competitors who are making cheese, or possibly they may be next door neighbour to the man who is sending the whole of his milk to the city for domestic use. Therefore, the butter manufacturer must get as good a price for his product because of the fact that labour and supplies are just as high as in the case of cheese. There is another factor that the farmer must consider

to-day. The man who is producing milk for the city and who raises no calves to replenish his herd, must go out into the country and buy his milking cows. Five years ago he could go into any farmer's barnyard and pick out the best cow in the herd for $50, while to-day he has to pay from $100 to $125 for an ordinary good grade cow. That has increased his capital expenditure.

The price of bacon was referred to the other evening. Now, let us consider for a few minutes the situation as to the cost of this article. Bacon hogs are bringing fancy prices to-day. If you will refer to the Montreal market you will see that select bacon hogs are bringing $17 per hundredweight, but the farmer has to pay an additional price to the man who is so fortunate as to have the little pigs for sale. Five years ago, you could buy those little pigs in this country for $1.50 to $2 each. To-day they cost the farmer $12 to $15 a pair at four to six weeks of age. Skim milk at that time was worth practically two cents a quart, but to-day it is worth five cents a quart. Therefore, I claim that the farmer is not receiving any extraordinary advance in this line. If you will compare the prices which the farmer received for this product in 1904 with those of to-day you will see a vast difference. I know a member of this House who, in 1904, sold 40 select bacon hogs for 3½ cents per pound. Is it not right that the farmer should enjoy the prices that he is getting to-day to enable him to even up the losses made at that time? The bacon hog is a by-product of the dairy, and cannot be retained or produced to advantage in its younger days without skim milk or sweet whey, which to-day for feed purposes is worth double the amount of what its cash value was five years ago. In addition to the higher cost of the by-product of the dairy, the farmer is compelled to-day to pay $48 per ton for shorts, which he formerly purchased at a cost of from $18 to $20 per ton. If we consider those high prices the farmer has to pay for cows, help and feed, we will be free to admit that he must get higher prices for his product.

If it were not for the destruction of shipping by the German submarines, the food supply of the world would not be in such a precarious position as it is to-day. If Great Britain and her Allies had the wheat, flour, cheese, bacon, and meats that have been sunk in the ocean, there would be no immediate shortage of food supplies. Take the situation of New Zealand to-day with 400,000 boxes of cheese ready for shipment, and also a large amount of butter, to say nothing of three and a half millions of carcasses of dressed mutton and no vessels in sight to solve the transportation problem. I think, Mr. Speaker, that our friends on the Opposition benches will be free to admit that there is a real German submarine menace in existence at the present time.

I do not intend to discuss the question of free wheat, as it has been thoroughly aired from all points of view but there is one thing that I have remarked in the Liberal press of this country, and that is their earnest endeavour to belittle everything possible done by the present Administration. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugley), the other evening, did not appear to like the idea of clippings from the press being read in the House, but I hold one in my hand taken from the paper of the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), the Brockville Recorder of April 25, 1917, which I am inclined to believe is another one of their endeavours to prove the incompetence of the Borden Administration. I will read it for the benefit of the House:

> Another evidence of the incompetence or worse of the Borden Government is found in the fact that when Sir Thomas White had passed the free wheat enactment, the authorities at Washington were not notified of the order and in consequence the Canadian product was held up by the United States Customs Officials and the Canadian producers were mulcted for large sums in the way of car demurrage. It was a not unusual oversight for Borden's men and a costly one to the Canadian wheat exporters.

Let me say that I have learned from undoubted authority that the American Consul here was promptly furnished with a certified copy of the action of the Government as stated by the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) in his address the other evening, and he duly forwarded the information to Washington at once. Now, I wonder if the hon. member for South Renfrew will be sufficiently fair to correct this false statement in his newspaper.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is the first time I have seen that item. I presume it is the item which appeared in very many of the papers. I read it in dozens of papers and I took occasion the other evening to ask the minister as to that and he corrected it at the time.

Mr. WEBSTER: It appeared on April 25, 1915. While I am on my feet I am going to take this opportunity to congratulate the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir

Robert Borden) and his colleagues on the success that they have achieved in their efforts to aid the Mother Country since the outbreak of this great world war. Let me say, Sir, that through those efforts they have succeeded in sending to the front a great army of young men, the flower of the manhood of this country, whose valorous deeds on the battle field have resulted in writing the word "Canada" high up on the scroll of honour among the nations of the world. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the brightest pages in the history of this war will be those that chronicle the achievements of our Canadian troops and let me say, Sir, that the record will be read with the greatest possible pleasure by Canadian posterity. It was nobly said by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) the other evening that Canadians knew how to live and that they had proven to the world that for the cause of freedom they knew how to die. In passing, Sir, I think it is only right that I should also pay my tribute of respect to the women of Canada for the efforts they have put forth. Let me say that the wives, the mothers, the daughters and the sisters and sweethearts of Canada are those on whose shoulders have rested the greatest possible responsibilities and anxieties, and only by the supreme patriotism which they have displayed have they made it possible for this Government to achieve what they have accomplished. They have given freely of their best, both sons and daughters, and I read with great pleasure the other day that there is no better class of nurses doing service in the great armies of the Allies than those who have gone from our own Canadian shores. Our doctors also have done a noble and humane work, but, Mr. Speaker, I think at the present time, we are too close to this great war to fully realize or appreciate what our own Canadian boys have succeeded in doing.

Let me say that the immortal deeds of the men of the maple leaf, the men who are proud to call Canada their home, will be recorded by the historians of the future; and generations of Canadians yet unborn will read with noble pride these pages in the book of history. When this great conflict has come to an end, when this cruel war is over, and when the dove of peace has again unfolded and spread her wings over the warring nations of Europe, then Canada will stand out pre-eminently among the nations of the world as the one nation that went into this fight, not from compulsion, but from a higher, loftier and nobler motive, a sense of duty and a patriotism that would not be denied, to secure for all time to come justice and liberty for the smaller nations of the world.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that we, the people of Canada, like all the citizens of the great British Empire to which we are so proud to belong, are fully resolved to face to a finish whatever the future may bring, until, in the providence of God and through the valour of our noble men, victory shall rest on our flag, and righteousness shall have been vindicated.

Mr. GEORGE W. KYTE (Richmond, N.S.): Mr. Speaker, the intervention of the Minister of Finance in the Budget debate this afternoon for the second time would seem to indicate that something has happened to disturb the serenity which he usually displays in his addresses to this House. The papers of yesterday contain the statement that on Saturday last the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) delivered an address to his electors in the county of Victoria. In the course of that very interesting address he said:

> In New York I was informed by a leading American financial magnate that I should not sail; that an attempt was about to be made to destroy me, and I was urged to cancel my trip. Thinking reference was had to torpedoes, I laughingly passed it off. The gentleman assured me, however, it was not torpedoes at sea, but "envenomed poison on the part of some of your own colleagues in the Cabinet who seek to get rid of the Prime Minister, but who realize that you are behind him solid, and in order to get rid of him they must first get rid of you."

The sequel to the statement of the ex-Minister of Militia is to be found in the presentation of the Finance Minister this afternoon. We remember that on Friday last the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) addressed this House upon the question of free wheat. There is apparently a feeling in this country supported by electors who are in sympathy with the Finance Minister that, should the conspiracy of which the ex-Minister of Militia speaks succeed, the Minister of Finance will be selected to lead the Conservative party. On the other hand, there are electors in the West supporting the Conservative party who believe that the honours and the mantle of the present Prime Minister should fall upon the youthful shoulders of the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen). I beg to assure the Finance Minister that the speech made by the Solicitor General on Friday evening last did not at all require his intervention in this

debate. While the Solicitor General did the very best he could, I assure the Finance Minister that he did not enhance his reputation as a special pleader by the address which he delivered to the House as to the reasons why the Government granted free wheat under the Order in Council of the sixteenth of April. I may with equal confidence assure the Solicitor General that the speech made by the Finance Minister this afternoon did not put him in a light superior to the Solicitor General in special pleading as to a subject on which neither of them appear to have much enthusiasm.

The Minister of Finance endeavoured to get some consolation out of the volte-face which he and his colleagues turned upon the subject of free wheat, from the traditional record of the Conservative party with respect to reciprocity. He pointed out that the principle of reciprocity was accepted by the Conservative party away back in 1878 and that he was not acting inconsistently with that policy in adopting the platform of free wheat as he did on a recent occasion. I might say that the resolution moved in the House of Commons by the Conservative party in 1879 in which the subject of reciprocity was mentioned, was formulated from a platform that was intended only for the purpose of getting into power, and the moment the Conservative party got into power they spurned the policy of reciprocity. Only when they were driven by the force of public opinion to accept its tenets was it adopted as part of their policy. We remember that in 1891 the Conservative party, having regard to the growing sentiment in favour of reciprocity throughout Canada, and being then face to face with a Dominion election, thought it would be to their interest to catch the vote of the farmers of the Dominion of Canada by professing to be in favour of reciprocity. But the gentlemen who formulated that policy did not receive the sanction of the Government of the United States, notwithstanding that Sir Charles Tupper, the spokesman of the Conservative party on that occasion avowed in the midst of the campaign that it was unnecessary for the people of Canada to support the Liberal party in order to get reciprocity, that they themselves were negotiating an extended measure not confined to natural products alone, but embracing manufactured goods as well. We know that the Secretary of State in the United States Government of that day took an early opportunity to repudiate the statement made by Sir Charles Tupper, and since then the Conservative party did not again venture to take up the subject under the name of reciprocity, notwithstanding that, in 1879, the policy of the party was adopted to bring about a reciprocity of tariffs and thereafter a reciprocity of trade. The speech of the Finance Minister this afternoon also accentuated the fact that he and the Solicitor General are not in accord as to the results which will flow from the placing of wheat on the free list. The Solicitor General, in his speech on Friday afternoon, said:—

> Where are the hon. gentlemen who in this House year after year assured us that as soon as we let down these iniquitous barriers the Winnipeg price would advance to the Minneapolis level to the benefit of the Canadian producer? If we follow the market after the 17th of April, we find that both markets advanced together with the same smaller spread between them that obtained the day before and the day after the Order in Council was passed.

The whole argument of the Solicitor General to this House on Friday last was that placing wheat upon the free list was of no advantage whatever to the western farmer, and he endeavoured to prove this by quoting figures.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I understood the Solicitor General to be referring to the higher grades, and I was speaking this afternoon with regard to the lower grades when I mentioned the payment of duty by the farmer.

Mr. KYTE: The Solicitor General was referring to the price of wheat at Minneapolis. As I said, his whole argument was built up for the purpose of trying to convince the House that the placing of wheat on the free list would be of no advantage to the western farmer. He stated, further, that the only time when the placing of wheat on the free list might be of advantage would be when there was an export trade in wheat from the United States to Great Britain, but as there was no export trade at the present time, the result that the Liberals anticipated in the way of advantage to the farmers under an arrangement for free wheat could not possibly accrue to them now. If the placing of wheat upon the free list did not result in increasing the price of wheat to the Canadian farmer, it had the effect of immediately increasing the price of flour to the Canadian consumer. Immediately after it became known that wheat had been placed on the free list, flour took a jump of 30 cents, 50 cents and, in a few days, 75 cents a barrel. We can only argue from the observations made by the Solicitor General that at a time when the price

of wheat was low, when the farmers might reasonably accept a higher price to compensate them for their labours in respect of wheat-growing and when the price of flour was so moderate that the consumer could afford to pay a little more for his flour without feeling the burden of it, the present Government refused to put wheat upon the free list. But when abnormal conditions were brought about; when the placing of wheat upon the free list could not result in increasing the price to the farmer and would inevitably result in increasing the price of flour to the consumer, that was the time that the Government selected to place wheat upon the free list. The Finance Minister stated in the course of his speech that no industry in Canada has had greater profits since the outbreak of war than the milling industry; yet when the policy of free wheat was accepted by the Conservative party, the price of wheat for the farmer did not increase, but the price of flour to the consumer did increase enormously. So that the consumer of Canada, after waiting for five years for the deliberate action of this Government to place wheat on the free list, is paying more for his flour than he ever did, and the farmer gets nothing in respect of the increased price of wheat.

Mr. LALOR: Does the hon. gentleman assume that that is the result of free flour?

Mr. KYTE: It is not necessarily a result of free flour; it is the result of free wheat under the present conditions. It gave the speculator an opportunity again to boost the price of flour upon the pretext that because wheat was placed on the free list it was necessary to increase the price of flour. The Solicitor General has met that by saying that the putting of wheat on the free list has not increased the price to the farmer so that there is no justification for increasing the price of flour to the consumer.

The Minister of Finance endeavoured to convince this House that the placing of wheat upon the free list by Order in Council at this time could have had no relation to political conditions in Canada. The last time a change in the tariff was made by this Government under Order in Council was in the year 1912, upon the eve of an election, in the province of Saskatchewan. It was the intention of the Government without previous intimation to reduce the price of cement, and an Order in Council was passed by this Government cutting the cement duty in two. That action synchronized with the holding of a provincial election in the province of Saskatchewan. If, therefore, at a time like this we on this side of the House find the Government by Order in Council again making appeals to the farmers of Western Canada in respect to the wheat, the hon. Finance Minister should not be angry with us if we associate his conduct in this respect with the election to be held in the province of Saskatchewan in the course of a few weeks.

The Finance Minister has taken great credit to himself for the many good things which he has brought about on behalf of the farmer. I do not think it is the desire of any person on this side of the House to rob the Finance Minister of any credit or glory to which he is justly and properly entitled in respect of the effect of the policies of his department upon any of the interests of this country. He said among other things that in the interests of the farmers he had put through an amendment to the Banking Act which enabled the farmer to hypothecate his stock for the purpose of securing loans. That was a condition which reflected not so much upon the fairness of the Finance Minister as upon the failure of the present Government to perpetuate the condition of affairs that existed when they came into office. It is true that the predecessor of my hon. friend, during the fifteen years that he was Minister of Finance, did not amend the Banking Act for the purpose of enabling the farmers to hypothecate their stock, because money being plentiful and farming operations profitable, it was not necessary in those days for the farmers to hypothecate their stock in order to raise money. But with the coming of the Conservative party into power a changed condition of affairs was brought about and it was necessary for the Finance Minister to give authority to the farmers to hypothecate their stock in order to obtain the money necessary for their daily needs.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. KYTE (resuming): Mr. Speaker, before the House rose at six o'clock I pointed out that the only result of placing wheat upon the free list on the 16th of April last was to increase the price of flour to the consumer, a price that had already reached such a height as to make it in many instances impossible for the working people throughout Canada to obtain for themselves and

their families the quantity of flour necessary for their support and sustenance. On the Montreal market, on the 17th day of April the price of flour had advanced 30 cents a barrel which meant a total advance of $1.40 in a week. Manitoba brands jumped 40 cents a barrel and Ontario brands jumped 60 cents a barrel by the 18th day of April. The cause of this rise in the price of flour is not the scarcity of wheat in Canada, because the market reports of that date informed the public that there was in Canada a surplus of 81,500,000 bushels of wheat. The export trade had ceased owing to the German submarines, and notwithstanding the fact that we had this large surplus of wheat in Canada, and notwithstanding the fact that the amount of the duty on wheat had been taken off by the Order in Council of the 16th of April, the price of flour continues to rise. The Financial Post, on the 17th of April had this to say:

> Flour advanced twice during the week, a total increase of seventy cents a barrel, a record for flour, which brought the price up to $10.70. The highest figure for flour prior to this was $10.50 in November last. The export flour business fom Canada is practically at a standstill. The Ogilvie Flour Milling Company informs the Financial Post that space is not available for ordinary commercial business overseas. The high cost of living is a regrettable economic fact, over which the packers and canners and other distributors of foodstuffs have no control. The enormous and eager demand for our products has brought about the situation. The remedy, as far as the Canadian consumer is concerned, is to reduce his demands.

During all this time, no effort was made on the part of the Department of Labour, that had particular charge of the question of prices under the proceedings which it had originated some months ago, to regulate the price of flour and other foodstuffs in Canada. The Minister of Finance stated this afternoon that the milling industry in Canada had made larger profits since the war began than any other industry. His statement is borne out by an announcement in regard to the Ogilvie Milling Company which was published in the month of October last, and which reads:

> A bonus of 4 per cent. for the year ended August 31st last was declared by the directors of the Ogilvie Flour Mills Co., Limited, on its $2,500,000 common stock, at a meeting held here yesterday afternoon. The bonus will be paid on October 1st along with the regular quarterly dividend of 2 per cent., making a total distribution out of the year's profits of 12 per cent.
>
> The bonus declared yesterday is the first extra distribution to be made by the Ogilvie Company since the stock was listed on the Montreal Exchange in 1908, although bonus payments have been popular with other milling concerns when an exceptionally good run of business has been struck. When the stock was listed the common shares were returning 7 per cent.; the rate was advanced to 8 per cent. in 1910 and has been held steady at that level through good times and bad.
>
> A year ago, when exceptional profits from wheat brought the earnings up to the phenomenally high level of 95 per cent. on the common,—

That is apparently an error.

> —the directors held to their conservative course, and shareholders received the usual 8 per cent and nothing more. Investment values added to by this conservation of resources have naturally been potent in increasing the earning power of the stock. The status of the company, with a large supply of liquid capital at its disposal, has changed from that of a borrower to a lender.
>
> At yesterday's meeting the directors took the view that the results of another year's business having been extremely satisfactory, there was no reason why an extra distribution of profits should be withheld any longer.

So you will see, Sir, that the enormous prices that have been charged for foodstuffs are not due to the economic conditions brought about by the war, but rather to the advantage that has been taken of the war by the milling industry of this country to boost the prices at a time when the boosting of such prices might possibly be attributed to war conditions. I say again that the Department of Labour should have taken this condition of affairs into account and taken steps similar to those taken by other countries to prevent the undue enhancing of the prices of foodstuffs.

The Budget proposals brought down by the Minister of Finance do not indicate either courage or originality. It is the fourth Budget that has been presented to the House by the hon. gentleman since the war began. In the first session after the commencement of the conflict, the tariff was increased on certain lines, largely having reference to articles of household consumption, and again in the session 1915, another increase in the tariff was proposed by the Government and carried through this House. Last year, war taxes were levied upon the profits of certain manufacturers under conditions which have yielded to this Government the sum of $12,500,000. The Minister of Finance this afternoon took great credit to himself for adopting a system of taxation upon war profits; but the total amount of revenue obtained by

the Government from this source, according to the statement of the Minister of Finance, is $12,500,000, whereas the increased revenue obtained by the Government by reason of the increased tariffs which were placed upon foodstuffs amounts to something in the neighbourhood of $60,000,000. So, while the manufacturing interests, those who are engaged in the manufacture of war materials, and whose business has improved by reason of war conditions and the increased price of monufacturers generally, have contributed to the revenue only $12,500,000, the consumers of Canada have contributed vastly more than that; and as a consequence we have the conditions that now exist in Canada in respect to the increased cost of living. It would appear that the monied interests in this country are still paramount. We know that in 1911 the issue in Canada between the two parties was whether there should be a Government in power whose policy was to reduce the tariff and thereby reduce the cost of living, or whether there should be a Government in power backed up by the interests that found it to their advantage to oppose the reciprocity pact and thereby maintain a continuation of high tariffs in Canada. The gentle manner in which the Minister of Finance has touched the manufacturing interests by war taxation goes to show that those interests are still in control of this Government, and that the welfare of the consuming population of Canada is a secondary consideration. During the last three or four years there has been an enormous increase in the acquisition of wealth by the manufacturing interests of Canada. No such corresponding advantage has accrued to our consuming masses or to the working men who have to depend on their day's pay for the support of their families. I have here a statement taken from a financial newspaper of the earnings of certain corporations in Canada during the last year which shows that the Dominion Bridge Company declared a dividend for the year of 16 per cent; Price Brothers, Limited, declared a dividend of 16.1 per cent, and in regard to the Dominion Textile Company, the Financial Post states that it hears that a bonus is on the cards for the shareholders of that company which is known to have had a successful year, the sales having reached the sum of $13,000,000. It says that the preferred stock will pay a dividend of 7 per cent and the common a dividend of 6 per cent. The profits of the Canadian Locomotive Company for the current year amount to $700,000, being 35 per cent on common stock of $2,000,000, after paying $15,000 for preferred dividends.

Stanfield's Limited, after paying bond interest, sinking funds and contingencies, showed a profit of $109,688.83, equalling 14½ per cent upon the preferred and capital stock of $750,000.

The net earnings of the St. Maurice Paper Company were $363,909 in 1915, and $2,832,-277 in 1916. The balance, after interest and depreciation were deducted, amounted to $1,582,792, equalling 15·8 per cent on the $10,000,000 stock outstanding.

The Union Bank Paper Company, which owns 75 per cent of the stock of the St. Maurice Company, had interest charges of but $187,000 per annum, and the depreciation charge of about $1,061,000 last year was exceedingly liberal. The Financial Post says that it is safe to assume that at least another 5 per cent or 6 per cent of actual stock profits is concealed in the 1916 depreciation charges.

The figures for Ames, Holden & McCready for the ten months of the fiscal year which will close on April 30, shows a very large increase in turnover over the previous year, and the profits will also show a very satisfactory gain.

Steel and Radiation Company: In 1914 their business amounted to $774,231.36, and profits $13,797.02; in 1915, business $342,-344:81, and profits, $123,086.20, and in 1916, business $457,389.87, and profits, $303,601.-33. This discloses the extraordinary circumstance that notwithstanding their business in 1914 was almost double their business in 1916, in the former year their profits were only $13,797.02 as compared with $303,-601.33 in 1916. Last year the Dominion Textile Company earned profits of $1,481,-195, equalling 12·5 per cent on the common stock. The Consolidated Rubber Company had net sales in 1915 amounting to $7,522,-147; in 1916, $12,094,695. Their profits in 1915 amounted to $534,978, and in 1916 to $905,205, or 22 per cent upon the common stock of $4,125,000. The Ogilvie Milling Company declared a dividend of 8 per cent on $2,500,000 common stock, and a second bonus of 4 per cent, making a total profit divided among the shareholders of 16 per cent. It is stated that the actual earnings of the Company amounted to over 25 per cent.

The Gould Manufacturing Company had profits in 1915 of $99,069, and in 1916 of $229,447, equalling 24 per cent upon the common stock of $750,000. The Canadian

Fairbanks-Morse declared dividends amounting to 39.97 per cent, upon a common stock of $1,480,600. The Dominion Steel Foundry paid 60 per cent in dividends during 1916. The Brandram-Henderson annual statement indicates a large increase in profits during the year. The surplus available after paying bond interest and preferred dividends and making liberal allowance for contingencies amounts to 13·8 per cent of the common stock outstanding, while the total surplus now amounts to about 36 per cent.

The Belding-Paul-Corticelli Company, after allowing for preferred dividends for the year, it is understood can show a surplus equal to 10 per cent on the common stock. This will be equal to 15 per cent on the preferred, compared with 7·1 per cent in 1915 and 4·9 per cent in 1914.

I quote these figures to show that, notwithstanding the war conditions from which every person in this country is supposed to be suffering, one element in Canada is certainly not suffering by reason of those conditions, for these manufacturing concerns are declaring dividends to their shareholders very much greater than any they ever declared in times of peace.

Mr. STANFIELD: Not all of them.

Mr. KYTE: With regard to the Bank of Nova Scotia, its net earnings for the year amounted to 19.2 per cent of the capital. The National Trust Company in 1916 had net profits of $236,254, equal to 15.7 per cent on the capital; 10 per cent was paid to shareholders and the balance carried forward.

With respect to the proposal brought down by the Department of Labour some few months ago on the subject of the cost of living, we have before us the Order in Council which was made public by the department, and on the strength of which the Minister of Labour claims credit for having done something calculated to reduce very materially the cost of foodstuffs to consumers. I will read a few sections from the Order in Council, showing the procedure to be followed. Section 3 says:

(1) No person shall accumulate or shall withhold from sale any necessary of life beyond an amount thereof reasonably required for the use or consumption of his household or for the ordinary purposes of his business.

(4) The Minister of Labour may, by notice in writing under his hand or that of his deputy, require any person who operates, controls or manages any cold storage plant, packing house, cannery, factory, mine, warehouse, or other premises in which or in any part of which any necessary of life is prepared, manufactured, produced or held by such person for himself or for another, or who in any manner deals in any necessary of life, to make and render unto such minister precisely as required by him, a written return.

And the Order in Council states the particulars to be given in the return. Section 5 says:

Whenever the council or any municipality shall declare by way of resolution that in its opinion excessive prices are being demanded within the limits of such municipality for any necessary of life, such council may, by notice in writing under the hand of its clerk or other authorized officer, require any person dealing within the municipality in such necessary of life, and locally situate therein, to make and render unto such Council within a time set in such notice, and such person shall make and render unto such council, precisely as required by it, a written return under oath or affirmation.

And the Order in Council states the details, and then goes on:

If, after the receipt of any such return, such council shall consider that any circumstances justify reference of the return and a statement of the conditions to the Minister of Labour for further investigation at his hands, or if no return, or what the council shall consider an untrue or misleading return, is made, such council may, by way of resolution in writing expressing the facts and the council's conclusion therefrom report to such minister.

Section 6 says:

(1) If, after the receipt by the Minister of Labour of any return made to him or to any municipality in purported compliance with these regulations, such minister shall consider that any circumstances so justify, or if, after a return under these regulations has been required, none is made or none is made within the time set in the notice requiring such return or within such further time as the Minister of Labour may upon special application to him allow, the said minister shall have power to investigate the business and to examine the premises, books, papers and records of the person making or failing to make such return, as the case may be, and, for those purposes such minister may appoint an Examiner or Examiners and may authorize in writing any examiner so appointed to enter and examine the premises, books, records and papers of such person, and to take evidence under oath or affirmation of any person who such examiner may believe has knowledge relating to such matters as ought to have been included within a proper return according to circumstances.

7. Whenever, in the opinion of the Minister of Labour, after an investigation and examination held in pursuance of the powers conferred by these regulations, an offence against any of these regulations is disclosed, said minister shall remit to the Attorney General of any province within which such offence shall have been committed, for such action as such Attorney General may be pleased to institute because of the conditions appearing, certified copies of (a) any return or returns and resolutions of any municipality which may have been made, rendered or passed pursuant to these regulations and are in the possession of the minister

and relevant to such offence, and of (b) the evidence taken on any such investigation or examination and the report of the examiner.

8. (1) No prosecution for a contravention or non-observance of any provision of these regulations shall be commenced without the written leave of the Attorney General for the province in which the offence is alleged to have been committed, expressing whether such prosecution shall be by way of indictment or under Part XV of the Criminal Code.

If ever there was a gold brick handed out to the people of this country in respect to the investigation of prices and regulation of the cost of living it is to be found in this Order in Council. Its effect is to provide that responsibility for action shall be transferred from the Government to the municipality, and from the municipality to the Attorneys General of the several provinces. There was a case in the city of Montreal where they attempted to define the procedure laid down in the Order in Council, but it was found absolutely unworkable. I have here a statement made by the legal adviser of the city of Montreal, to the effect that the charging of high prices for commodities is not an offence under the terms of the Order in Council, and that the element of conspiracy must exist. This is given as the contention of the city law department in regard to the communication from the Minister of Labour:—

To speak only of the present case, it is established that certain coal merchants have made, all overhead and other expenses deducted, a net profit of $6 per ton. These facts have been disclosed to the Minister of Labour. He alone has the power to make further inquiry in order to ascertain if this coal was carried in excess of the reasonable quantity required for the business of each trader, or whether such increase would be different if such information was asked by an officer of the Department of Labour.

Here we have an instance of the practical working out of the Order in Council passed at the instance of the Minister of Labour with regard to matters in which that Order purported to give jurisdiction. But it appears that it is absolutely impossible for anything to be done under this Order in Council in the way of regulating the cost of living. Having issued the Order in Council, the minister feels that his duty is accomplished, and, notwithstanding that the prices of commodities which constitute the necessaries of life are going up by leaps and bounds without any valid reason, nothing is done to relieve the situation.

Mr. CROTHERS: Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to read the whole of that opinion?

[Mr. Kyte.]

Mr. KYTE: I have read all of it that is relevant to this subject. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers), if he desires, can read the rest at his leisure.

Mr. CROTHERS: But it is only fair to read it all.

Mr. KYTE: I do not wish to cumber Hansard with it. There is one point that has engaged the attention of the newspaper people of this country, and that is the price of newsprint paper. For a year or more complaint has been made that the manufacturers of newsprint have been boosting prices far beyond what is called for by the conditions. They called the attention of the Minister of Finance to the matter some time ago, with the result that action has been taken. We on this side have contended that the Government ought to have adopted the policy applied by the Australian Government of fixing the prices of commodities which form the necessaries of life. Objection is raised that it would dislocate the course of business, and result in bringing about hardships instead of being advantageous to the public. With regard to the price of newsprint, the Financial Post of 17th April last states:—

The Financial Post understands that Sir Thomas White holds the belief that paper costs have advanced out of all proportion and is determined to enforce his views.

It is understood that any action taken would be along the lines of regulating the flow of exports by the placing of embargoes thus automatically reducing prices.

But, instead of doing that, the Government adopted the procedure with regard to newsprint that we asked them to adopt with regard to food products. It is stated that an Order in Council gave authority to an officer of the Government to take possession of newsprint paper manufactured in this country fixing the selling price. As an agreement had been made between the manufacturers of newsprint and the Canadian publishers, fixing the price at $2.50 the order was not gazetted. This was the order which resulted in fixing the price of newsprint in Canada. But that order was not enforced, because the manufacturers climbed down and fixed prices satisfactory to the newspaper proprietors. The Grain Growers of the West are organized, and they were able to press their views upon the Minister of Finance, with the result that a few days ago wheat and wheat products were placed on the free list. The newspapers are an influential body of great public influence, and the Government was forced to take action in order that the grievances they complained of might be

relieved. But the poor consumer, the workingman, must worry along as best he can, with the cost of living increasing and his income not increasing in proportion.

Let us see what has been done in Australia with regard to the fixing of prices and regulating the cost of living. I have here the statute dealing with that subject. After providing for the appointment of a board, the statute enacts as follows:

6. (1) The Board and each Commissioner shall, in relation to any matter as to which it or he has power to furnish a report or make a recommendation under these regulations, have power to—

(a) summon witnesses;
(b) take evidence on oath;
(c) require the production of documents, books and papers; and
(d) enter upon any premises and inspect any documents, books and papers or any stock of foodstuffs and necessary commodities, or authorize any member of the Board or any other person to enter upon any premises and inspect any such documents, books and papers or any stocks of foodstuffs and necessary commodities.

Subsection 3 provides:

(3) If any member of the Board or any Commissioner or any other person authorized by the Board or by any Commissioner discloses, except in the course of his duty, or except to the Board ,or to the Commissioner as the case may be, any information obtained by him while upon any such premises, he shall be guilty of an offence.

Subsequent sections are as follows:

13. (1) The minister may from time to time, on the recommendation of the Board or a Commissioner—

(a) determine the maximum prices which may be charged for foodstuffs and necessary commodities sold, and the maximum rates which may be charged for services the performance of which is commenced, in any proclaimed area;
(b) determine the conditions of the sale of foodstuffs and necessary commodities sold therein and of the performance of services the performance of which is commenced therein.

(2) Any such determination shall be published in the Gazette, and shall from the date specified in the Gazette have the force of law.

14. Notwithstanding anything contained in the last two preceding regulations the Governor General may, without any recommendation of the Board or a Commissioner—

(a) declare any area to be a proclaimed area for the purposes of these regulations;
(b) fix the price of foodstuffs and necessary commodities sold and the rate for services the performance of which is commenced, in any proclaimed area;
(c) declare that as regards any proclaimed area, any price fixed by or under these regulations shall, after a date specified by him, cease to be the maximum price at which foodstuffs and necessary commodities may be sold or offered for sale, and any rates fixed under these regulations shall, after a date specified by him, cease to be the maximum rates which may be charged for services the performance of which is commenced, in that area.

Another section of the Act provides that any violation of the recommendations made by the commission shall constitute an offence and shall be punishable accordingly. Here is a Government that apparently is not afraid to take the full responsibility of dealing with this subject. The question of the cost of living was not any more pressing in Australia than it is in Canada but in Australia there is a Government that is in office for the purpose of governing in the interest of the whole community and not in the interest of a special class. I shall, before I am through, be able to show this House that the results of the statute passed in Australia has been to reduce the cost of living enormously as compared with the cost of living in the Dominion of Canada. The particulars, relative to the fixing of wholesale and retail prices of foodstuffs and necessary commodities and services in Australia, which appeared in Weekly Bulletin, No. 660, have caused a number of inquiries from Canada requesting more detailed information concerning the administration of the regulations and the results achieved.

Action in regard to the fixing of prices of foodstuffs and necessary commodities was taken by the Commonwealth Government under the War Precautions Act (1914-16). Regulations, known as the War Precautions (Prices) Regulations, were issued in July, 1916, to supersede price fixing measures which had been put into operation by some of the state governments since the beginning of the war.

A commissioner has been appointed at the capital of each Australian state to administer the regulations and a Federal commissioner co-ordinates the work and is directly in touch with the minister in control of this section of commonwealth activity. The staff in each state consists of a commissioner, an inquiry officer and two clerical assistants. It is provided that a commissioner in any state may recommend that a certain article of food or any other goods be declared a foodstuff or necessary commodity under the prices regulations. On such item being approved it is proclaimed in the Commonwealth Gazette and inquiries are then undertaken by the commissioner in the state specially concerned, or in all states if the item is one affecting the interests of the whole Commonwealth.

The commissioner takes evidence on oath. In the case of an article manufactured in the Commonwealth he would obtain evidence as to the cost of the raw material, the average cost of distributing, existing wages awards, freight, and all the factors which govern the actual cost of production and distribution. The commissioner then recommends a price, wholesale and retail, at which such article is to be sold in the metropolitan area of the state, and for all other places the cost is the price fixed for the metropolitan area plus necessary costs of transportation.

The procedure is practically the same in regard to goods which are imported to the Commonwealth. The importer is expected to produce his original invoices and to satisfy the commissioner as to all the factors governing the price of the article.

The principle has been laid down that existing channels of distribution, commissions or allowances for same, are to be recognized so long as such charges are not unreasonable.

Prices, obviously, may fluctuate from month to month, on investigation being made by the commissioners as to the necessity for alterations. It is hardly necessary to emphasize that the price determination arrived at is the maximum legal charge on the article specified, but this does not prevent the article being sold at a lower wholesale and retail price. The foodstuffs and commodities upon which determinations have already been made (in some of the states) are:

Arrowroot, barley, bran, bread, butter, bacon, biscuits, cheese, cocoa, cornsacks, flour, groats, hams, infants' and invalids' foods, jam, milk both fresh and condensed, meats, oatmeal, flaked oats, rolled oats, quaker oats, pollard, plum puddings, preserved pineapples, rice, tin plates and soaps.

An investigation is now proceeding with the object of fixation of prices on boots and shoes, and the procedure was outlined by the Victorian commissioner. Three sets of samples of footwear were obtained, one from retailers and one purchased by the departmental expert. Representatives of the three interests will decide upon the standard types. Manufacturing costs and selling prices of such types will be investigated and, after every incidental charge associated with making and selling has been considered, the result aimed at is an equitable price to manufacturers, retailers and the public. It is the desire of the commissioners to allow the manufacturers to have the same rate of profit upon their goods that they had previous to the war, but they are not permitted to charge in excess of that. It is claimed by the federal commissioner that large savings have been effected without subjecting the trading community to any material sacrifice but at the same time permitting them to receive profits in the same ratio as those they received prior to the war

I submit that this is a practical way of dealing with this question. While the other elements of the community are making sacrifices during the war and sending their sons to do battle for the Empire, they are protected from further sacrifices by the Government refusing to permit the exactions of manufacturers in the form of an increase in the cost of commodities which they have to sell. Under no circumstances are they permitted to have a larger profit than they had previous to the outbreak of the war. The result of the application of this is very interesting in regard to the price of flour. A considerable saving has been effected by the reduction of flour prices. Portion of this is absorbed in the reduction in the price of bread, but not wholly. For instance, the price of bread has only been fixed for definite centres. A considerable area is outside the range of the proclamations, the country being sparsely populated and no reliable evidence being forthcoming upon which to base prices. This is shown particularly in Western Australia. In that state the local consumption of flour is 30,000 tons per annum. The result of the Commonwealth proclamations reduced the average price of flour in that state by £75,000 or by £2 10/- per ton. Prices have been also fixed for retail parcels of flour, 50s, 25s, and single pounds. In many cases this amounts to a reduction in price of upwards of 1/- on 25's and up to 3/- on 50's. It is however, not possible to make any approximately accurate calculation in regard to these parcels. It is not, says the Commissioner, an over estimate to place the savings to the people on the fixation by the Commonwealth of prices of mill products and bread at upwards of three quarters of a million pounds per annum. That is to say, the action of the Australian Government in fixing the price of flour alone has resulted in the saving of $3,750,000 per annum to the consumers in that country. I have the market quotations of certain commodities showing the prices charged in 1911 and 1917 and the House will see the startling increases that have taken place with respect to these com-

modities. The list of wholesale prices at Halifax is as follows:

	1911	1917
Pork, barrels	$21.50	$48.00
Beef, "	16.50	34.00
Lard, per lb.	.12½	.28½
Cheese, "	.13	.28
Sugar, per bbl.	4.85	8.75
Flour, "	6.50	12.50
Tea, per lb.	.25	.39
Molasses, per gal.	.28	.67
Corn Meal, per bag	1.50	3.50
Rolled Oats, per bbl.	5.25	9.00
Baking Soda, per keg	2.20	3.50
Washing Soda, "	1.40	2.80
Soap, (Surprise) per box	4.15	5.00
Biscuits, per lb.	.07	.11½
Butter, "	.27	.43
Eggs, per doz.	.21	.35
Bran, per bag	1.35	2.50
Middlings, "	1.50	2.75
Oats, per bush.	.55	1.00
Beans, "	2.25	7.50
Barley, Pot, per bag..(3c. lb.)	2.80	4.50
Split Peas, "	3.00	7.75
Bacon, per lb.	.18	.28
Ham, "	.17	.30
Rice, "	.04	.05½
Onions, "	.03½	.12

It does appear to me that this list provides a splendid field for the operations of the Minister of Labour if he had any real, actual desire to take steps to prevent such enormous increases in the cost of commodities. It cannot be argued that the high prices are due to war conditions, because the figures I quoted to the House a few moments ago showing the earnings of concerns manufacturing some of these products prove that their profits have increased enormously over their profits in other years.

I will take now the prices of certain staple commodities in Australia and compare them with the prices in Canada as of date the 15th of February, 1917.

Article.	In Australia.	In Canada.
Bran (per ton).	$21.84	$35.00
Bread (per loaf) 1½ lbs.	.05	.09
Butter	.36	.40 to .46
Bacon	.27 to .33	.32 to .33
Cheese	.21	.30
Flour	5.28 to 6.00	9.20 to 9.90
Oatmeal (100-lb. bags)	2.40	3.80
Potatoes (bush.)	.45½	2.00 to 2.34
Eggs	.18 to .24	.50 to .58
Yellow sugar (per pound)	.06	.08
White sugar (per pound)	.06½	.09

It was stated in a former debate in this House that the cost of living had increased in Australia as much as in Canada, or at all events that the rate of increase in Australia since the war was quite equal to the rate of increase in Canada. I have here, from the official figures supplied by the Commissioner in Australia, a statement to the effect that the cost of living increased, from 1914 to February 1917, 9·4 per cent in Australia while in Canada it increased 44·2 per cent. According to the Labour Gazette, the figures are somewhat different. I have here a copy of the last issue of the Labour Gazette which contains an index of a number of prices in Canada, the United States and certain other countries. The increased cost in Canada for 20 foods between July, 1914 and March, 1917 amounted to 44·2 per cent. That is compared with the cost of 46 foods in Australia which show an increase of 25 per cent. I submit that this comparison is not accurate and is not reliable. It would be fair to compare the increased cost of 29 foods in Canada with the increased cost of the same 29 foods in Australia. That has not been done, and the Labour Gazette have offset the index cost of 46 foods in Australia against 29 foods in Canada, and even that only brings up the increased cost in Australia to 25 per cent compared with 44·2 per cent in Canada.

The figures I have given showing the increase in Australia of 9.4 per cent are absolutely correct, and are taken from a statement forwarded to me from Australia. According to the Labour Gazette, the percentage of increase is 44.2 per cent in Canada, in Australia 25 per cent, in New Zealand 27 per cent, and in the United States 25 per cent. We hear a good deal said here of the enormous increase in the cost of living in the United States in the last few years, but according to the figures in the Labour Gazette, the increased cost in the United States is only 25 per cent compared with 44.2 per cent in Canada.

I will now take certain companies for the purpose of ascertaining how the new war tax is going to affect the manufacturing interests in Canada, and in what proportion we are receiving revenue from that source compared with the revenue obtained by the Commonwealth of Australia. During last year the profits of Stanfields, Limited, which is a very important manufacturing concern in Nova Scotia, which has done a great deal of business with the Militia Department in supplying underwear to the overseas troops, amounted in 1916 to $109,688, equal to 14½ per cent on the capital. Under the old war tax, last year the Government got $14,297 from Stanfields, Limited. The earnings of that company being less than 15 per cent, it is not affected by the new war tax, so that during 1917 the Government will receive from Stanfields,

Limited, only $14,297, being the same as the amount received last year. But after deducting this $14,297 by way of war tax, I notice that the stockholders were still able to receive $95,391, equivalent to 12.7 per cent on the capital stock of the company.

The Consolidated Rubber Company's profits amounted to 22 per cent or $907,500. Under the old war tax the Government took $154,687, leaving to the company $752,813, or 18 per cent upon the whole capital stock of the company. Under the new war tax the Government takes $247,500, leaving to the company $660,000, or an amount equal to 16 per cent upon the total capital stock of the company. Thus while the Consolidated Rubber Company and Stanfields Limited were content with a very much smaller dividend before the war, after paying the war tax imposed on them by the Finance Minister they will have left in their treasury a revenue from their investment far in excess of any they had received in any year previous to the war.

I take now the Dominion Canners Limited. In 1916 the net income of that company was $556,777. In 1915 there appears to have been a deficit of $294,439. In 1914 the net income was $215,123. In 1913 the net income was $380,517. So that during this past year of the war, the Dominion Canners have earned as a net income, over $200,000 more than they received in 1913 and far more than they earned in 1914 and 1915. A statement issued by the company informs the public that the earnings amounted to 24.31 per cent upon the preferred stock of the company and 14·20 per cent upon the common stock. Taking it upon the basis of 24·31 per cent profit, the war tax for 1915 amounted to $99,125 and the company retained $457,652, equal to 20 per cent upon the stock of the company. The new war tax will amount to $177,120, leaving to the company $379,656, or equal to 17 per cent profit upon the total capital stock of the company. Under the old war tax the Government took 17·8 per cent of the profits, and under the new war tax the Government taxes 32 per cent of the profits, leaving to the company profits amounting to 82·2 per cent in one case and 68 per cent in the other.

Let us see how the products of the Dominion Canners have behaved in the matter of price to the consumers in Canada. I find in a statement that came from the Labour Department that the price of tomatoes per tin—

[Mr. Kyte.]

Mr. LALOR: What were the profits of the company in 1915?

Mr. KYTE: There was a deficit in 1915 of $294,439. In January, 1915, the price of tomatoes, per can, size 2½, was 10 cents; in April, 1917, 20 cents. The price of peas in January, 1915, per tin, size 2, was 10 cents; in April, 1917, 15 cents. Corn, per tin, was 10 cents in 1915 and is 15 cents in 1917. These were the retail prices. I now quote the wholesale prices: Tomatoes, in 1915, $1, in 1917 $1.85 to $2.15; peas, in January, 1915, 95 cents, and in April, 1917, from $1.25 to $1.50.

Mr. LALOR: When you say that the price of tomatoes was $2.15, do you mean that the Dominion Canners Company received $2.15 a dozen for tomatoes?

Mr. KYTE: These are the wholesale prices.

Mr. LALOR: Are they the prices at which the wholesale trade sold to the retailer?

Mr. KYTE: Certainly.

Mr. LALOR: Then you are not insinuating that these are the prices which the Dominion Canners Company received?

Mr. KYTE: The wholesale dealers got a little profit, but not as much as the Dominion Canners Company received. The wholesale dealers would not get 24 per cent profit upon their transactions, I am quite sure, as the shareholders of the Dominion Canners Company did.

Mr. LALOR: If the hon. gentleman thinks that the Dominion Canners Company is making money very fast, I may tell him that he can buy preferred stock at 75 or less and common stock at 20. He might find that, according to his ideas, a good investment.

Mr. KYTE: Very good, considering the fact that they are paying a 24 per cent dividend.

Mr. LALOR: They are not paying any dividend at all, either on preferred or on common stock, and they have not been able to do so for a long time.

Mr. KYTE: The statement to the public indicates that the earnings were 24·31 on the preferred stock of the company.

Mr. LALOR: I am telling you that they did not pay any dividend.

Mr. KYTE: I have quoted from the statement of the company issued to the public—perhaps for the purpose of selling stock,

I am not sure. The wholesale price of corn in January, 1915, was 95 cents, and in April, 1917, $1.75; strawberries,, 1915, $2.17½; 1917, $2.50; raspberries, January, 1915, $1.97½; April, 1917, $2.75. So you see, Mr. Speaker, how this works out. The manufacturing concerns are earning more than they ever earned before, with the result that the price to the wholesaler is greater than ever in the history of the country, and the price to the retailer is greater than ever in the history of the country, and the price to the consumer is so great that he must deny himself in many instances the luxury of eating the products of the Dominion Canners Company.

Mr. LALOR: Has the hon. gentleman any idea of what the price of tin-plate is to-day as compared with two years ago?

Mr. KYTE: I do not know; it does not affect the question.

Mr. LALOR: It affects the price a great deal.

Mr. KYTE: If the Dominion Canners Company were paying such enormously high prices for their supplies, how did they come to pay a dividend of 24 per cent?

Mr. LALOR: I rise to say that that is absolutely false. There is not a word of truth in that statement.

Mr. KYTE: Well then, the Dominion Canners Company is sending out a statement, for the purpose of influencing the stock upon the market, which is absolutely untrue.

Mr. LALOR: That is not true. No statement was ever issued by the Dominion Canners Company, saying that they were paying 22 or 24 per cent profit. It would be a good deal better if the hon. gentleman would find out the facts before he made his statement.

Mr. KYTE: The point in dispute between my hon. friend and myself is as to whether the dividend was earned or paid. I do not care whether it was paid or not; the statement says that the indicated earnings on preferred stock in 1916 was 24.31 per cent. Let us see how our friends would fare if they were doing business in Australia. If Stanfields Limited were doing business in Australia during last year, instead of contributing $14,297 to the public treasury, they would have contributed 50 per cent of their total earnings, or $54,844. If they were doing business in Australia in 1917, instead of contributing $14,297, as they will to this Government, they would contribute to the Government of Australia the sum of $82,266. If the Consolidated Rubber Company were doing business in Australia, they would have contributed in 1916 to the treasury of Australia $453,750, compared with $154,687, which they paid here. If they were doing business in 1917 they would contribute to the treasury of Australia the sum of $680,625, instead of $247,500 that they are now paying. If the Dominion Canners Company Limited were doing business in Australia they would have contributed in the year 1916 $278,425, instead of $99,125 as they did, and if they were doing business in Australia they would tribute $417,637 to the treasury of Australia in 1917 instead of $177,120 which they will pay here.

The hon. Minister of Finance takes glory to himself for the amount of taxation that he has levied upon the manufacturers of Canada. It would be well for him to look at what the Finance Minister of Australia is doing. The new war taxation brought down by the Finance Minister a few days ago is a very complicated statement indeed. It is impossible for an ordinary man to figure out how much any company in Canada is liable to contribute, because the minister has graduated the percentages so that earnings up to a certain amount will pay 10 per cent up to a larger amount 25 per cent, above that 60 per cent, and so on to 75 per cent. That sounds very big, but when you come to figure out what it amounts to—I had this done by the Finance Department—you see how far short it falls, so far as contributions to the treasury are concerned, of the amount contributed in Australia. In that country the Government takes 50 per cent of the profits of every company during the first year and 75 per cent of the profits during the second year. There they have a government that watches the interests of the consumers. The prices of all the necessaries of life are fixed, with the result that the increase in the cost of living in Australia has only amounted to 9.4 per cent. In addition to that, the Government takes the profits of the manufacturers, so that they do not get any benefit or advantage out of the war that is not shared by the other people in that dominion. The consequence is that instead of a trifle of $12,500,000 being collected by the war tax upon manufactures, an enormous revenue is being collected from that source.

The Minister of Finance, as I stated in the early part of my address, did not show very much courage or originality in respect

of his taxation proposals. We have in Canada a tariff that has increased enormously the cost of everything to the consumer. Apart from the tariff existing before these war measures were brought down, there was an increase of 7½ per cent, not only upon goods that were previously dutiable, but upon all free goods as well. The result has been to increase enormously the cost of living, whereas the Government have allowed the manufacturers to slip by with a very small proportion of taxation, considering the enormous profits that they are making. If the Finance Minister had adopted the principle of taxation in force in Australia and had exacted fifty per cent of the profits during the first year and 75 per cent during the second year, he would be able to put every article of consumption upon the free list and would have a larger income than he has at this time. If we are to have a happy and contented people; if we are to live under conditions that will enable us to bear the burdens of the war, the Government will have to get back to sound finance and economics. They must remove the duties upon the necessaries of life, as was done not only in France and Italy, but in Germany as well, and regulate the cost as is done in Australia. The consequence is that although these nations are very much nearer to the centre of war and suffer more grievously, under war conditions, than we do, they are not suffering in the matter of taxation nearly as much as we are.

9 p.m.

Mr. LALOR: The Government have just removed the duty upon flour. Perhaps you have not noticed that.

Mr. KYTE: I notice it was removed at a time when such removal could not be of any advantage to the consumer. The Government took very good care not to remove the duty at a time when its removal might have been an advantage, when the price of flour was low and the consumer could afford to pay a little more for a barrel of flour without complaint, and they waited until the conditions were such that the removal of the duty could not benefit the farmer or the consumer but would benefit the speculator.

Mr. LALOR: The speculator has raised the price of flour.

Mr. KYTE: The speculator has raised the price of flour, and the Minister of Labour, instead of dealing with the matter himself, has passed the puck on to the city councils and the town councils throughout the Dominion of Canada, and feels that he has discharged his duty by doing so.

[Mr. Kyte.]

It is not only in the matter of foodstuffs that we are suffering; we are suffering in the increased cost of boots and shoes, clothing, rubbers, fishing supplies. Stanfields, Limited, for instance, are reaping the benefit of the enormous protection that it is receiving. The price of underclothing has been increased enormously to the consumers in this country, and, notwithstanding the payment of the war tax, the shareholders of Stanfields, Limited, are making more money now than they ever before made in their lives. We have in this country a condition of affairs approximating the conditions that exist in countries that are actually at war. Although we are a producing, a farming country, although the opportunities for transporting our produce to the other side to remedy the conditions of scarcity in Britain are unavailable to us and we have millions of bushels of wheat in this country, we are suffering the same exactions and privations that we would suffer if we were actually in a state of war. The Government felt that the only means of meeting the difficulties of raising revenue was by applying the system of taxation. It is extraordinary how our friends in the Conservative party, while they always preach that we should give and should make sacrifices, in the operations of Government and in the carrying on of their trade policy, take very good care that no sacrifices shall be made by their friends the manufacturers, who support them so loyally in this House and in the country.

Another source of complaint in respect of the administration of the affairs of Canada is the enormous expenditure of money which is being carried on at a time when war economy ought to be practised, while war economy is being preached by the Minister of Finance and by his colleagues in the Government. It is just about a year ago that we had in this House a discussion about a matter which indicated the wasteful methods in force in respect of the expenditure of money for the carrying on of this war. It is about a year ago, I think, that the question of the fuse contracts was discussed in this House and was referred to a Royal Commission. I am not going to discuss the findings of that commission, but it was found that every allegation made re-

garding the extravagant prices which were paid to friends of the Government was absolutely proved from start to finish, the result being that millions of dollars were lost to the taxpayers of this country. Allison, Yoakum, Lignanti are three names that were familiar to us in Canada a year ago; not only were their names familiar, but their persons and physiognomies were familiar to the residents of the city of Ottawa. We do not see J. Wesley Allison around here as we did in those days nor do we see Yoakum and Lignanti anv more. What an autocry was raised against Liberals in this House because they dared to make allegations which resulted in the findings of the Royal Commission! My poor, humble self was singled out as a person who ought not to be at large and who should suffer dire penalties. Poor, old somnolent toryism! It forgets that the battle for free speech had been fought in Great Britain three hundred years ago and the victory won at the cost of a King's head. I am sure that my friends opposite regret very much that conditions exist in this country that permit free speech and free discussion. I state emphatically that the Opposition sitting in this House would not be discharging its full duty if it did not bring to the attention of the Government and of the country the shortcomings and maladministration of this Government in respect of war measures and war expenditures. What is the remedy for the condition of affairs that exists at the present time?

We have had some discussion in regard to changes and amendments to the tariff in order to meet the present conditions in Canada. For my part, our friends in the West cannot go too far in the matter of demanding reduced taxation and lower tariffs in this country for me to follow them. Every statement and every principle that have been enunciated on this side of the House with regard to tariff and the desirability of reducing tariff and reducing the cost of living will receive hearty and enthusiastic support from me. At the present time we have sources of revenue that are quite available to the Minister of Finance and quite adequate to all the demands notwithstanding that the demands are very great. As I pointed out a moment ago, if the minister only had the courage to adopt the system of taxing companies that exists in Australia, he could put all the foodstuffs and the necessaries of life upon the free list and still have more than enough revenue to meet all the actual requirements of the present time. After the war, there will be great burdens to bear, and great courage required on the part of the Minister of Finance of the day. There is one field of taxation which has not been touched yet, and which the Minister of Finance seems to be afraid to touch. I refer to the taxation of income. By reason of the war we shall have in Canada a large number of millionaires who have become millionaires on account of the opportunity given them of making enormous exactions, not only through manufacture of war material, but through the manufacture of the necessaries of life. These manufacturers would never have received their millions out of the taxpayers, had it not been for the unfair conditions that have prevailed during the carrying on of the war. There is no more promising field of taxation to meet the requirements that will have to be met after the war than to make these gentlemen contribute of the millions that they have been able to acquire, while the common people of this country have been driven to the last extreme to meet the requirements existing in their households from day to day, and while by far the largest proportion of them have to mourn the loss of brave sons who have fallen in the field of battle.

Mr. J. A. ROBB (Huntingdon): Mr. Speaker, the Budget speech of the Minister of Finance contained two outstanding statements, one being that the debt of this country, which before the war was $336,000,000, had increased now to $900,000,000, and that before the end of the fiscal year it would be $1,200,000,000. For making identically the same statement, or perhaps even a more moderate statement, to their electors, some of my friends on this side of the House have been accused of disloyalty.

Another outstanding statement in the Budget speech of the Minister of Finance was that no tariff changes were proposed this year. Previous speakers have congratulated the Finance Minister upon the brevity of his Budget speech. Apparently, he has gone from one extreme to the other. Six years ago he was talking too much of a sort on the tariff question, but to-day he avoids the tariff as he would a pestilence. Less than a year ago, only six months ago, in fact, when the western farmer was still marketing his crops, our Conservative friends were still strong in the faith that it would be of no benefit to the farmer to have the United States market open for his wheat. It would ruin the Canadian milling industry, they said, and would be very injurious to the dairying interests in Canada.

I wonder what accounts for this sudden conversion? Is it a case of eleventh hour repentance, or have they caught the contagion of repentance which has afflicted their Nationalist friends in the province of Quebec? My good friend and former fellow-citizen, the Minister of Inland Revenue, openly confessed his sins to the Conservatives at Montreal a short time ago, saying that six years ago, when he was but a mere lad of thirty, he had done wrong in opposing the Laurier naval policy and any other policy looking to the support of the Mother Country in the matter of naval defence. The Minister of Inland Revenue made his confession to a party of friends around the banqueting table, but the Minister of Finance, having in mind previous wobblings and promised changes in the tariff on the eve of by-elections in the West, burns his bridges behind him and three days before Parliament meets rushes through an Order in Council placing wheat, flour and semolina upon the free list. By this Act the Government admit not only that they were wrong six years ago, but wrong, also, upon three occasions during the last six years, one of those occasions being no later than last session. They have admitted their judgment upon the question of free wheat to be defective. What will the country think of their business ability when after studying the question for six years they accept, without consulting Ottawa, a tariff proposition made in Washington, and one that in my judgment is not so good as the tariff proposals of 1911? It is said that free wheat was the arch of the reciprocity proposals. That was the opinion of western Canada, where everybody talks wheat. It was also contended in western Canada that free barley, free oats and free flax was a good thing for the western farmer, because they give him a revenue while he is breaking or cleaning his land. We in the East favoured reciprocity because it opened up a better market for our dairy products. Reciprocity, as hon. gentlemen will remember, placed butter and cheese upon the free list. No tax was imposed upon these products on their way from the producer to the breakfast table of the consumer. So we in the East looked favourably upon reciprocity, because it offered these advantages to our dairy farmers.

Let us consider for a moment the question of wheat. The tariff arrangement of 1911, negotiated by the Hon. William Fielding, whose every tariff Act for 15 years tended towards stability, would have given to the western farmer everything he asked for. The Minister of Finance acknowledged this afternoon that since 1879 Canada has been looking for a reciprocity arrangement with the United States, and I repeat that the tariff arrangement of 1911 would have given to the farmers of this country the market they had been looking for, without in any way interfering with our manufacturing industries. It would also have given greater encouragement to the milling industry. Under that arrangement the Canadian miller would have been able to buy his wheat either in Canada or the United States. If there were a short crop in Canada the fields of Kansas were open to him, and he could get the wheat ground en route to the sea, thus giving a plentiful supply of bran, shorts and mill feed to our Canadian dairymen. But our Conservative friends opposed those proposals at that time, and their arguments—but they had no arguments. They appealed to race and religion, loyalty and patriotism, and listening to those appeals, the people of Canada lost a bargain that would have given this country wider markets; the West would have got the market she asked, for and eastern Canada a steadier and healthier and better market for her products. That tariff arrangement would have removed the tax on the breakfast table of every man who has a family to feed.

I would like to prove to the Minister of Finance that the bargain he has accepted to-day is not as good as the bargain of 1911. The Liberals were defeated upon the arrangement of 1911, and as a result the Conservative-Nationalist party came into power and formed a Government. In 1913 the United States revised their tariff, and with due regard to the action of the Canadian people, or rather the Conservative element of the Canadian people, they placed a duty of ten cents a bushel on wheat, inserting a clause in the tariff, however, whereby any country opening its markets to the flour, wheat and semolina of the United States would have reciprocal advantages in the United States markets. They also placed cream and milk on the free list, but a prohibitory tax was imposed on butter and cheese. For six years our Conservative friends have been insistent that it was of no advantage to the Canadian farmer to ship his wheat to the United States market. During those six years the price of wheat was neither high nor low:

it was a reasonable price, but the Canadian farmer looking to the markets of Minneapolis always thought he could get a higher price for his wheat in the United States. Indeed, the Minister of Finance admitted this afternoon that wheat was ten cents a bushel higher in the United States market than in the Canadian market. And after having for over six years deprived the western producer of the market he was looking for, and at a time when wheat was $2 a bushel, or double its former price, and when the western farmer had parted with the bulk of his crop, and when it was in the hands of the elevator and the speculator, the Government hastened by Order in Council to take off the duty, and by that means open the United States markets to our wheat. And remember, the western farmer was looking for a market not only for his wheat, but also for his barley, his flax and his oats. Our Conservative friends take an infant conceived in Washington and throw that to the western farmers, thinking that he will forget the demand he has been making for six years for a larger and wider market for his product.

The Finance Minister dwelt strongly on the point that he would make no tariff modifications this year. I would like to prove to him that if he is to save the milling industry in this country, if he is to place it in a position to compete in normal times with the mills of the United States, and also if he is to save the dairy industry of this country from ruin, he will be compelled to change his mind and make further modifications. In the change of tariff hurried through by Order in Council, the Finance Minister pays no attention whatever to bran and shorts coming into this country. Bran and shorts go into the United States free, but farmers in this country who wish to import bran and shorts must pay a tariff of twenty-five per cent—seventeen and one-half per cent the regular duty and seven and one-half per cent war tax. What would be the result of this? We have a statement of the millers of this country, in a letter published in the Montreal Gazette of 25th December, 1913, to the effect that the reciprocity proposition was far better for the millers than the proposal under the Underwood tariff. And why was that proposition better? Because the millers of the United States are able to buy their bags cheaper and to build their mills at less cost than similar mills can be built for in Canada. Seventy-five thousand dollars will go further in the building of a mill in the United States than $100,000 will go in Canada. The United States miller can buy cotton bags at a rate equal to eight and a half cents a barrel cheaper than they can be bought on the Canadian market. I would ask the Finance Minister how long he thinks the Canadian miller can compete under such conditions?

Hon. gentlemen opposite are strong for protection for our manufacturing industries. It was one of their complaints in 1911—that the reciprocity agreement would injure our industries. But they themselves have created conditions under which every barrel of flour which comes into Canada from the United States brings in three yards of cotton free. That was avoided in 1911. Why? Because there was a protection of 50 cents a barrel on flour—and $2.50 on bran and shorts. I have here the printed statement sent out by the Dominion Millers Association of Toronto, of which Mr. C. B. Watts is the secretary. It was sent out at the time reciprocity was under consideration. It gave the result of an interview with Hon. Mr. Fielding, then Minister of Finance. Remember, that the millers at that time were not opposed to reciprocity, but wanted a wider extension. Opposition to the reciprocity agreement on the part of the millers was a second thought, after Mr. Fielding had refused to allow the millers to retain their 50 cents a barrel protection on flour and ship the bran and shorts free to the United States, which was the request of the deputation of millers that waited upon him. They urged that arrangements be made for free entry of brans and shorts into the United States. Mr. Fielding asked them if they would be willing to have bran and shorts come into Canada from the United States free, and they said they would. He then asked them if they would be willing to have flour come in free and their answer was in the negative. Mr. Fielding decided, and I think rightly, that in consideration of the protection of fifty cents a barrel on flour it was reasonable that the Canadian millers should sell their bran and shorts to Canadian dairymen at $2.50 cheaper than the price at which they exported it. To-day we have another proposition before us. Wheat is free in both countries, and so are flour and semolina. I repeat that every barrel of flour coming into Canada from the United States brings in three yards of cotton free in the shape of the bag, and that the Canadian miller is up against it in this competition, because the Canadian Government demands a tariff of 27½ per cent on all the

empty bags brought in. But what is the condition with regard to bran? The Finance Minister lays great stress upon the fact that our wheat crop was pooled with our Ally, the United States, and that we must do all we can to provide bread at reasonable prices. But man cannot live by bread alone—he must have butter on his bread. And how is this Government going to help the Canadian dairymen to produce more butter and more cheese and to answer the demands of the cities for cheaper milk and cream, when it places a tax of 25 per cent on bran and sorts coming into Canada? Let me show the Minister of Finance how that works out. The Order in Council enacting free wheat was passed on the 16th April. On the 14th April the price of bran in Buffalo was $43.50 a ton; in Toronto, $38 to $40, and in Montreal the same. After this Order in Council has been in force for fourteen days, the price of bran had advanced for the Canadian dairyman to $43 to $45 a ton in Toronto, and the same in Montreal; but in Buffalo the price remains about the same as it was on April 14 (indeed a little less), prices being quoted at from $43.75 to $43.25, with $42.25 for May delivery. Thus there is no advance in the price of bran in the United States, but an advance of $5 a ton in Canada. How does the Finance Minister think the Canadian farmer is going to answer the appeal for more butter and cheese, and cheaper milk and cream, under these conditions? But the position is even worse than that. We read in the trade journals of Montreal that last week hundreds of carloads of bran were sold for immediate or future shipment to the United States. It will not be long until there is more and cheaper bran in the United States than in Canada. You cannot blame the miller if he ships his bran to the highest market, but if the Canadian farmer wishes to import bran from the United States he is met by a tariff created by this Government. Bran at Buffalo worth $43.25 per ton is subjected to a duty of $10.80 a ton coming into Canada. That is equal to $216, per car load. But supposing that bran dropped to $30 per ton, as bran is likely to come down as the grass gets better, the duty will be $7.50 per ton coming into Canada, or, in other words, the Government will be collecting from the farmer on every carload of bran that he brings into this country $150. Supposing bran again drops to $20 per ton the duty will be $5 per ton or $100 per car load. In other words, for every car load of bran, made from Canadian wheat milled in the United States, that the Canadian farmer brings into Canada, the Government demands one of his best cows.

My hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Webster) this afternoon pointed out that the price of live stock was almost double what it was five years ago. He gave as the reason that the farmers could not raise live stock profitably if they shipped their milk and cream. I would like to show my hon. friends how they are responsible for this condition. Had we accepted the reciprocity proposal we would have had a market for our butter and cheese in the United States. But we turned that down. The United States revised their tariff and placed milk and cream on the free list. The immediate result of that change was that, from all the eastern townships and from parts of Ontario where they could ship, carloads of milk and cream were going into the United States. Where they could not ship the milk and cream they shipped the cow. Canada lost not only the milk and cream, the butter and cheese, but the profit on the cow, and the labour that might have been utilized on Canadian farms and in Canadian factories manufacturing Canadian cream into butter and cheese to be exported as butter and cheese. The result of this condition is set forth in a bulletin prepared by Mr. Grisdale of the Experimental Farm. Hon. gentlemen can find it in sessional papers No. 16, of the year 1917. In 1913, the year the United States revised their tariff, Mr. Grisdale says that there were 2,188,824 milk cows in eastern Canada. In 1915, after two years of this policy, under which our milk and cream were going to the United States, and under which butter and cheese were prohibited, the milk cows of eastern Canada had decreased in number by 113,074. But it was worse with young cattle. Mr. Grisdale says that in eastern Canada, in 1913, there were 2,479,406 cattle other than milk cows. Two years later the number had decreased by 603,902. That is a condition that has been brought about by changes in the United States tariff. I would plead with the Minister of Finance; just now we have a demand from the housewives of Canada for the admission of oleomargarine, for anything at all to get cheaper fat stuffs for the bread of the children. We have a demand from the cities for cheaper milk and butter. The farmer is blamed for advancing prices. The Finance Minister answers that demand by compelling the Canadian farmer to pay in his own market $5 more for a ton and $100 more for a carload of bran than he was paying fourteen days ago. He has placed

the further restriction upon the Canadian farmer that if he imports bran from the United States under the present conditions he is met at the custom house with a price of $216 per car load. The Minister of Finance boasted this afternoon—and I am just as proud as he is that I am a farmer's boy. He was proud to have been on the farm. I know that the Minister of Finance knows something about farming, probably more than our western farmers do. Farming in the West, after all, is not a very strenuous occupation. The man puts in his crop and waits for it to ripen, then he harvests it, markets it, and he is through. But, in eastern Canada, where men milk and provide milk, cream, butter and cheese for the cities, farming is altogether another proposition. Where a man on the farm has to rise on a cold winter morning and go out to the stable with a coal oil lantern it is a slavish job all the way through, and under these circumstances how can the Minister of Finance expect that the farmers are to increase their herds of milk cattle when the Government creates conditions that make it more expensive for them to produce? I hope the minister will change his mind, and that before we get through with the session he will introduce such legislation as will enable our Canadian farmers to get their bran and shorts without being compelled to go to the custom house and pay an increased tax.

This is a time when we all admit that we have made mistakes. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sevigny) openly acknowledges that he made a mistake in 1911. The Minister of Finance himself has acknowledged that he made a mistake in opposing tariff concessions in 1911. He has made that acknowledgment by an Order in Council. Statesmen from overseas are in Washington in order that by consultation and advice our new Allies may avoid the mistakes made by us in earlier days. Our own veteran statesmen, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) is at Washington and the newspapers tell us that the Minister of Finance and my hon. friend and former fellow-citizen the Minister of Inland Revenue are also to go to Washington. Why not take advantage of the occasion to say to our neighbours that in 1911 we were wrong when we declined to accept their fair trade with them? Let us have a fair trade that will be satisfactory to the East and the West. Will the Minister of Finance rise to the occa- them? Let us have a fair trade that will be conditions which will satisfy the East and the West and prepare the road for a growth and extension which we all hope for Canada, or will the Minister of Finance leave that to his successors? That is a question I am not able to answer.

If I were looking to my own interest and that alone, I would not object too strongly to this protection on bran and shorts. But I am not elected to this Parliament of Canada to look after my own business. I am elected to look after the dairymen of the constituency which I represent, and I beg to submit an amendment to bring the matter fairly before the House. I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Kay (Missisquoi) as an amendment to the amendment:

That to ensure a plentiful supply of bran, shorts, and middlings for the farmers to produce milk, cream, butter and cheese, and for the raising and fattening of livestock, this House is of the opinion that wheat, bran, shorts, and middlings should, without delay, be placed, on the free list.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This amendment is out of order because only one amendment can be moved to the motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. ROBB: Then I give notice that when the amendment of my hon. friend for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) is disposed of I shall propose this amendment.

Mr. JAMES MORRIS (Châteauguay): Mr. Speaker, in rising to ask the attention of the House for a few minutes I certainly do not intend to delay the House at any great length. I have not been in the habit of taking up much of the attention of this House while I have been a member, and I suppose that it is but right that I should occupy one of the back benches. But, Mr. Speaker, representing as I do an agricultural district, I feel that it is my duty to extend to our Minister of Finance the congratulations of the agriculturists of my county, not only those of my county but the agriculturists and, in fact, the whole people of Canada, on the manner in which he has handled the financial affairs of this country. Without going back to the Budgets of the past, let us take simply the one that is before the House to-day.

But before going any further, I feel that I should reply to one statement that the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) made in his opening remarks, when he referred to the men on this side of the House as allies of the Nationalist party. I would ask him to look to his friend the member for Laprairie-Napierville (Mr. Lanctot) if he wants to know what a Nationalist is.

The hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have accused us of an alliance with the Nationalist party. They accuse these men here of being Nationalists. They deny them the right of reformation. But let him look to his friends on the other side of the House for the last two years who have been preaching the doctrines of the Nationalist party, and no man knows it better than my hon. friend the member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb). He has seen the evidence of it right in the village of St. Remi where the hon. member for Laprairie-Napierville had as his principal orators Armand Lavergne and Tancrede Marsil. Let him look into the history of the Nationalists of this country, let him look into the history of the men who have been preaching treason, nothing short of treason, gentlemen, and he sits there, the man who had two of those men as his chief speakers. Then they accuse the Conservative party of connection with the Nationalists. Shame, I say, on hon. gentlemen opposite. If anything, let us be honest. If we are wrong we will admit it. There are men sitting on the Conservative side who have admitted that they did entertain principles favourable or in keeping with the Nationalist principles. They have seen the folly of their ways and have reformed and to-day they are accused by men on the opposite side of the House because they did reform. I would ask hon. gentlemen if Jesus Christ accused St. Paul for reforming? St. Paul was a persecutor of Christ at one time. Did you or any man ever hear of Christ accusing St. Paul for having reformed? Oh, woe unto ye scribes and hypocrites.

I had no intention of launching into a discussion of that sort when I rose to speak. I rose in the first place to congratulate our Minister of Finance, not only the Minister of Finance but the whole Government, on what they have accomplished within the last five years. I think that I have the people of Canada back of me when I make the statement that without going back to former Budgets, the Budget that is to-day under discussion has the approbation of ninety per cent of the honest people of Canada, regardless of the criticism that you hear from the opposite side of the House; for we know, and we can fully realize by the nature of the criticism that has come from the opposite side of the House, that the hon. gentlemen opposite are not sincere and consequently are not honest in their criticism. We can have no better illustration of it than in regard to the matter of free wheat. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been clamouring for that for a number of years.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Mr. MORRIS: Now they have got it, and yet the criticism of the Government to-day is stronger than ever it was before, which leads me to believe that for political purposes hon. gentlemen opposite would deprive their people of what they have been clamouring for for a number of years. We can only judge of that by the statements they have made in the House. I feel justified in saying that the great majority of the people of Canada to-day are satisfied and are offering their congratulations to our Minister of Finance on the manner in which he has handled the financial affairs of Canada. I have no intention of going into details of our national finances. That has already ben done so thoroughly, and the situation has been so well elucidated by the minister himself and by the Solicitor General, that it would be folly on my part to attempt to delve into it. Besides that the financial situation to-day has developed into such tremendous proportions that I am free to admit that it is baffling to the ordinary mind. But we feel to-day that in the man who has charge of the finances of this country we have a master of finance. Future history will record him as such. Not only can I say this of our Minister of Finance, but if I had time I might go over all of the departments and point with pride to their administration.

I will simply give the house a few impressions. Next to the work that has been accomplished in connection with the finances of Canada is that which has been accomplished by the ex-Minister of Militia. I feel satisfied, Sir, that when the history of this country shall be written, the name of Sir Sam Hughes will go down to posterity as one of the greatest men of Canada, notwithstanding the vile attacks that have been made by some hon. gentlemen opposite upon his character. They did not dare to come out openly with any statement, but by certain charges that were made or insinuated, they attempted to cast slurs on his name. But the attempt was an absolute failure, and the verdict of the people to-day is that the charges which were made in this House last winter were without foundation and were brought forward purely for political purposes.

Mr. TURRIFF: Why did the Government kick him out, then?

Mr. MORRIS: The Government are not kicking. They are going to make hon. gentlemen opposite kick before they get through with them. As the representative of an agricultural district, I should not fail to make mention of the Department of Agriculture. I feel sure that I shall be backed by 90 per cent of the people whom I represent when I say that the present Government has done more for agriculture than ever has been done in our district in the past, particularly in connection with the live stock industry. I shall not attempt to go into the details of the work of the Department of Agriculture, which is better known perhaps, to other members of the House than it is to me. One branch that I wish especially to call attention to is the Live Stock Branch, particularly the distribution of male animals, which had its origin in the mind of our late friend, John Bright, who was the head of that branch of the department. En passant, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that it would be out of place if I were to say a word with regard to the death of our friend John Bright, who, I feel, is lamented by agriculturists from one end of the land to the other. He has, perhaps, done more for that particular branch of the department than any other man living. There originated in the mind of John Bright things that never were done in Canada before. He was attentive to his duty, courteous to any one who met him and ready to give good advice and counsel to any one who went to see him. I feel that Canada, and particularly the Department of Agriculture, has met with a great loss in the death of John Bright.

Mr. GRAHAM: Hear, hear.

Mr. MORRIS: We have heard a great deal about free wheat. I was somewhat surprised to hear the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) criticise that measure. Like many of his friends in the past, he has agitated in favour of free wheat. In rejecting that measure the Government did perfectly right, and under former conditions I am pleased to say that this measure is not a change of policy; it is simply an emergency measure consistent with the trade policy always followed.

Mr. GRAHAM: Hear, hear.

Mr. MORRIS: It was done to meet the extraordinary conditions that have been brought about by the submarine warfare. I am glad that we have a Government that is large enough and broad enough in mind to meet situations of that kind. I would myself prefer that this be not a permanent policy, because I do not believe that free wheat would eventually be a benefit to the farmers of the West. Moreover, in legislating here we must have regard to the farmers of the East. The member for Huntingdon knows as well as I do that the stock men of the East are dependent, in a large measure, on the by-products of wheat. If we send our wheat to the United States we shall be deprived of that by-product, and, as a matter of fact, do injury to the stock men of the East by granting free wheat to the farmers of the West.

I have listened with a great deal of attention to the speeches delivered by the hon. gentlemen opposite. I have no doubt that had these same gentlemen gone before the country when the agitation for the Transcontinental railway was in progress they would not have dared to make the statements that they have made in the House to-day. The principal argument made at that time was the necessity of transportation for the great products of our western country—the transportation of our manufactured products from the East, and of the products of the great prairies from the West. That was a reasonable argument, and the people accepted it, the Transcontinental railway was built upon that ground. These same gentlemen now tell us that we should deprive this road of the benefit which would accrue to it through the transportation of the products of the West, by diverting those products to the south. I have been a Protect-

10 p.m.

ionist all my life, and my belief in the principle of protectionism is stronger to-day than ever it was. Before hon. gentlemen opposite took office in 1896, the great dividing line between the two parties was protection or free trade. Hon. gentlemen opposite advocated free trade, although possibly they were not all out-and-out free traders. Just as soon, however, as they came into power, they swallowed with one great gulp all their free trade talk and they simply had to come down from their perch and accept the Conservative policy of protection. That fact is well known to the people of Canada, regardless of what hon. gentlemen opposite may say. If one talks with the thinking men of this country, one will soon realize that. There are a few things that come home forcibly to the ordinary man, and I will cite only two of the reasons why I am in favour of protection. In the first place, it cannot be denied that this country of ours has prospered greatly under a protective policy; second-

ly, we have only to look to the Republic to the south of us to see that it has grown to be a great nation under one of the highest protective tariffs in existence. These are evidences that cannot be denied, I care not what arguments may be brought forward. They are facts going down in history and they cannot be gainsaid. It is said that Great Britain has prospered under a policy of free trade, but conditions there are absolutely different to-day from what they were when Great Britain was in the process of establishing her manufacturing industries. We are told that during the Spanish war the workmen of Great Britain learned from the people of Spain the methods of manufacturing fine fabrics, and that when the Spanish war was over, they came home and put into operation what they had learned in Spain. Great Britain thus grew with practically no opposition until it became the greatest manufacturing nation in the world. When my hon. friends opposite seek to cast reflections upon the manufacturers, they are making a great mistake. We require the agriculturists, but we also require the manufacturers to consume what the farmer produces, and we have that illustration in Great Britain which has become, if not the greatest, one of the greatest nations that the world has ever known, and that result has come about principally through her vast manufacturing industries. Circumstances change, however, and Great Britain now realizes that she has made a mistake in recent years in not putting on a protective tariff. We can see now that Germany had made inroads into the trade of Great Britain and of all her overseas Dominions. Right in our own country we have seen the inroads that the Germans had made in selling to us products that we could manufacture ourselves, and that I think we shall manufacture in the future. That goes to show that a protective policy is the only proper policy for a young country such as Canada.

Perhaps hon. gentlemen opposite as well as hon. gentlemen on this side of the House feel that I am in rather a happy frame of mind, and I may say that I am in so far as this Government is concerned, because as a supporter of this Government I do not think that we have anything to fear in appealing to the country. Although no man in this House or in the Dominion would regret more than I would a general election at the present time when our country is at death's grip with an enemy, yet I feel satisfied that with the record that this Government has at its back, we can go to the country with confidence. I would feel sorry for a man who endeavours to force an election on this country at the present time because I know that that is contrary to the wishes of the people of Canada regardless of their politics. Some of the most staunch Liberals in my constituency are absolutely opposed to an election at this time. The hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) notwithstanding the efforts he has been making during the past year when he has absolutely violated the truce, knows that the people of his own constituency do not approve him; he knows that the Liberal catechism of his own county, the Huntingdon Gleaner, condemns the action that he has taken during the last two years. Later on, Sir, I may have occasion to refer to those matters, but for the present nous avons fini.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, I do not purpose answering the charge of dishonesty. We on this side of the House occasionally have charges of disloyalty and of want of patriotism hurled at us, and my hon. friend (Mr. Morris) in the desire to make a few more charges against us, charges us with being untruthful, insincere, etc. We are quite willing to let those charges go for what they are worth. I would like, however, while the Minister of Finance is in his seat, to refer to one remark of my hon. friend. I was unfortunately absent when the minister was speaking this afternoon, but I understand that he said that the Order in Council providing for free wheat would not be repealed except by the authority of this House, while the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Morris) says that it is merely a temporary war measure and not a policy at all. I must say that the remarks of the Solicitor General are open to the same construction as the remarks of the last speaker. If I am correctly informed, the remarks of the Minister of Finance, however, are not on the same line. I am advised that he said this was a permanent policy until repealed by the House. I will leave the last speaker and the Solicitor General and the Minister of Finance to settle these things amongst themselves. We can take whatever meaning we like out of the speeches, and I suppose that was their intention. If we want to believe it is a permanent policy, we can believe it; if we want to believe it is a temporary policy, we can believe that, and so on. No doubt

these opinions are given out to satisfy different sections of public opinion.

A short time ago I read an address delivered by the Minister of Finance at St. James Methodist Church, Montreal. He disclaimed any intention of preaching a sermon, but I think myself it was rather a good sermon that he delivered on that occasion. His subject was, Self Denial and Self Sacrifice; a very good subject to preach on whether in a church or in this House, and it struck me it would not be a bad text for the minister to dilate upon before his special friends, the highly-protected interests of Canada; I think an address of that kind is very much needed in that quarter. The Minister of Finance, it seems to me, might equally well have called his subject "Efficiency." Among other things he said at that meeting:

> Increased production is necessary, increased agricultural production especially. Every acre, every plot of land in the Empire, should be made to produce this year to the utmost of the human energy available for the purpose.

Further on he says:

> It is the bounden duty of every citizen to multiply his efforts to greatly increase production.

The minister is right. Increased production of foodstuffs for the Allies is sorely needed, and Mr. Balfour seems to have impressed this need upon the people of the United States. But in order to secure this increased production there must be increased efforts and increased efficiency. There are difficulties, however, in the way of increased production in this country. Speaking of the particular part of the country with which I am best acquainted, we have many difficulties to contend with. We have had two bad threshing seasons followed by two late springs, which have greatly curtailed spring and fall ploughing, and necesarily curtailed also the production of food stuffs. These difficulties, unfortunately, have at the same time increased the danger of a luxurious growth of the farmer's great enemy, the weed crop. Those however are not the only difficulties with which the food producers of our country have to contend. Some difficulties cannot be avoided, but others can. One of the great difficulties with which the farmer has to contend is the increased price he has to pay for his implements, caused by the high protective tariff imposed by this Government. In my part of the country the threshing season is very short, lasting only a few weeks. We are obliged to thresh out of the stook, because it is impossible to ge the labour to stack. The result is that any man who has very much of a crop is obliged to have a threshing outfit of his own, not the very largest obtainable, but one that will cost him about $2,500. The most up-to-date outfits cost from $5,000 to $6,000, but the ordinary farmer would get one for his own use costing about $2,500. The duty the dealer would pay on that machine would amount to about $500. The dealer would undoubtedly charge the farmer something additional on the duty he was obliged to pay, let us say ten per cent on the $500; that would be $50, making $550 duty which the farmer would have to pay. Anyone who was asked to pay a direct tax of $550 for some article needed in his business would think it a tremendous charge, but it is only one of the many indirect taxes that we have to pay on account of our protective policy. If the threshing machine that was bought by the farmer was manufactured in the United States $500 of the amount paid by him would go into the treasury of this country; we are not grumbling about that. If the machine is bought from a Canadian manufacturer, the price would be just the same, if not a little more. But if the machine is bought from a Canadian manufacturer no part of the $500 duty that the farmer would otherwise pay would go into the treasury of this country; it would all go into the pocket of the Canadian manufacturer. Now, I find that in the last year for which we have official figures for the manufactures of Canada, we manufactured four times as much as we imported. If that is true with regard to threshing machines, in order for the treasury of this country to collect $500 duty we should have to pay duty on five machines, one imported and four manufactured. I ask you if that is good business. It is an indirect tax it is true, but we have to pay it just the same as if it were a direct tax. The same remark applies to seed drills and a great many other farm implements. Self-sacrifice is needed not only on the part of the farmers, but on the part of the manufacturers as well. Our farmers were criticised for refusing an offer to sell their wheat to the Allies at a price less than one half the market price, and were even looked upon as disloyal by some. But we have got accustomed to this cry of disloyalty and want of patriotism. Only a few days ago an hon. gentleman on this side of the House who has a son at the front, and was anxious to see that he was not exposed to unneces-

sary temptation from the wet canteen, was told that he was unpatriotic for bringing up the subject in the House. Now, I think it would be a great deal better if we cut out these charges of disloyalty and want of patriotism. Many of us have sons at the front and may hear of their death at any moment, and if ever there was a time when this cry should not be raised, surely it is now. I would not like to charge any man with disloyalty, not even those political colonels who strut around our country in the King's uniform, drawing big pay, and who have been on a free trip across the Atlantic to England or France, but who, the moment they smelt gunpowder, turned tail and skipped back home, leaving their men to go to the front without them. I would not charge even these men with disloyalty, though it would be far more reasonable to do so than to make the same charge against our farmers. Sacrifice is needed not only from our farmers, but on the part of our manufacturers as well. There have been cases of self-sacrifice on the part of manufacturers in Canada, but these have been isolated cases, and we want it to be a general thing. The duties on the farmer's tools of trade, if I may call them so, should be absolutely taken off, and the customs duties reduced on other things required by the consumers of this country. Efficiency is needed by the farmer. But efficiency is needed also in all walks of life, and in no place more than in the Department of Finance, but I am afraid there are not many places where it is less shown.

We have heard references to after-the-war conditions, and, though I have little hope of seeing the war end as quickly as some people have, it is worth our while to consider the probable state of affairs after the war. There are troubles we shall have to bear, which will only begin after the war is over. In the first short session after the beginning of the war, we voted $50,000,000 for war expenses. A few months later we voted $100,000,000. In the session following we voted $250,000,000, and this session we have voted $500,000,000—ten times the amount of our first vote; and not a single vote of those I have mentioned has been less than double that which preceded it. I think the man would be rash who should say that we were not almost sure to have another vote in this House, with a strong probability that it will be double the last. I trust that will be the last we shall have, but of course we cannot be sure. All this means that we shall have an extra indebtedness caused by the war of from $1,500,000,000 to $2,000,000,000. We shall also have a yearly pension list of $30,000,000 to $50,000,000. The man who thinks we are not liable to such an amount must be very sanguine as to the early end of the war. That means that we shall have to raise in the neighbourhood of $150,000,000 a year on account of the war alone, besides all that we must raise for other purposes. We hear the boast made that last year we had some $60,000,000 to the good, notwithstanding the fact that we paid $25,000,000 in interest on war indebtedness and pensions—$85,000,000 In all. But we must remember that in these years of war we are sure to be in a very much better position to pay large sums than we are likely to be afterwards. It has been admitted over and over again in this debate, that conditions are abnormal, that revenue and exports are abnormally large. I do not know what our exports of war material are, but I find that for the year 1916 our exports of cartridges alone amounted to about $225,000,000. It is plain that the only reason why our revenue exceeds our expenditure this year is to be found in these conditions, otherwise, we should be far behind, we should not have one cent of surplus to pay towards our indebtedness or pensions or interest on war debts.

The question of income tax has been discussed occasionally in this House. The Minister of Finance objects strongly to an income tax on account of the cost of collection, but I do not think he will deny that the cost of collecting an income tax is trifling compared with the direct and indirect cost of collecting customs taxes. The last year for which we have official figures of the manufactures of Canada is 1910. I find that during that year we manufactured goods to the value, approximately, of $1,166,000,000. Of these, we exported $144,000,000, leaving $1,022,000,000 of home manufactured goods to be consumed in Canada. Our imports of manufactured goods for the same year were nearly $255,000,000. I think we are safe in saying that, generally speaking, the same price is paid for home manufactured goods as for the imported goods. We paid an average duty on imported manufactured goods of about thirty per cent, as nearly as I can gather.

We have listened to the arguments of the Solicitor General on free wheat, and I think those arguments work in very well here. He told us that now that the duty is eliminated, the prices in the importing market are what they were before, less the

duty. That is the actual result he finds in the case of wheat. But the same would be the result in the case of imports of manufactured goods. If the Solicitor General is right in his contention, then, if we throw off the duty from $255,000,000 of imported manufactured goods, we decrease the price not only of those goods but of the home manufactured goods as well to the former level in the importing country less the duty. That is the Solicitor General's own argument in the case of wheat, and if it is a good argument it must apply to manufactured goods as well. We pay $30 of duty on every $100 worth of goods we import. Then we pay about $3 more as a profit for the importer who pays the duty, making $33 on every $100 worth of goods. We consume of home manufactured goods about four times as much as we import, which would represent higher prices equal to $132 for each $100 worth of imported goods. Adding this to the $33, you have $165 which we pay out in order that the revenue may receive $30. Is that efficiency? I submit it is not; it is the most wasteful way we could adopt for the collecting of revenues. Yet we follow this method at a time when it is most important that our methods should be efficient, and that for every dollar we pay in taxes as much as possible should go into the public treasury. People are beginning to recognize the iniquity of operation of the tariff, and the Toronto News, the chief journalistic spokesman in Canada, I suppose, of the manufacturers, as the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) and the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) are the chief spokesmen for protected interests in this House, has the following in its issue of 24th April, 1917:

Manufacturers and the Future.

If the Daily News may speak a word in season we would advise the Association to take every feasible means of justifying fiscal protection as essential to Canadian industries, to the employees of these industries and to the country as a whole. For the most part the manufacturers have a good case and they should place it before the people in effective form. A tariff ferment is working. The Western farmers want lower duties, but on the other hand the war has brought a strong hope of inter-Imperial and even inter-Ally trade arrangements supported by preferential tariffs. The Dominion could not prosper industrially without fiscal protection, and this is why the people support it. The system could never be maintained in the interests of the manufacturers alone, but as the manufacturers control the enterprises and business fostered by the tariff they should take the lead in making its advantages understood by the people.

The manufactures of Canada have never been slow in trying to educate the people upon the effects of protection. However, I think the News feels that they must be a little smarter about it, that there is danger ahead, and that a tariff ferment is working. If the newspaper means that the people are thinking along tariff lines and are beginning to realize the iniquity of the tariff, it is quite right. I do not say that the customs tariff must at once be completely abolished, but I say that a manufacturing industry which requires 30 per cent protection in this or any other country is not suited to the country and it is not in the interest of the country that it should be carried on. An industry that cannot thrive on a 10 or 15 per cent tariff is not suited to the country and should not be continued. I believe that if we would make 15 per cent our maximum tariff rate we would have just as much manufacturing in Canada as we have now, Canada would be more prosperous and the wages paid would be better because we would only carry on manufacturing industries that are suited to the country. The people are thinking along tariff lines to-day. The sentiments expressed so forcibly here from time to time by my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) are just the very sentiments that are filling the minds of the people from the Atlantic to the Pacific, not only the people on the western prairies, but the people of the Maritime Provinces, Quebec and even a very large part of Ontario, protectionist as it is. It is a matter that is receiving a great deal of attention on the part of the people and they are realizing the iniquity of the tariff.

I have been told by a prominent manufacturer in Canada that on some lines of manufacture where the duty is highest the manufacturers are making no money and that they must have more protection to succeed. What does that mean? It means that while in some cases we pay $130 or $140 for goods that we could buy but for the tariff for $100, we are paying that $30 or $40 into the pockets of the Canadian manufacturers for the purpose of making millionaires while in other cases we are throwing the money away. If it is doing no good at all we might as well throw it into the fire if my information is right. What is the use of paying these tremendous duties if they are doing no good? I would say at once, abolish these duties and let the manufacturers who are engaged in these lines of manufacture go at

some work that is suited to the country. The Solicitor General told us something in regard to the western free trade sentiments, and I believe he understands the subject. Some people suggest as a solution for this trouble the establishment of large manufacturing industries in the West. I think that probably the Solicitor General knows the difficulties in the way and that this is not a solution of the question. In conversation once with a prominent Conservative protectionist, he advanced the theory to me that the proper way to do was to establish a tariff between the East and the West so that we could develop manufacturing industries in the West. If we established a tariff against the East we might have protection of the West against the East. If it is correct to say that manufacturing industries are essential to the East surely it is just as correct to say that they are essential to the West, with the tremendous capabilities of that country. We have a country which is capable of sustaining ten times the present population of Canada and we are told that in order to sustain a big population we must have manufacturing industries. I think my Conservative protectionist friend was not so very far astray if his views were right. But they are not correct. I told him that he was following the protectionist argument to its legitimate conclusion, but that I had no use for his proposal.

Mr. BLAIN: How does my hon. friend explain that Winnipeg is the third largest manufacturing city in Canada?

Mr. THOMSON: I do not propose to enter into an argument with regard to Winnipeg, because Winnipeg is not a typical city of the West. It has water powers which the rest of the country has not. The Solicitor General can answer that question better than I can. I am speaking for the large plain district west of Winnipeg. If my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) will come with me to southern Saskatchewan I can take him for days and weeks during the winter time and he cannot find a water power that will run a coffee mill. I think if he talked a little while to the Solicitor General he could put him right on that, and I think the Solicitor General would not for a moment advance that plan of solving the question. In Saskatchewan I have ripened tomatoes very successfully and I know that some people have ripened apples there. Our British Columbia friends tell us that in order to prevent the prairie farmers from eating American apples they must have a considerable amount of protection. We have as good a right to forbid our farmers eating British Columbia apples as the British Columbia men have to prevent us eating American apples. It would take far more protection to shut out British Columbia and American apple growers in favour of the Saskatchewan apple growers than it takes to shut out American apples from the prairies. But the theory is the same. If it is right in one case it is right in the other. Surely we have a right to our own market if we can grow enough tomatoes to supply the demand in Saskatchewan. But, probably our consumers would have to pay more for tomatoes and probably the men who grew tomatoes would do better if they were to go into some other line. Their case seems to me to be the same as that of the manufacturers who are not making any money. But then think of the home market right at our door, instead of going a thousand miles across plains, over mountains and through tunnels to get to that home market. If the argument is good in one case it is good in another. That is the sort of argument we continually hear in favour of protection, this blessed old home market out of which we can make so much money and out of which we never make anything. I do not believe in the theory that any one part of Canada should have protection against another. I do not believe in the theory that we should have this exorbitant protection in favour of any one class of people in Canada as against another. I believe we should produce things suitable to our own soil and climate and that we should buy other articles from those who are in a better position to produce them than we are. I believe different soils, different climates, different conditions and even different temperaments were given us for a great and wise purpose and I am sufficiently old fashioned in my belief to be satisfied that it is poor business kicking against the goads or against the Creator's plans.

In the year 1910, we manufactured goods for home consumption to the value of $1,022,000,000; and they say that we paid duty on the whole of this amount, either into the treasury of the country or into the pockets of some one else, or else we threw it away in cases where the manufacturer was not making any money. We are told that this creates a wonderful home market for us. What about that home market? I find that to produce not only that $1,022,000,000 but the whole $1,166,000,000, wages and salaries are paid to the amount

of $241,000,000, less than 24 per cent of the cost of the manufactured goods. We are paying 25 per cent and 30 per cent on that in order to encourage the home manufacturer and to get the home market. That is, we pay $250,000,000 or $300,000,000 in order to get the home market of people who earn $240,000,000. Then where is the money going to come from? We will have to get more in actual profits than they actually earn in order to be even with the game. That is an exact fact. That was proved conclusively by the Solicitor General in his free wheat argument, proved to the hilt. I believe that if we abolished our protection on a great many things and materially reduced it on other things we would still employ as many labourers as we do now, and would pay as good wages. President Wilson made a careful examination of the wages paid in highly protected manufacutring industries and in those not so highly protected. He satisfied himself that in the lines where they had very little protection they paid higher wages than in those that were highly protected. I think there is no question about that. I once took occasion to look into that myself. I thought that I would get what information I could as to the wages paid in Great Britain, in France and in Germany. As those three countries were naturally in pretty much the same position, the rate of wages, other circumstances being equal, would be about equal. I found that in free trade Great Britain the rate of wages was over 26 per cent higher than in either France or Germany. I found that in those two protectionist countries the rate of wages was practically the same, while in Great Britain it was 26 per cent higher. That bears out the contention of President Wilson that it is in the unprotected manufactures that the best wages are paid. That is quite natural because they are engaged in lines which are natural to the country. The others are not, and therefore are not able to pay such good wages.

The Solicitor General is rather troubled about the slowness of these British statesmen, who do not seem to be bright enough to know when to adopt protection or anything else. He is worried about the adverse balance of trade against them. On page 889 of Hansard, he enters into quite a wail with regard to the unfortunate position of those people in Great Britain. He laments that the balance of trade is against them, that they do not know enough to put on a protective duty, and adds:

> That is the position she is in whereas, on the other hand, it is unfortunately true that her rivals in this struggle have enormous balances of trade in their favour and have, within their own borders, every great industry brought to its highest point of perfection. That is one of the great elemental truths that has enabled Germany to maintain the struggle to this day.

Either the Solicitor General is astray in his statement, or the bluebooks which his Government publishes are seriously astray. I find, in the last Trade and Commerce reports which are available, that Germany during the five years immediately preceding the war, imported during every year much more than she exported. I find that for those five years her imports exceeded her exports by 7,400,000,000 marks, about $1,800,000,000, or $360,000,000, a year on an average. That is protectionist Germany which my hon. friend wants to hold up as an example of a country having a trade balance in its favour.

Mr. WRIGHT: Is that not entirely attributable to the fact that Germany was storing up immense stores with a view of bringing on this war?

Mr. THOMSON: I am not so thoroughly posted in the German policy as to be able to tell my hon. friend just how that was. I find however, that the same thing holds good in every place I have looked for the figures for the exports of Germany at any time for the last twenty years.

Mr. WRIGHT: They have been working for the war that long.

Mr. THOMSON: I am not dealing with the question of why it should be; I am merely meeting the statement of the Solicitor General, who said that the opposite was true, whereas the Government bluebook says that this is the truth.

Mr. WRIGHT: So it would be under normal conditions.

Mr. THOMSON: The Solicitor General says it is under present conditions. The same thing is true, although not to the same extent, of Austria and Bulgaria. I have not been able to find the figures of these years for Turkey. Possibly my hon. friend may find some consolation in Turkey; if so, he will be welcome to it. I may tell my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. Wright) that, according to the Government bluebooks, the most progressive countries in Europe have all a balance of trade against them, and had a balance of trade against them before the war.

Mr. WRIGHT: Name them.

Mr. THOMSON: I shall do so: Great Britain, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Italy—

Mr. WRIGHT: The hon. gentleman proved a moment ago to his own satisfaction that Germany was importing a great deal more for war purposes.

Mr. THOMSON: I did not say anything about war purposes. I said that Germany was importing more, and, therefore, according to my hon. friend's way of putting it, the balance of trade was against her. Is that right?

Mr. WRIGHT: Naturally would be if she imported a large quantity for war purposes.

Mr. THOMSON: I was endeavouring to give a list of the most progressive countries in Europe which had a balance of trade against them. They are, Great Britain, Germany, France, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland. Those are some of them, the best countries in Europe. What are the countries that have a balance of trade in their favour? Russia —not any too progressive generally—Mexico, Spain, Serbia, and, I think, Roumania. I am not saying that we should not have a balance of trade in our favour, but the balance of trade is usually against a new country like this, which is in process of development. It is not a bad thing to buy more than you are selling, provided you are putting your purchases to good use. Even in business the balance of trade is often against one, and it is not always a bad thing. The balance of trade would be against us this year if it were not for the abnormal conditions which exist. As one gentleman has put it, the Kaiser must receive the whole of the credit for the balance of trade being in our favour, and if it is as good a thing as some people say it is, we ought to fall down and worship the Kaiser at once.

The Solicitor General said that Great Britain from 1914 to 1916 had increased her exports only to the amount of 25 per cent. I would have been very glad if Great Britain had been allowed to increase her exports to us to the amount of 25 per cent, but on account of the beautiful little 5 per cent penalty which my hon. friend and his colleagues inflicted on Great Britain at the time of her need, her exports to us at that time decreased from $132,000,000 to about $77,000,000. That is the way my hon. friend and his colleagues treated Great Britain in a time when she needed help.

As I understand the Solicitor General, he says that there is no benefit in free wheat except as regards the lower grades. He refuses to have a statute passed which would have the same effect as the Order in Council, but which would be of a permanent character; at least it would not have the limitations and qualifications which the Order in Council has. In order to prove that we could secure no benefit from the sale in the United States of the higher grades of wheat, my hon. friend depends entirely upon only one day's quotations of the market prices. In the beginning of his speech he remarked, truthfully, I think:

> There is no lesson to be learned, even though the result is truly told and not falsified, by taking individual patches and comparing one year with another. A great historian has said that by taking mere fragments of history you can learn nothing at all, or any lesson you like, but that if you take history as a whole you get great and salutory lessons, valuable for all time. It is the same with the history of our finance.

It was the same also with regard to the history of free wheat—though perhaps the Solicitor General would not agree with me on that point. My hon. friend has quoted the authority of a great historian that you cannot learn anything by taking only patches and shreds into consideration; yet he has taken up one little shred and has tried to prove everything by it.

Referring to the manner in which the market is fixed in Winnipeg, he says:

> Our market is across the water at Liverpool, and as a consequence the price of wheat in this country is fixed by the Liverpool market, less the freight and less one cent a bushel which the grain dealer retains for his profit; I believe that is the rate obtaining with every dealer in grain. The management of the Liverpool Exchange have advised me that the prices fixed for grain have been arrived at by that process, and by that only; and that has always been the case.

My hon. friend gives the quotations which were made on a certain day in Winnipeg, when there were fluctuations of 11½ cents. But the Liverpool Exchange is closed before ours opens, on account of the difference in time; the English grain dealer is through with his day's work before our men start. When the Winnipeg Grain Exchange opens, they have quotations from Liverpool, and these quotations remain the same during the whole day. This being the case, how does the hon. gentleman account for the fluctuations?

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I stated was that the Liverpool prices were cabled to the Winnipeg Exchange and the Winnipeg prices were fixed on that cable in the way that I set forth. Necessarily there are fluctuations on the grain exchange, but the price that is cabled and given out by the

grain exchange or the Grain Dealers Association, as it is called, is the price that rules throughout the day at the different buying points in the West. If my hon. friend will write Dr. McGill, secretary of the Grain Exchange, who gave me the information, he will be told exactly the same thing.

Mr. THOMSON: I do not question what my hon. friend says now, but I question what he said the other day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what I said the other day.

Mr. THOMSON: I read what you said the other day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Read it again.

Mr. THOMSON: I read it exactly as it appears in Hansard; I did not put in one word that the hon. gentleman did not say.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps you did not read it all.

Mr. THOMSON: I did read it all, so far as was necessary to my argument. If there were fluctuations of 11½ cents, that shows that there are bids which are not placed on the Liverpool markets and that the rule which my hon. friend has laid down is not good. This is an erratic world, and I think one of the most erratic things in it is the grain market. It is difficult to say how the grain market will go.

11 p.m.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman still say that there is not a balance of trade in favour of Germany?

Mr. THOMSON: According to the Government blue-books there is a balance of trade against them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You quoted what it was, not what it is.

Mr. THOMSON: I do not know what Germany is doing now; I suppose she is doing what the British fleet lets her do.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The relative proportions of Germany's export trade as compared with that of the British Empire have for years been increasing in Germany's favour. Whereas in 1900 for every £100 worth of German goods exported, there was exported in 1913, £229 worth, Great Britain, for every £100 worth exported in 1900, there was exported in 1913 only £180 worth.

Mr. THOMSON: I object to my hon. friend's making a speech in the middle of my remarks.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend challenged me a moment ago; perhaps he will let me answer him now.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. THOMSON: I think that my hon. friend is rather infringing on his privileges; he is making another speech. I quoted the remarks of my hon. friend, word for word, I showed that he was absolutely wrong, and he dares not deny it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I wish to deny it now, but you will not let me. I want to show you where you are wrong.

Mr. THOMSON: I will read my hon. friend's words again.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman will not let me deny it.

Mr. THOMSON: I will let you deny it, but I do not want you to make a speech. This is the second time that the hon. gentleman has attempted to make a speech in the middle of my remarks, and I do not propose to allow it. The hon. gentleman said, in speaking of the balance of trade:

> It is unfortunately true that her rivals in this struggle have enormous balances of trade in their favour, and have, within their own borders—

And so on. Now what balance of trade Germany has in her favour since the war began I do not think my hon. friend knows; I do not, because we cannot know exactly what is going on in that country, as Germany is not giving out any such information. I have quoted up to the time of the war, and in all these years the balance of trade was against Germany.

Mr. MEIGHEN: She was gaining very rapidly.

Mr. THOMSON: It is true that in the last years she had not been gaining very rapidly. For one year before the war she had made a big jump. I have looked up the figures for the last ten or fifteen years, and I have found that the average is about the same as it was during those five years, a little less, I think, so that she has not been gaining. She may have gained in one year, but you cannot prove things by one quotation. One swallow does not make a summer, although, if my hon. friend so desired, he could prove to his own satisfaction that one swallow made half a dozen summers.

I was dealing with the question of free wheat and of my hon. friend's proof of the statement that we were getting no benefit on the higher grades of wheat. He claims

to prove that by the conditions of the market for one day. I have read a great many opinions of experts in the grain trade, hundreds of which opinions are quoted in the newspapers, and I do not remember seeing a single one that claimed for a moment that the market quotations of the day cited by my hon. friend prove anything, although he says that they prove everything; that they settle the whole question. I submit it does not; the mere fact that there were certain spreads on one day proves nothing. I might just as well claim that because the prices are to-day from 40 to 50 cents a bushel higher than they were at the time the Order in Council was passed, therefore the prices have advanced on account of wheat being put on the free list. The experts do not contend for a moment that the quotations of that day prove anything. Mr. James Carruthers, in the Financial Post of the 28th of April, speaking of free wheat, says:

> I believe it will prove a great benefit to our farmers. Free wheat will contribute to the prosperity of the western farmer, and consequently to his contentment.

I fancy, if I am not mistaken, that Mr. Carruthers was an expert in grain matters when my hon. friend was running around in pantaloons, although my hon. friend thinks that he knows more than Mr. Carruthers about this subject. I quote from the Nor-West Farmer of the 20th of April:

> Regarding the permanent benefits of the removal of the duty on wheat, only time can actually determine.

My hon. friend, however, thinks he can determine it from one day's quotations.

> It will mean much to the western farmers; it will give them this great southern market at their very door, which will be utilized whenever it is advantageous to do so. This will be a permanent advantage.

My hon. friend says it is at present advantageous for him to have free wheat on account of the low grades of wheat, and I grant he is right; but it is advantageous for him to have it at all times, because of the fact that our highest grade of wheat, which is better than anything the American farmer produces, is wanted at all times by the Minneapolis miller for mixing purposes, and he is always willing to pay a little extra price for it, so if we always have that market we shall always get that benefit. I do not purpose saying anything further about this Order in Council or Statute. I tried to secure a little information from my hon. friend when he was speaking, when he claimed that the Order in Council was in exactly the same position as a statute. I asked him if the Order in Council could not be repealed at any momnt by another Order in Council, and he admitted that it could. I am not sure whether he meant by the further answer that he made, to leave the impression that if a statute were passed, it could also be repealed by an Order in Council. My hon. friend may be a little rash sometimes and so may his Government, but they would hardly be so rash as to repeal, by an Order in Council, an Act passed by this House shortly before. I am not, however, going to enter into a discussion as to whether or not an Act of Parliament passed in this way could be repealed by an Order in Council.

Mr. McKENZIE: It certainly could not be repealed unless the statute itself provided for that being done.

Mr. THOMSON: I am not going to enter into a discussion of the effect of this Order in Council when the war is ended. Personally, I believe my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) is right so far as I have been able to follow his argument. I am very glad that the Government have gone so far as they have in the matter of free wheat, although I am very sorry for the way in which we were given free wheat, and I am very sorry that they should have waited until a moment when the placing of wheat on the free list would do the least good, although I am not saying this in a complaining way. Some statements have been made in this House as to the proportion of wheat still in the farmers' hands at the time the Order in Council was passed. The proportion of wheat was very small; but the proportion of low grade wheat is very much smaller, for this reason. The parts of the country in which there were the poorer grades had very light crops, and consequently the farmers did not take long to thresh the grain, and as they needed the money, they marketed those low grades quickly. I believe, therefore, the greater proportion of that grain was marketed and that a very small proportion of it is left in the farmers' hands. The great benefit from free wheat has gone, for this year at least, to the speculator and the miller, and hardly any of it to the farmer. Although I know a few farmers in my constituency who are still holding wheat, I do not know of one who is holding the low grade of wheat.

Mr. LALOR: I think the Government crop reports would lead one to suppose

there is quite a large amount of wheat still in the farmers' hands. I am not saying this as a matter of criticism, but just as a matter of information. Does my hon. friend think that statement is not correct?

Mr. THOMSON: From what I know, there is a very small proportion of wheat in the farmers' hands now. Although the bulk may be considerable, it is a very small proportion of the crop. It must be remembered that the official reports to which my hon. friend refers were made some time ago, and that the wheat is continually and rapidly going out of the farmers' hands, because in the latter part of the winter most of the grain is rushed off. The farmers must market it before the sleighing is over, because after that they have no opportunity until after the seeding is done, and then they are busy ploughing. It is a rash thing for a farmer to hold grain over unless he has an elevator. Some of them are holding grain in elevators, but that is a very small proportion of the crop, and so far as the low grades of wheat are concerned, there is practically none now in the farmers' hands, so that whatever benefit is derived must be derived entirely by the speculators and practically none by the farmers. I think the Solicitor General will bear me out in that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not yet.

Mr. THOMSON: I tried to draw out the Minister of Finance this evening, but evidently he does not want to be drawn. We have heard, however, what the Solicitor General has to say; it was pretty carefully worded, and it might mean almost anything or nothing. We have also heard what the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Morris) has to say. He was very outspoken; I am afraid he blurted the truth right out. He accused us of being untruthful. I could not accuse him of that, because I think he told us the plain truth. This is purely an emergency measure, and the moment it suits the Government they will rescind it.

If the free wheat policy is to be of benefit only in the case of lower grades of wheat, what will happen if we have a good crop this year? Last year our crop was very poor on account of the rust, but this year we may have a good one, plump grain, I hope, like we had in 1915. What would happen in that case? If the Government are thoroughly sincere, and I would not like to accuse them of being insincere, why then at the beginning of next season they will rescind the order; they must, if their reasoning is sound.

Mr. LALOR: You have the positive statement of the Minister of Finance that he will not do that.

Mr. THOMSON: I was not in the House when the Minister of Finance made that positive statement, and I have tried to draw him out this evening but he will not be drawn. There have been so many interpretations of that positive statement of his, that I do not know what it means. I am told that it was merely a statement that the Order in Council would not be rescinded except on authority from this House.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If my hon. friend will read Hansard to-morrow, he will see that he has not correctly quoted me.

Mr. THOMSON: In the meantime, we have the positive statement of hon. gentlemen opposite that it is an emergency measure, and we have the rather roundabout statement of the Solicitor General from which the only reasonable inference is that the Order in Council will be repealed when it is no longer required, and it will be no longer required if we have no low grade wheat this year. I hope we will have none, but I do not want to see this Order repealed.

On motion of Mr. Boulay, the debate was adjourned.

On the motion of Sir Thomas White, the House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

Wednesday, May 2, 1917.

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

REPORT.

Abstract of Statements of Insurance Companies in Canada for the year ending 31st December, 1916. Sir Thomas White.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

PATENT MEDICINES.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Is it the intention of the Minister of Inland Revenue to propose at the present Session a Bill respecting patent medicines?
2. If not, why?
3. Has a repeal of the old law been requested by the different medical associations throughout the country?

4. Was there a formal promise made to these Associations that the present law would be repealed and that a new Bill would be brought down based on the reports and suggestions of the said Medical Associations?

Mr. SEVIGNY:

1. No.

2. This subject is still under consideration.

3. The department has received a number of communications on the subject.

4. No, but the matter has been under consideration.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Has Dr. Magnan resigned as Controller of Patent Medicines?

2. If so, is it the intention of the Government or Minister of Inland Revenue to appoint anybody in his place?

3. If he has resigned, what are the reasons of his resignation, and was it given of his own free will or forced upon him?

Mr. SEVIGNY:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. He was given the choice between resigning and being dismissed.

ADVERTISING FOR RECRUITS.

Mr. MACDONALD:

How much has been paid or spent by the Department of Militia in advertising for recruits in Canada?

Mr. SPEAKER: Stands as order for return.

Mr. MACDONALD: This is a categorical question, Mr. Speaker, and the answer must be very brief. I do not see why it should stand as an order for return.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: It is in form a simple question, but the answer involves the examination of tens of thousands of files in the Department of Militia. It will take a long time to go through these files and collect the information upon which the answer must be based. I will have the information prepared as soon as possible.

Mr. MACDONALD: Will the hon. minister agree, if it goes as an order for a return, that it should cover the names of the persons to whom the moneys were paid?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I would suggest that the hon. member put it on the Order Paper for, let us say, to-morrow.

MAJOR GENERAL CARSON.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Has Major-General Carson resigned his military position overseas?

2. If so, for what reason?

[Mr. Gauvreau.]

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

LIEUT. F. J. S. MACKENZIE.

Mr. PARDEE:

1. What amount of money was paid to Lieutenant F. J. S. MacKenzie for services while recruiting for the Kitchener Platoon of the 131st Battalion, C.E.F.?

2. What amount, if any, was paid for expenses while at this work?

3. What amount, if any, was paid to his wife as separation allowance during same period?

4. What number of recruits were secured for this platoon in the 131st Battalion by his efforts during this period, who went overseas?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: 1, 2, 3 and 4. None.

LT. COL. J. D. TAYLOR, M.P.

Mr. PROULX:

1. Has any sum of money been paid to, or accepted by, Lieut-Colonel James Davis Taylor of the 104th Regiment, Westminster Fusiliers of Canada, for military duty, and as a Member of the House of Commons since August, 1914?

2. If so, what amounts have been paid to him for military salary, military expenses, separation allowance to his wife and family and indemnity as Member of the House of Commons, respectively?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. Yes. (To 16th January, 1917, when he returned to Canada on leave.)

2. As Officer Commanding 104th Regiment Active Militia, Home Guard duty, Military District No. 11, from August, 1914, to February, 1915, $1,162.50; as Officer Commanding 131st Battalion, Canadian Expeditionary Force, from January 1st, 1916, to January 16th, 1917, $2,733.30; total, $3,895.80. Expenses, $323.93; separation allowance, nil; indemnity as member of the House of Commons, $910..

INTERIOR STORAGE ELEVATORS.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Has the Grain Commission made any report recently on the establishment of new Interior Storage elevators in Western Canada?

2. If so, what were its recommendations and is it the intention of the Government to act upon these recommendations?

Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

TAXATION OF DOMINION & HUDSON BAY COMPANY'S LANDS.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Has the Government received the following Resolutions from the Alberta Association of Local Improvement Districts and Rural Municipalities?

"No. 17. R. M. Dowling Lake, No. 305. Whereas certain lands are being held in various Rural Municipalities of the Province of Alberta by the Dominion Government for the Hudson's Bay Company, and known as The Hudson's Bay Company's Reserves, and whereas, the municipalities are deprived of all revenue from taxes on such lands.

"Be it resolved, that we petition the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada to force the Hudson's Bay Company to accept title to such lands, that they may be taxed, or in lieu thereof to have the said lands thrown open for homestead entry.

"No. 18. R. M. Dowling Lake, No. 305. Whereas certain persons have been making a practice of holding Crown lands either as homestead entries, preemption entries or purchased homestead entries, for a number of years without paying their taxes to the various municipalities, and whereas, when such lands are cancelled and revert to the Crown the various municipalities are deprived of the accumulated taxes against the said lands.

"Be it resolved, that we petition the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada to amend the Dominion Lands Act so that the taxes accumulated on lands reverting to the Crown shall be the first charge against moneys paid in by the entrants on account of improvements or moneys to be refunded to the former entrants on account of purchased moneys paid by them."

2. Does the Government purpose taking action to meet the requests made in these resolutions?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes.

2. Complete information was sent the Association mentioned as to the action being taken in these matters.

EMIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. MACDONALD:

What was the number of people who left the Provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta for the United States between the first of August, 1916, and the first of February, 1917, during each of the calendar months?

Mr. ROCHE: The Canadian Government does not collect data regarding persons leaving Canada.

CAPT. RAMSAY RANKIN.

Mr. BEST:

1. Has the attention of the Government been called to an alleged interview published in the Stratford Herald with one Captain Dr. Ramsay Rankin to the following effect:

"Captain Ramsay Rankin, formerly Medical Officer of the 110th Battalion, arrived home last night from England. He is home on an extended leave and will not likely be called on to go back before the fall of the year. "I figured that I was not going to stick around England for two years,' said Dr. Rankin, speaking to the Herald this afternoon. 'There are medical men in England now who have been there for two years and have not got to France yet.' Dr. Rankin said that there was a surplus of medical officers with the Canadian Forces in England and at the present time there are far more than will be needed for some time to come."

2. Is Captain Rankin still a member of the Canadian Expeditionary Force?

3. If so, in what capacity?

4. Is he drawing pay?

5. Is Captain Rankin qualified professionally as a Medical Officer?

6. Did Captain Rankin come to Canada on leave?

7. If Captain Rankin is not on the Canadian Expeditionary Force, when were his services dispensed with, and why?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. Yes.

2. No.

3. Answered by 2.

4. No.

5. Yes.

6. No.

7. April 22nd, 1917, Captain Rankin requested permission to resign his commission in the Canadian Army Medical Corps, C.E.F., and permission to do so has been granted.

BRITISH EMBARGO ON CANADIAN CATTLE.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Have any representations been made by the Minister of Agriculture to the British Government with a view to raising the embargo on live Canadian cattle entering the Mother Country?

2. If so, has there been any answer received?

3. What is the nature of said answer?

Mr. BURRELL:

The Prime Minister is taking up this matter with the British authorities, but I am not aware that any answer has yet been received from him.

THE LATE JOHN BRIGHT.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. Was the late John Bright, Live Stock Commissioner, a graduate of any Canadian university?

2. If so, what degree, what university, and in what year did he graduate?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

VETERINARY DIRECTOR GENERAL.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. Is Mr. Frederic Torrance, Chief Veterinary Inspector of Canada, a graduate of any Canadian university?

2. If so, what degree, what university, and in what year did he graduate?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes.

2. Graduate of McGill University, with the following degrees: B.A., 1878; D.V. Sc., 1890. It is presumed that this question

refers to Doctor Frederick Torrance, the Veterinary Director General.

LIEUT.-COL. CHABOT, M.D.

Mr. CRUISE:

1. Is Dr. Chabot connected in any way with the Militia Department or any other department of the Government?
2. If so, is he drawing pay and at what rate?
3. Is his wife drawing separation allowance?
4. If so, how much?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. Yes; Lieutenant-Colonel in the Canadian Army Medical Corps, and is at present the Medical Officer in charge of the Military Section of the Ottawa General Hospital, Water Street.
2. Yes; $5 per diem, pay of his rank.
3. No.
4. Answered by No. 3.

CONTROLLER OF FOOD PRODUCTS.

Mr. KYTE:

Is it the intention of the Government to appoint an official Controller of Food Products in Canada?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Any announcement that the Government may have to make respecting the matter in question will be made to the House in due course.

SHIGAWAKE EAST P.O.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. What service is given at the new Shigawake East post office?
2. Who carries the mail, and what amount is paid him?
3. Were tenders called for this work?
4. Who were the tenderers, and what was the amount of their respective tenders?

Mr. PATENAUDE:

1. Shigawake East Post Office is to be established on the 3rd May, 1917, with mail service twice a day from the Gaspé and Matapedia Railway post office.
2. The postmaster elect, W. D. Sullivan, will perform the service at $80 per annum.
3 and 4. The offer received from the postmaster elect being reasonable, it was not considered necessary to invite public tenders. It is the usual practice in offices of small revenue to award the contracts to the postmaster if his offer is a reasonable one.

BRIDGING RESTIGOUCHE RIVER.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Has the Department of Public Works received any requests within the last two years for the erection of a bridge over the Restigouche River between Campbelltown and Cross Point, Quebec?
2. If so, from whom?
3. What answer was given?

[Mr. Burrell.]

Mr. REID:

1 and 2. On March 2, 1915, Mr. W. S. Montgomery, of Dalhousie, N.B., requested that a survey be made.
3. That instructions would be given to make a survey, and report on the estimated cost of construction.

PASPEBIAC WHARF.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Has any arrangement been arrived at between the Government and the firm of Robin, Jones & Whitman, regarding the use by purchase or lease, of the company's wharf at Paspebiac, Quebec?
2. If so, what is the nature of the arrangement?

Mr. REID: 1 and 2. No arrangement has been made.

CROSS POINT WHARF.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. What has been the cost of the Government wharf at Cross Point, Quebec?
2. How much was expended there (a) previous to 1911, and (b) how much since that date?
3. Has the work since 1911 been done by day work or by contract?
4. If by contract, who was the contractor, and how much was he paid?
5. How much has been paid to D. Champoux in connection with this work, and when was the money paid?
6. Were tenders called for the timber and lumber supplied for this work, and who were the tenderers?
7. Was D. Champoux one of the tenderers?
8. What were the amounts of the respective tenders?

Mr. REID:

1. $31,241.04.
2. (a) $26,451.81; (b) $4,789.23.
3. Day labour.
4. Answered as above.
5. Nothing.
6, 7 and 8. No tenders were called for. Materials were purchased at market prices from local dealers.

BONAVENTURE BREAKWATER.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. What amount has been expended in the breakwater at Bonaventure, Quebec, (a) on the breakwater, and (b) dredging?
2. How much has been expended there since 1911?
3. Is any work contemplated there this year?
4. If so, what is the nature of this work?

Mr. REID:

1. (a) $46,163.30; (b) $24,307.99.
2. $1,807.26 on breakwater; nothing expended on dredging.
3 and 4. No work contemplated.

HOPETOWN POST OFFICE.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. What is the service at the Hopetown, Quebec, post office?
2. Has there been any change since 1911?
3. If so, what was the change?
4. What amount is paid the mail carrier, and when was the contract awarded?
5. Were tenders called for this work?

Mr. PATENAUDE:

1. Daily except Sunday from Paspebiac.
2. No.
3. Answered by No. 2.
4. The original contract, which provided for a semi-daily service between Paspebiac and railway station and for a daily service between Paspebiac and Hopetown, was entered into at the rate of $260 per annum, but, owing to the fact that one train per day which carried mail to Paspebiac was cut off, the service between Paspebiac and railway station was reduced to six trips per week, and a corresponding reduction was made in the rate of payment to the contractor, thereby bringing the present amount paid him to $208 per annum. The contract was awarded on April 12, 1915.
5. Yes.

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL COMMISSION.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. What was the cost of the Georgian Bay Canal Commission during the past year to January 1, 1917?
2. Has any report been presented from the Commission?
3. How much longer, in view of the necessity of economy, is this commission to be continued in existence?

Mr. REID:

1. From January 1 to December 31, 1916, $18,170.18.
2. Yes, preliminary report laid on table of House and subsequently printed and distributed.
3. The Government is not in a position to say, at the present moment, how much longer it will be necessary to continue this commission.

INDIAN RESERVES.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Has the Government attempted to secure any portion of any Indian reserve for the purpose of land settlement for returned soldiers?
2. Have any definite arrangements been made in that connection? If so, where?

Mr. ROCHE: 1 and 2. No.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

What is the gross amount paid by the Government since October, 1911, to H. P. Duchemin, of Sydney, N.B., for services and disbursements under the Public Inquiries Act, or otherwise?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

1. How many permanent civil servants or officials were in the employ of the Department of Customs on the 10th day of October, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?
2. How many temporary civil servants and employees of all kinds were in the employ of the said Department on the 10th day of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?
3. How many permanent civil servants or officials were appointed by said Department since the 1st of August, 1914?
4. How many temporary civil servants and employees were employed by said Department since August 1, 1914?
5. What was the gross amount paid by said Department for salaries and expenses to both permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1911?
6. What was the gross amount paid by said Department for salaries and expenses of all permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1917?
7. How many civil servants were appointed by said Department since October 10, 1911, under the provisions of Section 21 of the Civil Service Act?

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How many permanent civil servants or officials were in the employ of the Department of Marine and Fisheries on the 10th day of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?
2. How many temporary civil servants and employees of all kinds were in the employ of the said Department on the 10th day of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?
3. How many permanent civil servants or officials were appointed by said Department since the 1st of August, 1914?
4. How many temporary civil servants and employees were employed by said Department since August 1, 1914?
5. What was the gross amount paid by said Department for salaries and expenses to both permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1911?
6. What was the gross amount paid by said Department for salaries and expenses of all permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1917?
7. How many civil servants were appointed by said Department since October 10, 1911, under the provisions of Section 21 of the Civil Service Act?

Mr. CHISHOLM:

1. How many permanent civil servants or officials were in the employ of the Department of Naval Affairs on the 10th day of October, and how many on the 31st March, 1917?

2. How many temporary civil servants and employees of all kinds were in the employ of the said Department on the 10th day of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?

3. How many permanent civil servants or officials were appointed by said Department since the 1st of August, 1914?

4. How many temporary civil servants and employees were employed by said Department since August 1, 1914?

5. What was the gross amount paid by said Department for salaries and expenses to both permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1911?

6. What was the gross amount paid by said Department for salaries and expenses of all permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1917?

7. How many civil servants were appointed by said Department since October 10, 1911, under the provisions of Section 21 of the Civil Service Act?

Mr. CARROLL:

1. How many permanent civil servants or officials were in the employ of the Department of Labour on the 10th day of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?

2. How many temporary civil servants and employees of all kinds were in the employ of the said Department on the 10th day of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?

3. How many permanent civil servants or officials were appointed by said Department since the 1st of August, 1914?

4. How many temporary civil servants and employees were employed by said Department since August 1, 1914?

5. What was the gross amount paid by said Department for salaries and expenses to both permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1911?

6. What was the gross amount paid by said Department for salaries and expenses of all permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1917?

7. How many civil servants were appointed by said Department since October 10, 1911, under the provisions of Section 21 of the Civil Service Act?

Mr. COPP:

1. How many permanent civil servants or officials were in the employ of the Department of Railways and Canals on the 10th day of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st March, 1917?

2. How many temporary civil servants and employees of all kinds were in the employ of the said Department on the 10th day of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?

3. How many permanent civil servants or officials were appointed by said Department since the 1st of August, 1914?

4. How many temporary civil servants and employees were employed by said Department since August 1, 1914?

5. What was the gross amount paid by said Department for salaries and expenses to both permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1911?

[Mr. Chisholm.]

6. What was the gross amount paid by said Department for salaries and expenses of all permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1917?

7. How many civil servants were appointed by said Department since October 10, 1911, under the provisions of Section 21 of the Civil Service Act?

Mr. PAPINEAU:

1. How many permanent civil servants or officials were in the employ of the Department of Inland Revenue on the 10th day of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?

2. How many temporary civil servants and employees of all kinds were in the employ of the said Department on the 10th day of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?

3. How many permanent civil servants or officials were appointed by said Department since the 1st of August, 1914?

4. How many temporary civil servants and employees were employed by said Department since August 1, 1914?

5. What was the gross amount paid by said Department for salaries and expenses to both permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1911?

6. What was the gross amount paid by said Department for salaries and expenses of all permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1917?

7. How many civil servants were appointed by said Department since October 10, 1911, under the provisions of Section 21 of the Civil Service Act?

Mr. DOUGLAS:

1. How many permanent civil servants or officials were in the employ of the Department of Interior on the 10th of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?

2. How many temporary civil servants and employees of all kinds were in the employ of the said department on the 10th day of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?

3. How many permanent civil servants or officials were appointed by said Department since the 1st of August, 1914?

4. How many temporary civil servants and employees were employed by said department since August 1, 1914?

5. What was the gross amount paid by said department for salaries and expenses to both permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1911?

6. What was the gross amount paid by said department for salaries and expenses of all permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1917?

7. How many civil servants were appointed by said department since October 10, 1911, under the provisions of Section 21 of the Civil Service Act?

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. How many permanent civil servants or officials were in the employ of the Department of Trade and Commerce on the 10th day of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?

2. How many temporary civil servants and employees of all kinds were in the employ of the said department on the 10th day of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?

3. How many permanent civil servants or officials were appointed by said department since the 1st of August, 1914?

4. How many temporary civil servants and employees were employed by said Department since August 1, 1914?

5. What was the gross amount paid by said department for salaries and expenses to both permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1911?

6. What was the gross amount paid by said department for salaries and expenses of all permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1917?

7. How many civil servants were appointed by said department since October 10, 1911, under the provisions of Section 21 of the Civil Service Act?

Mr. KYTE:

1. How many permanent civil servants or officials were in the employ of the Department of Indian Affairs on the 10th day of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?

2. How many temporary civil servants and employees of all kinds were in the employ of the said department on the 10th day of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?

3. How many permanent civil servants or officials were appointed by said department since the 1st of August, 1914?

4. How many temporary civil servants and employees were employed by said Department since August 1, 1914?

5. What was the gross amount paid by said department for salaries and expenses to both permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1911?

6. What was the gross amount paid by said department for salaries and expenses of all permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1917?

7. How many civil servants were appointed by said department since October 10, 1911, under the provisions of Section 21 of the Civil Service Act?

Mr. MACKENZIE:

1. How many permanent civil servants or officials were in the employ of the Department of State and Mines on the 10th day of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?

2. How many temporary civil servants and employees of all kinds were in the employ of the said department on the 10th day of October, 1911, and how many on the 31st of March, 1917?

3. How many permanent civil servants or officials were appointed by said department since the 1st of August, 1914?

4. How many temporary civil servants and employees were employed by said Department since August 1, 1914?

5. What was the gross amount paid by said department for salaries and expenses to both permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1911?

6. What was the gross amount paid by said department for salaries and expenses of all permanent and temporary civil servants and employees for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1917?

7. How many civil servants were appointed by said department since October 10, 1911, under the provisions of Section 21 of the Civil Service Act?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

For a copy of all letters, petitions, recommendations, tenders and other documents in the possession of the Port Office Department, bearing date after July 1, 1913, relating to the mail service between Malignant Cove and Knoydart, in the County of Antigonish, N.S.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, Orders in Council, etc., relative to the dismissal of James Lovett from the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Halifax, N.S.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

For a copy of all Orders in Council, letters, telegrams, etc., to or from any employee of the Government in reference to the improvement and equipment of the life saving station at Whitehead, Guysborough County, N.S.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

For a copy of the report of the Commission appointed to investigate the condition of the Military Hospital at Halifax, with a copy of the evidence taken by said Commission at Halifax and all other documents in the possession of the Department of Militia and Defence in connection with such investigation.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

For a copy of the report of the Royal Commission appointed by Order in Council, 20th September, 1916, to inquire into and report upon the conditions in regard to the delivery of cargoes of coal to coasting vessels in the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. MACDONALD:

For a copy of all letters, copies of letters, telegrams, reports and all other documents relative to the purchase of the two vessels, A. J. McKee and T. J. Drummonds, by the Railway Department under the Order in Council dated April, 17, 1917.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN PRIME MINISTER AND EX-MINISTER OF MILITIA.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.) moved:

For a copy of the correspondence between the Prime Minister and the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence which led to the latter's resignation or dismissal from the Government.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I would suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) that as a matter of courtesy to the Prime Minister he might allow this motion to stand until his return. The correspondence asked for is that which has passed between the Prime Minister and the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence. I submit that there might be considerable of the correspondence of a confi-

dential character, and it is only proper that the Prime Minister should himself have an opportunity of pronouncing upon this motion, as he is the only member of the Government who could authorize the bringing down of the correspondence in question. I submit to the House that it is due to the Prime Minister that my hon. friend should allow his motion to stand until the Prime Minister returns.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: I have no objection to that suggestion, but I might remark that on the 7th of February, the day of the adjournment, the Prime Minister stated that it would be brought down.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not at all question what my hon. friend has said, but, as a matter of fact, this information could not be brought down until the Prime Minister returns. I would not like to see that order passed without giving him an opportunity to speak upon the motion if he should so desire.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: The matter can stand until the Prime Minister comes back.

Mr. SPEAKER: Motion stands.

PHYSICAL WELFARE OF THE CANADIAN PEOPLE.

DOMINION DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SUGGESTED.

Mr. MICHAEL STEELE (South Perth) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the efficiency of the nation depends largely on the physical condition of the people, and in order that the latter may be conserved in the largest possible measure, there should be organized a separate department of the Government having supervision over all matters relating to the physical welfare of the Dominion.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in commencing my remarks I desire to offer an explanation which will make clear the intention of the resolution now before the House. It is well known that under the British North America Act the provinces have jurisdiction over:

The establishment, maintenance and management of hospitals, asylums and charities and eleemosynary institutions in and for the province, other than marine hospitals.

The House is also aware that since Confederation the provinces have undertaken many lines of public health work which they continue to carry on with much benefit to their people. The intention of the resolution is in no way to interfere with the rights and functions of the provinces, and for this reason it would have been better had the last clause of the resolution read:

There should be organized a separate department of the Government having supervision over all matters relating to the physical welfare of the people of the Dominion so far as they come within the Federal jurisdiction.

It is perhaps no exaggeration to say that at no period of our history has the prevention of disease and the physical welfare of our people occupied so large a place in the thoughts of every intelligent community as obtains at the present day. This has been accentuated by the present war in Europe. Prior to the outbreak of war there was much evidence of the progress of sanitary science and of the satisfactory results therefrom. We had seen typhus fever, cholera, and other less acute diseases practically exterminated in civilized nations. We had seen the rate of mortality from typhoid, smallpox, scarlet fever and others vastly decreased. We had seen the rate of mortality in England and Wales reduced from 21.4 per 1,000 to 14.6 per 1,000 in the last fifty years, thus saving the lives of 345,000 people each year.

But the war has furnished some remarkable examples of the value of sanitation and medical science. Instead of thousands of our brave soldiers dying from typhoid, as occurred in all previous wars, and tens of thousands being affiicted and rendered useless by the same disease, we find that by the efforts of medical science typhoid in the army has been practically exterminated so much so that in the year 1915 in the great British army, including the forces from the overseas dominions, only some 46 cases of typhoid occurred. Let this House imagine, if they can, the increased efficiency of the Army on this account. Dr. W. Osler's opinion is that if inoculation against typhoid in the armies were universal it would increase the efficiency of the forces by one-third. Not only typhoid but cholera and tetanus, the greatest enemies of the British soldier in all previous wars, are beaten for all time to come. Not only this, but the death rate from sickness in the millions fighting under the Union Jack, has been less than the rate of mortality among men of military age remaining at home. When a man joins the army he is taught how to live. His food and general life is regulated to produce vigorous manhood and these described conditions are the result. The war has taught us this lesson, that a nation fights upon its health. The fit man has not only to protect himself and his family but also to protect the unfit man and

his family who are unable to protect themselves. War has shown what can be done when qualified men are given power and resources with which to cope with disease. We all deplore the immense loss of life in war but if we are willing to utilize the lessons taught by the war we can in future save many more lives each year than are now being lost in the European conflict.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we can conquer disease in war, surely we can overcome it in time of peace. We have seen something of what science has wrought in the war spheres but lest Parliament may conclude that it is only in war time that problems arise affecting the health of our people, let me assure this House that the health problems of times of peace while possibly not so acute are of still greater importance to the future welfare of the nation. Canada is on the threshold of nationhood. We have the experience and the errors of the European nations and the United States to guide us and we should profit therefrom.

There are two great avenues through which our population increases, viz., immigration and natural increase.

How can our Government help the efficiency of the nation through immigration? First, by encouraging physically and mentally fit people to settle in our land, and secondly by refusing admission to our country of those who are physically and mentally unfit to become productive citizens. The need of attention to the latter problem is evidenced by the following facts: The number of feeble minded in Canada is constantly increasing. There are to-day in Ontario 7,700 feeble minded and probably at least 20,000 in the whole Dominion. This does not include the insane, idiots, epileptics, etc. From a population of 20,000 the number of this class will rapidly increase, for these people multiply rapidly, and 80 per cent of the offspring of such parents will be feeble minded. The only effective way to check the increase from this source is to segregate them, and it is estimated that if this plan were put into operation now by the year 1950 this country would be free from this menace.

The Government may constitutionally be relieved from responsibility for the care of our feeble minded population, but they cannot refuse to accept responsibility for the admission through our immigration ports of such people. It is beyond dispute that our system of examination of immigrants is too lax. During the year 1914-15 there were deported from Canada, on account of imbecility, insanity, and mental defect, 154 persons. All of these must have been admitted within three years previous, and under a strict supervision of cases nearly all of these could have been excluded. Six hundred and six were deported during the three years 1913-14-15, and even this figure does not indicate, with any accuracy, the number of such cases admitted to the country.

Since the Public Health Service of the United States has taken over the work of examining immigrants at the New York port of entry the methods have been greatly improved, and in consequence there are 75 per cent more rejections than formerly. Officials who have charge of the medical examination of these immigrants estimate, from their experience, that four out of every one thousand who apply for admission to that country are mentally defective.

If the examinations at the Canadian ports of entry were equally thorough, and they ought to be, many feeble minded who are now admitted and later deported or become a charge and menace in the country, would be rejected. As evidence of this let me quote the results of a test made in 1914 by Dr. Pagé, our very excellent and efficient superintendent of immigration at the port of Quebec. In July and August of that year he secured the services of Miss Mateer, a specialist from the School of Feeble Minded at Vineland, New Jersey, to assist in examining immigrants for mental defect at the port of Quebec. In those two months 14,700 were examined, and of these 2 in 1,000 on an average were found to be mental defects. If that proportion held good throughout all our immigrants there were, during 1914-15 and the two preceding years, nearly 2,000 mental defectives who sought admission into Canada, while at least two-thirds of them were admitted. If the proportion found at New York held good at our ports there must have been admitted to Canada in these three years at least 3,000 mental defectives—an appalling number.

We are to-day paying the cost of this lax system. A few statistics will illustrate this. In 1914 there were admitted to the Ontario hospitals for the insane 1,451 patients, and of these 545, or 37½ per cent were born outside of Canada. Undoubtedly a large percentage of these could have been excluded by a rigid inspection by trained experts, and by investigation of their family history in the lands whence they came. Out of 2,438 patients admitted to the Orillia asylum for feeble minded since it was opened 424 were born outside of Canada. There were admitted to the hospital for

epileptics at Woodstock, Ont., during the nine years of its existence, 435 patients, of whom 80 were born outside of Canada. As each of these patients costs on an average $300 per year, it can be seen it is costing the province of Ontario an enormous sum each year to care for the mental defectives who are admitted to Canada and who could be kept out of the country by more careful inspection by qualified inspectors. But the cost does not end there. Each succeeding generation swells the number, for at least 80 per cent of their offspring will also be feeble minded. And these are among the material we are expected to change into patriotic citizens.

From the ranks of this class, too, are recruited many of our criminals. Dr. Goddard, of Vineland, says:—

> There is no such thing as hereditary criminals, it is hereditary feeble-mindedness that accounts for the conditions. Criminals are not born, they are made, and probably fifty per cent of all criminals are mentally defective.

So intimately associated is the problem of mental deficiency with crime, poverty, disease, immorality and other social evils that health authorities, educational authorities and the courts are deeply interested in a satisfactory solution.

The greater number of our immigrants are from Great Britain and the United States. In the former country it is estimated that there are at least 300,000 feeble minded, and in the latter country half a million. We see, then, how easy it is to have large numbers of feeble minded seeking admission among our new immigrants.

But the meance through our immigration is not confined to feeble mindedness. This applies also to the tubercular. In 1914, out of 746 inmates of a number of Canadian tuberculosis sanitaria, 93 in all, or 12 per cent of the total, had been in Canada less than three years. In the Winnipeg sanitarium, of 174 inmates 24 were admitted during the first year in the country and 20 in the second year. In all, 52 had been in Canada less than three years. In the Lac Tranquil sanitarium, Kamloops, B.C., of 400 admissions 8½ per cent had been in Canada less than one year.

When we consider that only 25 per cent of our tuberculosis cases are in sanitaria we can estimate the enormous number of such cases that are finding a refuge in Canada, and so increasing the burdens of the Canadian taxpayers and menacing the health and efficiency of the people. And in this young country, where we are now laying the foundations for a future mighty nation, we allow this condition to develop. We prohibit child labour, or place restrictions upon it in the interests of the race, and very properly so; but I wish to say, in all sincerity, that the wrong done even unborn children and the Canadian people generally by parents, defective or diseased, whom the state permits to marry and multiply, is a vastly greater danger to the state than child labour.

Let me speak now of communicable diseases. The suppression of these diseases should be made a state problem, because they attack the citizenship of our country. We are ready, prompt and effective in resisting the foe from without, but, I fear, indifferent and negligent in our resistance to the greater foes within. Someone has said that these diseases are the children of a nation's ignorance and neglect. Protection against communicable disease is as important as protection against larceny or incendiarism, assault, or even murder.

It is estimated that there are in Canada every year at least 50,000 deaths which could be prevented. These deaths are caused by polluted water, impure and adulterated food and drugs, epidemics, various preventable diseases such as tuberculosis, typhoid, etc., unclean cities, and bad sanitation in our homes. Fifty thousand people dying each year whose lives could be saved —and this Parliament gives scarcely a thought to it. If 50,000 people, half the population of Ottawa, were destroyed, say, in one day by some terrible calamity, would we not take notice of it! There are in Canada 500,000 cases of preventable disease every year. If we should read in the press to-morrow morning that the whole population of Montreal was stricken with some disease, would we not wake up and take action? Yes, 50,000 of our people are needlessly dying every year. 500,000 are suffering from illness which can be prevented, and $100,000,000 or more is being lost every year—and still we give no heed.

This leads me to speak of the vast economic loss to the workingmen of the country through sickness, and again I am compelled to use statistics from the United States, because we have none dealing with the matter in Canada. The report of the Committee on Industrial Relations appointed by Congress made a very searching investigation of this subject and said that each of the thirty million workmen of the United States were losing on an average nine days work each year from sickness. This meant to them a total loss of $680,000,000 annually. From sicknes unemployment

results, and from this follow further distress, destitution and disease. All charitable organizations testify that a very much larger percentage of the cases that apply for asistance are driven to them by sickness than by unemployment. The economic evils of sickness are recognized so generally that numerous remedies have been advocated. The one most generally adopted is that of social or health insurance. Most European countries have adopted this policy of alleviating the distress resulting from sickness. The last to do so was Great Britain, when in 1911 Lloyd George's scheme was put in force. The United States is at present devoting much thought to this matter, and it is probable that within a few years that country, too, will have some such system. Canada, sooner or later, will have to grapple with the conditions produced by sickness among her people. But there is for this young country a better way than the method forced on the older nations by their past neglect. We are to-day in a position to prevent the conditions which have demanded relief in the older countries. These remedies are merely palliative. Conditions are permitted to develop which demand a remedy. Better far for Parliament to prevent such conditions than to play at effecting cures after they have been allowed to become established. So we ought to do in Canada.

Society is demanding each year greater skill and greater efficiency of its members, a requirement that calls for a greater investment in the training of the individual and a condition that makes the economic loss due to preventable diseases most appalling. The great economic loss due to the deaths of individuals before they have become an earning power, and of persons dying during the most productive period of life is relatively small as compared with the enormous loss caused by illness, with its consequent loss of time of the wage earner, the inefficiency of the worker, the expenditure for medicine and attention and the absence or decrease of productiveness on the part of other individuals who must spend a part of or their entire time in caring for the sick. It is obvious that this large loss of life and health constitutes a serious curtailment of the productive efficiency of the nation, and that a heavy economic burden results from the support of invalids, defectives, and those deprived of their bread winners.

The United States National Conservation Commission have also looked into this matter, and the substance of their report is this: 42 per cent of all deaths are unnecessary; over 630,000 lives could be saved annually in the United States by applying existing and known methods of life-saving. This would add at least fifteen years to the average duration of human life.

Perhaps, however, the one most appalling feature of the whole subject is the vast national loss resulting from infant mortality. The Canadian people are waking up to the fact that there is an enormous waste in infant life. The war is teaching us the value of babies. We may be asked how can these helpless, expensive little creatures be of value in this war time? It is because they are our future men and women, and saving the babies is providing the nation with its future man power. There are dying in Canada every year about 30,000 children under one year of age, 15,000 of these lives could be saved. These would be Canadian born citizens ready to take their places in the ranks of Canadian citizenship. We spend hundreds of thousands of dollars in inducing people from all parts of the world to come to Canada, many of whom never become Canadian citizens and never get into close touch with Canadian life or Canadian institutions; yet by our indifference and neglect we lose every year 15,000 possible future citizens, the progeny of our own people—and still we are told that Government has no responsibility in the matter. It may appear absurd to speak of the conservation of human life at a time when almost the entire world is engaged in a struggle which daily demands the sacrifice of thousands of lives, but even in the midst of this cruel slaughter, where a terrible drain of life is necessary, if Canada and the British Empire are to live, it surely becomes increasingly urgent on this Parliament to offset this terrible loss by minimizing the unnecessary sacrifice of child life. The baby is worth saving and worth being surrounded by healthful conditions, so that when manhood or womanhood is reached we may have a healthy citizen. In Britain the army doctors have rejected a million men for physical unfitness. In Canada, while I have not the figures, I have no doubt that the proportion is equally large. Surely this is a national loss which calls for intervention. Our citizens and soldiers are grown up babies, and we cannot have the grown up man without first having the baby. Had the conservation and preservation of human life in Canada received during the last fifty years the same attention that the health of the

horse, the cow, the hog has received, Canada would to-day have been able to put in the field an army of 600,000 men as easily as she has raised her present 400,000.

I have endeavoured to show the House some of the problems—national problems—which Canada must sooner or later face with all seriousness. We have the problem of the physically and mentally defective immigrant becoming a menace and a burden to the nation. We have the prevalence of communicable diseases with all their evils, bringing death to thousands, lessening the efficiency of other thousands, and impoverishing tens of thousands of our citizens, most of which diseases are preventable. And then we have the problem of infant mortality. Surely these problems are worthy the attention of this Parliament.

With all the changes and advances and improvements in departmental administration during the past quarter century, the administration of health matters remains unchanged, and this notwithstanding the fact that probably nothing has so much required improved and modern methods of administration. To quote again the great Disraeli, "The care of the public health is the first duty of a statesman." Disraeli knew nothing of the conditions in Canada but I wish to quote the opinions of men who do know the conditions. At the meeting of the Civic Improvement League of Canada, held on January 20, 1916, the following resolution was passed:

> That the league petition the Dominion Government to establish a Federal Department of Public Health, in order that all matters of health and disease under Federal, provincial and municipal jurisdiction, the compilation of health literature, the direction of research work, and the preparation of statistical records may be systematized, co-ordinated and unified for the sake of greater economy, progress and efficiency.

At every congress of the Canadian Public Health Association since its organization in 1911 the following resolution was passed:

> That in the opinion of this association it is a matter of great importance that the Dominion Government do take steps to create a Department of Public Health, in order that all Federal branches dealing with health work may be co-ordinated under one administration.

The Canadian Public Health Association embraces in its membership representatives from all the provinces. In it are found most of the men who have given public health close and continuous study for many years—the men who are actively interested in public health—and this resolution is the result of their opinions. At the inaugural meeting of the Canadian Public Health Association, held in Montreal on the 13th of December, 1911, His Royal Highness, the Duke of Connaught spoke as follows:

> Of the many subjects which are awaiting solution in Canada, none is so important to my mind as that of the health of its inhabitants, both adult and infant. It is a subject which affects every one of us individually, and we owe it to ourselves and to the rising generation to see that conditions are improved, so far as lies within our power. Public health is a question which arises above all politics and it is the duty of the whole nation to join in promoting the objects of the association which is now gathered here.

The present unbusinesslike, necessarily inefficient and expensive system, when we estimate it by results achieved, is indefensible, and is, in my opinion, a reproach to the administrative methods of this and previous Governments. A Department of Public Health, as proposed, would co-ordinate the various Federal activities that we have already and put them together under one intelligent management. This is the businesslike plan; it is the economical method, and of greater importance than either, it is the only plan which can give efficiency.

Practically every continental European country has a National Health Service. The United States in 1912, notwithstanding the previous existence of State Health Boards, established a Federal Public Health Service, and already it has proven its value, and lastly, at the present moment, we have the example of Great Britain where the question is now under consideration. The recent report of the Local Government Board, of which Lord Rhondda is the president, recommends the establishment of a Ministry of Health in the British Government, and there is every reason to believe the recommendation will be adopted. A Ministry of Health is urged as a war measure, first and foremost, the central fact of the situation being that if the nation is to survive it must look to its health and the health of its children. The press of Great Britain generally commends the proposition. The London Daily News in an editorial of April 2 last said:

> It is an interesting and in its way a hopeful fact, that both Lord Rhondda and the very strong Unionist Social Reform Committee,—which includes such men as Lord Henry Bentinck, Mr. Leslie Scott, and Major Waldorf Astor—should have apparently arrived at the same conclusion in studying from different angles the important subject of national health.

On certain points there is a general agreement. No one will deny, for instance, that the present state of things cannot be suffered to continue. The most elementary consideration of economy and efficiency make it essential that the hopeless administrative chaos which the committee hold up to just ridicule in their report should be brought to an end as speedily as possible. But apart from this, no one now questions that the problems of national health are in every sense matters of life and death for the nation. We cannot afford to suffer conditions to continue under which the President of the Local Government Board can express his considered conviction that a thousand infant lives 'are needlessly lost' every week; and that this is only one side of a very many sided problem.

And on the same day The Times editorially said:

It is scarcely disputed that during recent years our health services have tended to outgrow their strictly departmental character. They have progressed in efficiency and in importance, but their growing importance has only served to reveal the isolation in which each of them stood. Powerful instruments of good in themselves, they often failed in the larger sense because they lacked a common purpose and a common direction. Machinery was multiplied without a corresponding gain in achievement; there was waste of men and material; there was overlapping. To careful students of these circumstances it appeared inevitable that sooner or later the streams must unite, and now events have lifted the question above the level of more intelligent anticipation. A national need has arisen which makes it imperative that union should take place forthwith. Our losses in the field can only be made good by preventing needless losses at home.

For these reasons we welcome the proposals which have been made by the President of the Local Government Board. Lord Rhondda signalized his entry to office by declaring that 1,000 infant lives could be saved every week. He has now indicated in what manner he believes this vital economy can be secured. He proposes the formation of a Ministry of Health, in which various departments supervising medical matters shall be concentrated.

We recognize the fact that our ministers are burdened with work at the present time, but under the crushing load of duties daily imposed upon them they have a thought for the future of our land and of the problems which the future—the near future—must grapple with. The care of health of the nation may not be urged upon them so insistently as some other matters; but I am sure their expressed appreciation of the needs, and their sympathy with any efforts to correct the conditions calling for remedy will lead them to give the matter sympathetic and, I hope, favourable consideration. The minister who gives Canada an efficient Health Department confers upon the future citizens of our country and upon the nation as a whole a boon that will loom large in the minds of future generations. But it may be asked what can a Federal Department of Public Health do? Let me summarize:

1. It could have supervision of the examination of immigrants as to their mental and physical condition, with a view to excluding large numbers of mental and physical defectives now admitted.

2. It could have supervision of quarantine at our ports and the prevention of the importation of communicable disease.

3. It could have the care of marine hospitals.

4. It could collect vital statistics—we have in Canada no complete statistics of births, marriages and deaths for the whole Dominion.

5. It could have supervision of foods and drugs, as they affect the health of the people.

6. It could collect information of the prevalence and geographic distribution of disease and other pertinent sanitary information.

7. It could investigate causes of disease.

8. It could co-operate with and render assistance to provincial health authorities.

9. It could distribute information and literature regarding the prevalence, distribution, causation and prevention of disease.

10. It could establish a great national hygienic laboratory. This could be operated in connection with the work of the Research Commission for the appointment of which the Government deserves much credit.

I trust that this matter which I have endeavoured to bring before the House at this time will receive the consideration, not only of the Government, but of all the members.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL: Does the hon. member intend to ask that any of the powers now held by the provinces in this matter should remain with the provinces or that they should be brought under the control of the Dominion by an amendment to the British North America Act?

Mr. STEELE: There should be no interference whatever with the work now being carried on by the provinces; but there are other lines in which, with a federal health service, the health work of the nation could be co-ordinated in such a way that there would be no interferences with the pro-

vinces; there would be no overlapping; there would be much greater economy of service and much greater efficiency. There are, of course, many matters which the provinces have not power to deal with, as the British North America Act places the great bulk of health work under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

4. p.m.

Mr. EUGENE PAQUET (L'Islet) (translation): Mr. Speaker, with the leave of the House, I shall speak a few words to the resolution proposed by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele). What is the aim of the resolution?

That, in the opinion of this House, the efficiency of the nation depends largely on the physical condition of the people, and in order that the latter may be conserved in the largest possible measure, there should be organized a separate department of the Government having supervision over all matters relating to the physical welfare of the Dominion.

In this morning's issue of the Ottawa Citizen, the hon. member for South Perth is reported as seeking to secure the organization of a department of public health, in order to promote the teachings of one particular school. The hon. member has already made it clear to the House that the resolution is no way concerned with the teaching of medical science or the doctrines of any particular school.

The hon. member for South Perth is entitled to the congratulations and thanks of the House. His disquisition is admirable, bearing as it does on a subject which is of interest to the whole Canadian people. It is universally acknowledged that a nation's strength and vigour depends to a great extent on the physical condition of its constituent elements. The great strides made in medical science since the wonderful discoveries of Pasteur, Koch and Lister have saved countless human lives. The results attained in scientific research and modern sanitation account for the preservation of hundreds of thousands of soldiers' lives. The health and strength of the Canadian nation largely depend on the moral, physical and mental qualities of the people and of the foreign element which is bound to come to our shores. Our first care should be to eliminate from among the British and American immigrants, who seek admission, the mentally defective. In Great Britain and the United States it is claimed that 600,000 persons suffer from mental diseases in one form or another. Immigrants should be subjected to a rigid inspection as to their mental condition by experts in disease of the brain. At a special clinic in a Toronto hospital, it was found, as stated by the hon. member, that a large number of the weak-minded were foreigners. It behooves us then to require a more rigid examination of immigrants, so that any who later might become a menace to the vigour of the race may be refused admittance.

There is nothing in the constitution to prevent the establishment by the Federal Government of a department of public health. Since Confederation, the Federal Governments have dealt with many matters concerning public health, but the enactments of provincial legislatures in that sphere must be kept in mind. In Canada the importance of sanitation is being recognized more and more. In the province of Quebec, to speak only of my province, there is a Board of Public Health which has to deal with the problems of hygiene and to cope with epidemics. Its sphere of utility is being extended every day. In the same province there are health officers who look after hygienic conditions. Last winter, Laval University at Quebec gave lectures on public sanitation, the graduates at the end of the course being awarded a degree in hygienic science. Some of the graduates secure positions as sanitary inspectors.

I feel that the best means of developing the physical welfare of our people is by the establishment of a federal department of public health. But before working out the details of the scheme, representatives of the Provincial and Federal Governments should hold a conference to decide on a course of action that would avoid all possible encroachment on provincial jurisdiction. Once a mutual understanding is reached, the proposed department could easily be set in operation. Public health work is extending its usefulness every day, and I have no doubt that such a department in the Federal Administration would soon prove its necessity. At the present time matters concerning the public health are divided among various departments, with no attempt at co-ordinate action, such as could be secured if they were all united under one responsible head.

I wish to call the especial attention of the Government and of the Minister of Inland Revenue to the Act concerning patent medicines. That subject is one for a public health department to consider. I have closely examined the Act and read important articles dealing with the enactment. As a result of a careful study, I should ask the Government and the House

to repeal or amend the law so as to afford a greater measure of protection to the public. It has been said by a physician: Public health is indeed endangered, because everything, in so far as it is concerned, is done in the dark. It offers a fertile field for the operation of quackery. No doubt as to that.

I wish to congratulate heartily Dr. L. F. Dubé, of Notre-Dame-du-Lac, county of Temiscouata, province of Quebec, on the lecture he delivered in the month of September, 1916, before the Commission of Sanitary Services. Whoever reads this dissertation cannot but urge an immediate revision of the law concerning patent medicines. With the leave of the House, I shall read the following extract from his lecture:

"When a department or a federal board of public health is established at Ottawa, it is to be expected that it will be entrusted with the supervision, inspection and control of all matters coming under the Act, as well as with the enforcement of the law, and control over the sale and manufacture of patent medicines. The work should be carried on under medical officers or health specialists duly authorized."

Medical associations have insisted on the repeal of the present Act, and I cannot urge too strongly the necessity for new legislation. In every department of the service there are at present to be found branches having to do with matters connected with public health, and which should properly be entrusted to one department. The result would be unity of purpose and action, which are indispensable if it is desired to reap all the fruits of modern scientific achievements.

Before resuming my seat, I wish to say a last word of commendation of the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele), for having called the attention of the House and of the Government to such an important subject as that of public health.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Minister of Agriculture): My hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. Steele) had a resolution of somewhat similar character last year, and, in presenting it, he brought forward a great deal of valuable data on the subject of control of the health of the nation and of the jurisdiction in these matters of the provinces and of the Dominion. The hon. gentlemen then made a number of valuable suggestions, which entitled him to the thanks of the House. He has brought the question forward in a somewhat different form this year, though covering very much the same ground. I do not wish to say much upon the subject, because, though I am partially responsible for the administration of certain legislation regarding public health, I have not the advantage possessed by my hon. friend of being a physician, and so I would rather touch on one or two points raised by the resolution itself than attempt to deal with the address in which he presented it. The question has been raised by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) as to whether there was in this resolution any intention to interfere with the control of health matters by the provinces. As is well known, the question of jurisdiction is a little involved in this, as in some other matters. Take education, for instance. It is clearly laid down by the British North America Act that the Federal Government has absolutely nothing to do with education, which is left entirely to the jurisdiction of the province. In other subjects, such as agriculture, the provinces and the Dominion have concurrent jurisdiction, the only stipulation being that where provincial legislation is repugnant to that passed by the Dominion Parliament the Dominion legislation governs. But when we come to legislation on health, as I understand the Constitution, it is specifically provided that the provinces have a limited jurisdiction, they being confined wholly to control of hospitals and eleemosynary institutions. It is left to be inferred that the Federal power can deal with all other health matters. At the same time, we know that by custom there has grown up in Canada a practice by which the provincial governments carry on the major part of the work in connection with public health, while at the same time the Dominion Government has taken some things in connection with health under its entire jurisdiction. Let me refer, first, to my own department. To that department has been assigned the duty of guarding the health of the people from all contagious diseases of a grave character brought here by immigrants from other lands. We have quarantine stations, as is well known, in Quebec, Halifax, British Columbia, and elsewhere. Again, the Dominion Government has always had entire control over everything concerning leprosy, and we are carrying on this work at a station in New Brunswick and at another and smaller one in British Columbia. These matters the provinces have not touched at all. The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) has referred to the work of the Immigration Branch of the Department of the Interior,

and he has suggested that in many respects it might be made stronger and more efficient than at present. Of course, the hon. gentleman will admit that a great deal of excellent work has been done, though, of course, it is true that the efficiency of the department might be strengthened. The Immigration Branch of the Department of the Interior looks after minor diseases, such as some of those to which the hon. member referred, and its officers are supposed to prevent the entry into Canada of those whose mental or physical health makes them undesirable immigrants. The Department of the Interior also has entire charge of the health of Indians, and it appoints doctors to carry out its obligations in that respect. The Marine and Fisheries Department exercises more or less control in connection with the health of sailors and, I think, one or two other matters.

But I would point out that no specific authority has been assigned to the provinces with regard to health matters. By long custom a practice has grown up, and it has been embodied in legislation, under which the provinces exercise control over public health and under which they have empowered municipalities to deal with those matters to a considerable extent. So, legislative and administrative work in connection with health is very wide and is largely out of the control of the Dominion Government. In the United States also, the division of jurisdiction has been somewhat vague. My hon. friend (Mr. Steele) is better informed on the subject than I, but as I understand it the question of quarantine in the United States was for many years little dealt with, if at all, by the Federal Government. In Boston, and I think also in New York, quarantine has been carried on by the municipal authorities, and in other cases by state authorities, and it is only within the last two or three years that the Federal Government has taken the whole control. In the United States they have not a department of Public Health, but they have what is called a Public Health Service which is under the jurisdiction of or is practically a bureau of the Department of the Treasury.

I quite agree with my hon. friend in saying that if the change he proposes were brought about it would not necessarily involve direct interference with the work of the provinces so as to invite any hostile or critical attitude on their part. Necessarily there would be a very thorough investigation and conference with the provincial authorities in order to co-ordinate the work and avoid duplication as far as possible. The effort would be more in the way of co-operation and co-ordination than in the way of an attempt to take from any other body that which it might think it ought to control. I do not anticipate any great difficulty in arranging these matters when they come to be dealt with. I think my hon. friend is on sound ground when he emphasizes, among other things, the tremendous necessity in this country, as in other countries, of dealing more with prevention rather than neglecting it, and then spending great energy and large sums of money in efforts to cure disease after it has declared itself. We should go to the root of the matter and try to establish such conditions that diseases of the lamentable kind that exist here and elsewhere may not get a footing through lack of energy in improving conditions. I was particularly impressed with what the hon. member said with regard to the feeble-minded and the regrettable state of things in this country, as well as in most countries, in this respect. I am quite sure that united and energetic action in dealing with the situation would result in incalculable good to the people. I am also thoroughly in accord with him when he states that the proper direction of the energies of governmental authorities and individuals to this health question is a matter of enormous importance not only from the point of view of the abolition of poverty and crime, which necessarily must follow widespread conditions of disease, but also from the consideration of its direct effect on the economic efficiency of our nation. I am perfectly convinced that a vast amount of waste and inefficiency which are to be found in our own country, as in other countries, is due to the neglect by the state of some of the matters that have been referred to by my hon. friend. If I understood my hon. friend aright, he seemed to take the ground—perhaps I misunderstood him—that we had not made any progress, that we were at a standstill, which was a matter of regret. I presume he meant that in so far as federal control of health matters goes we had not advanced our position very much. He would not, I am sure, mean to convey to this House the idea that in Canada there has been no progress made with regard to general health matters, because there has been a lot of earnest attention paid to the subject by municipalities, by provincial authorities, and, to some ex-

tent, by the Dominion authorities. I think it will not be disputed that some real progress has been made.

The resolution which my hon. friend has brought before the House is of a little more comprehensive character than was the resolution introduced last year, because in its concluding sentence it calls for the supervision by this department of public health of all matters relating to the physical welfare of the community. I think I understood him in his opening remarks to say that he did not intend it in that way, because I do not imagine for a moment that the resolution was intended to imply an absolute control by the federal department over all health matters. At the same time, taking the resolution as it is worded, it would be questionable whether this Government could even under any conditions attempt the absolute supervision over all questions of that kind because it might somewhat interfere with the rights of the provinces.

It has been suggested that there is a danger in creating a department of public health because it would tend towards the establishment of a close medical organization, of one particular system of medical education, and of certain schools of thought in medical matters which would interfere with the freedom of those who do not perhaps hold the same views. I do not think, as far as I was able to gather, that my hon. friend had anything of that sort in his mind; nor if a department of public health were established do I imagine that any such tyranny—that is the word that has been used by the hypercritics—would follow. I gather that what my hon. friend aims at is the co-ordinating of the activities in the country in regard to health matters in such a way that there would be greater unity of action and purpose and that the Dominion might give more energy and devote more attention to such matters as medical research and all questions affecting not only natural health but health as it relates to international matters, and also that it would prosecute somewhat more vigorously that very important phase of the question regarding sanitation as applied to health matters. In these objects, the House, I am sure, and certainly the Government, cannot but sympathize. Last year when my hon. friend brought this resolution to the attention of the House, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), in my absence through illness, spoke on the resolution and pointed out that it had already had the consideration of the Government, but that there were so many problems and so much pressing work engaging the time and attention of the ministers, that a matter of this sort, which although it might seem simple, required the most careful consideration and which must be the subject of conferences with the provincial authorities before it was put into effect, would have to be left for a later time. Reasons of that kind which were advanced last year, I am sure my hon. friend will appreciate, are equally strong now when the war is in a more acute and terrible phase than it was before, and when the pressure on ministers and departments is certainly not less but, if anything, a great deal more. I am not prepared to dispute the soundness of the position which my hon. friend has taken up. I personally sympathise with what he is aiming at. While I do not think it is desirable or possible to go into a matter of this kind satisfactorily at the present time, I am frank enough to say that I have such sympathy with it that I believe the time is not far distant when it will have to be taken up and dealt with and when it is it will be a step in the right direction. Further than that I do not wish to detain the House except to say that my hon. friend deserves the thanks of the House for bringing this subject to its attention, and after all it is of a great deal more importance than many of the subjects which we consume time in debating.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris): I think this House is indebted to the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) for presenting to it a question of such great importance. I doubt very much if any hon. gentleman could present this resolution more ably than has my hon. friend. It is a question that needs a great deal more consideration, and with your permission, Sir, I wish to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

UNCLAIMED BANK BALANCES.

PROPOSAL TO DEVOTE THEM TO PATRIOTIC FUND.

Mr. D. C. ROSS (West Middlesex) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is advisable that unclaimed balances at present in the Chartered Banks of Canada should be transferred to the Treasurer of the Patriotic Fund to be used for the usual patriotic purposes.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in presenting this resolution to the consideration of the House

it is not my intention to go into any long argument in regard to the matter. I think the facts are pretty clear and I would just make a few observations in regard to what I am asking for in this resolution. In the first place I wish to be entirely frank with the House and to say that after considerable research I have been unable to find any precedent for what I am asking in the resolution. In going through the law of the United States I find no enactment on unclaimed balances. I find that in the states of Connecticut, Idaho, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Mexico, and New York there are enactments on the statute books which provide for unclaimed balances inasmuch as advertisement is required of the names of those who are entitled to the money where money is concerned but there is no final disposition of the money.

The law in all these states simply provides that the Government shall, in a public way, make these deposits known by advertisements published in the papers in metropolitan centres, or in Government blue-books, or in reports submitted to the Legislature after deposits have been in the banks for a certain length of time and no transaction has taken place in regard to them. I find that under the law of France no final disposition is made of unclaimed balances. In Great Britain, no ultimate disposition is made of these balances, although the matter has been brought up several times. The only precedent I am able to cite in regard to these balances is the law of the Commonwealth of Australia. According to the law of Australia of 1911 there is this statutory provision.

(1) All moneys to the credit of a depositor's savings bank account (not being a deposit on behalf of a minor) which has not been operated upon, either by addition or withdrawal, for a period of seven years and upwards, shall be carried to an account to be called the depositors' unclaimed fund, and shall cease to bear interest.

(2) The Governor may, on proof to his satisfaction that any person is entitled to any money which has been carried to the credit of the depositors' unclaimed fund, direct payment thereof to him, and his receipt shall be a good discharge to the bank.

(3) A list of the amounts carried to the depositors' unclaimed fund and not claimed shall be published annually in the Gazette.

(4) All moneys in respect of which a claim is not established within ten years after having been included in any published list shall cease to be claimable, and shall become the absolute property of the bank, but the Governor may, with the consent of the treasurer, allow any claim after that period has expired, if he is satisfied that special reasons exist for the allowance of the claim.

This is the only provision I have been able to find which ultimately disposes of unclaimed balances, and according to the law of Australia as I have read it here an unclaimed balance at a certain stage becomes the absolute property of the bank.

For my own part I could not go that far. My resolution does not go that far. I would not wish in any case to go to that length because I think the bank has no title to this money, particularly in this country where the chartered banks enjoy greater privileges and pay less for them than in any other country. However, I am not making this motion out of anything in the way of ill feeling to the banks, because I have none; I am making it from purely patriotic motives. At this time in the history of this Empire we are not following precedents. I cannot say that we are really making precedents, because the times are too exceptional. But, I think that on both sides of the House we are trying to legislate according to the special circumstances that we find surrounding us, in the best interests of the country and of the Empire; and I think this resolution, if adopted by the Government, will help in that great purpose for which we are all striving at the present time; will aid in the alleviation of the sufferings of our soldiers, and will help ultimately to win the war.

Most hon. gentlemen, I think, are acquainted with the existing law in Canada. It is contained in sections 114 and 115 of the Banking Act of 1913. I shall not read the sections, but, briefly, they provide that after a period of five years has elapsed and no transaction has taken place or no interest has been paid on a balance in the bank, a report is made of that balance to the Government and that balance is published in the official reports of this Government. That balance is not taken by the Government except in one case: If a bank goes into liquidation or becomes insolvent and there is money in the hands of the liquidator which is unclaimed, either dividends or deposits, that is paid to the Finance Minister and remains the property of the Government until some claim is made for it, and if a claim is established the amount is paid to the person establishing such claim. Apart from that, there is no payment of unclaimed balances in the way of dividends or drafts that have not been cashed, or certified cheques unpaid. By the law of 1913 a further amendment was made which renders it impossible for me to say exactly that the returns which we have furnished to us at the

present time exactly show the amounts of unclaimed balances, because by that amendment it is stated that any sum under five dollars that has been unclaimed for five years will not now be printed in the Government return. So that I cannot say that the figures I give and that I find in the reports of the Government are absolutely correct. I am not going into the old law in regard to unclaimed balances. As far as the Parliament of Canada is concerned, the law as it at present stands is practically the same as when it was first introduced in 1890. But I am going to deal with it just as it stands at the present time.

There has been one precedent in this House which would jusify this resolution. When the Banking Act was being considered in 1913 by a special committee appointed for that purpose, the hon. member for South Ontario introduced an amendment providing that all unclaimed balances would be turned over to the Finance Minister. That motion was put in the committee and it was defeated by a vote of fifteen to ten; so that I have this justification in the records of this House, that on that committee of twenty-five members, ten men at that time were in favour of turning the unclaimed balances in the banks over to the Government of this country. That is practically my motion to-day, except that I wish to have the money used for a specific purpose.

There are only three factors in the resolution: In the first place, there is the question of the banks. Probably before I deal with that I should consider the amounts of these balances. According to the latest returns available to me, I find in the statement furnished to this House, of unclaimed balances in chartered banks in 1915, that there were in the banks of this country unclaimed balances of deposits amounting to $916,535.74 and of unpaid certified cheques, drafts or bills of exchange, $171,224, making a total of $1,087,759. I find also, on going back to the records of 1903 and taking the same items, that there were in the chartered banks of this country $517,272, so that in those twelve years these unclaimed balances had increased by $580,000. This question may be considered from three sides, and in the first place, from the standpoint of the banks. Are the banks going to be hurt by the Government implementing this resolution? The money is not theirs. According to these returns they have had the use of $500,000, half a million dollars of the people of Canada, for twelve years, for which they have not paid a cent. They should be very thankful, I think, for that privilege, and they should be willing at this time to give this money for a patriotic purpose. In the second place, the withdrawal of this money will not, because the amount is so infinitesimal, be detrimental to the banks concerned. I find on looking at this return that in 1915 the unclaimed balances—I am considering only deposits now, because the same argument applies to these as applies to other unclaimed balances—in the various banks were, in round figures, as follows: Bank of Montreal, $111,000; Quebec Bank, $15,000; Bank of Nova Scotia, $37,000; Bank of British North America, $73,000; Bank of Toronto, $4,000; Molsons Bank, $17,000; Banque Nationale, $19,000; Merchants Bank of Canada, $37,000; Banque Provinciale du Canada, $7,000; Union Bank of Canada, $89,000; Canadian Bank of Commerce, $103,000; Montreal City and District Savings Bank, $128,000. I shall not read the whole list, but it will be observed that the three largest amounts are $111,000, Bank of Montreal; $103,000, Canadian Bank of Commerce, and $128,000, Montreal City and District Savings Bank. My argument is this: having regard to the large capitalization of these banks and the immense amount of their deposits, the payment by them to the secretary of the Patriotic Fund through the Finance Minister of the small amount of money suggested would not prejudice their business in any way. The deposits in the banks to-day amount to the enormous sum of $1,500,000,000, in round figures, having increased during the last three or four years to the extent of nearly half a billion dollars. At the present time, therefore, through the thrift and industry of the people, the Canadian banks are in a stronger position, so far as deposits are concerned, than they ever have been. Moreover, I do not think they need this money—and this has been shown by recent financial operations. The Minister of Finance, with great foresight and great success, put on the market a patriotic loan only a short time ago. To this loan the banks subscribed an amount in the neighbourhood of $50,000,000—I have not the exact figures, but they are familiar to the minister. This shows that the banks were not very hard up. If they could for patriotic reasons give to the Minister of Finance $50,000,000 on account of that war loan, surely they can allow $1,000,000 to go out of their coffers for the purposes men-

tioned in this resolution. I say, then, that the banks cannot complain if they be asked to do this. The money is not their own; they do not need it and the amount is so infinitesimal that it cannot possibly injure their financial operations.

If this resolution is accepted, the bill to be founded upon it will contain many details which could not possibly be set forth in the resolution. But if I had stated it to be my object to confiscate these unclaimed balances, what would that mean to the depositors? The amount of unclaimed deposits in the Bank of Montreal is $111,000, and in that amount 1,900 people are interested. Only three people are interested in deposits exceeding $3,000 and only fifteen other than the three are interested in amounts exceeding $1,000. The average deposit of the 1,900 people is $59, but if you subtract the larger deposits of the eighteen people mentioned, the average amount is only $40. The same conditions obtain in the Bank of Commerce; there are only eighteen depositors of unclaimed balances amounting to more than $1,000. So that even if it were my intention to confiscate this money, the amount taken from each depositor would be very small indeed.

In the third place, what are going to be the needs of the Patriotic Fund? No one will take exception to the great work that has been done in connection with the Patriotic Fund; no greater work has been done in any country. If I have the figures correctly, there has been collected through the voluntary offerings of the people of Canada about $21,000,000, for the purpose of assisting the widows and dependents of the soldiers who have gone across the seas to fight the battles of Canada and of the world. I do not think that the people of any country have responded more liberally to these appeals than have the Canadian people. The people of Britain salute them for the generosity with which they have responded to every patriotic appeal that has been made. But there has been this criticism—and I think it is a fair criticism—that the Patriotic Fund has been raised by voluntary subscription and that at each successive appeal the same men have almost invariably subscribed. It has been suggested that when we send our soldiers across the water to fight our battles, the country should take care of their dependents by general taxation—and there seems to be some weight and some justice in that criticism. But there will come a time in the history of this war when we shall have

350,000 or 400,000 men on the other side of the water. When the war is won, the patriotic fervor which moved the people to subscribe to the Patriotic Fund will not be as warm as it formerly was, and the people will not give so freely. There will be a certain amount of stagnation in trade; there will be a period of hard times and the need for some increase in the Patriotic Fund will be greater than it ever was. I submit that this $1,000,000 will be the splendid nucleus of a fund to provide for that day, which will surely come, when the people will not be as able or as willing to respond to appeals made on behalf of the Patriotic Fund as they have been in the past. On that account, if on no other, I think this resolution is justified.

There is just one more consideration, and that is the depositor. I am not asking the Government to take this money from the depositor. I am not asking them to do what has been done in Australia; I do not think that would be just and right. Since my entrance into this House I have been a constant champion of the depositor, and am to-day. I think that the depositor in the Canadian banks does not get his rights and does not get ample protection. He does not get his rights in the matter of security; he does not get a sufficiently high rate of interest. There are many things that could be done for the depositor in the Canadian banks, and which will be done some day, I hope, in the near future. If this resolution is accepted by the Government and this money paid through the Finance Minister to the secretary of the Patriotic Fund, it will be my suggestion to the Minister of Finance that in case valid claims are made in the future upon the Government of Canada and those claims are established by proper evidence, these depositors do not have their money taken from them, but that this rich Dominion is generous and just enough to see that these depositors are paid the money that they have deposited in the banks of this country. That is all I will say in regard to the resolution, and I hope I shall receive a sympathetic and generous response from the Minister of Finance.

Hon. Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I accept, without reserve, the statement of my hon. friend as to the motives which have actuated him in bringing this resolution to the attention of the House. I think, however, that his patriotic feelings and sympathies

have got the better of his judgment, because what he proposes here is really an unwise course, and one calculated, if adopted, to affect our credit as a nation in which property rights are observed. My hon. friend has not carefully drafted his resolution. Just let us see what he asks this House to do. He asks the House to confiscate the unclaimed balances at present in the chartered banks of Canada and transfer them to the treasurer of the Patriotic Fund. My hon. friend does not state in this resolution whether the rights of the depositors against the banks are extinguished or not; he does not state whether the banks are to continue to be liable to the depositors whose deposits are to be transferred to the Canadian Patriotic Fund, or whether the banks are to be indemnified by the Government. I submit, with confidence, that, on these grounds alone, this resolution could not be adopted by this House.

Let us consider what these unclaimed balances are. The chartered banks of Canada receive deposits in the ordinary course of their business. Some of the balances in connection with these deposits remain unclaimed for a certain time and are then designated " unclaimed balances." At least I assume, that is what my hon. friend has in mind, because his resolution is so worded that it would really apply to all balances on deposit to-day with the chartered banks of Canada and unclaimed at this moment; but I assume that what my hon. friend means is unclaimed balances in the technical sense of the word, and I do not desire to take an objection on the score that my hon. friend refers to all balances, because I am aware that he does not. The legal position to-day is that the chartered banks of Canada owe those depositors the several amounts of money—comparatively small in most cases—to which my hon. friend has referred. Those balances are unclaimed, but they are not unclaimable. The bank is responsible to pay those balances when they are asked for by the parties entitled to them. My hon. friend proposes to confiscate the deposits. In one portion of his speech I understood him to say that, as the amounts were small, there was no valid objection to the Government transferring them to the Canadian Patriotic Fund. That would indicate to me that what my hon. friend has in mind is that those depositors would lose their rights against the banks. If they lost their rights against the banks, what you have done is this: You have made each one of those depositors, who may apply for and claim his balance at any time, an involuntary contributor to the Canadian Patriotic Fund. The very essence and genius of the Canadian Patriotic Fund is that it is constituted by voluntary contributions from the people of Canada. Yet my hon. friend proposes—if I understood him aright, and I am sure I did—to make all those depositors who have unclaimed balances in Canadian chartered banks, lose those unclaimed balances to the Canadian Patriotic Fund. I would submit that that is pure confiscation, absolutely unwarranted, and I am quite certain that the Canadian Patriotic Fund would not desire that those depositors should be made, against their will and without their knowledge, to give to the Canadian Patriotic Fund their unclaimed balances, which they may claim and have the right to claim at any time. My hon. friend would have been more fair if he had said that in his view the banks would remain liable to the depositors and, if necessary be indemnified by the Government but it is entirely unnecessary to take that course. If the Canadian Patriotic Fund at any time is in such need that public assistance is required, application will no doubt be made to the Government. It seems to me that it would be very much better that the Government should itself afford assistance, if assistance were indispensably necessary, and if it were no longer possible to maintain this fund by voluntary subscription, rather than that by legislative action of this Parliament we should confiscate moneys which belong to hundreds or thousands of individuals throughout this country and transfer these moneys to the Canadian Patriotic Fund.

It is a fact that those deposits in most cases are not called for and are not likely to be called for; but if any legislation is necessary in connection with this matter, it should not be of the character which my hon. friend has put forward, but upon a revision of the Bank Act—and the matter was under consideration at the last revision—the question might be brought up as to whether the banks should continue beyond a certain time to hold unclaimed balances, as to whether they should not pay the amount into the Consolidated Revenue Fund to be available for the purposes of the Government, on the condition that the Government would indemnify the banks against any claims which might be made by the owners of the balances against the

banks. That has been put forward on more than one occasion when the Bank Act has been under consideration, and that question would seem to me to be a proper subject for the consideration of Parliament. I know that opinions differ as to it, and I am not expressing my own view. The course which my hon. friend asks the House to pursue, namely, to confiscate the unclaimed balances of those depositors without providing any means whereby they are to be indemnified—because the resolution does not anywhere refer to indemnification—appears to me to be legislation that would be regarded by the public, certainly by the financial world, as entirely unwarranted. It is therefore clear, at least it is quite clear to me, that the House could not pass the resolution in its present form.

Mr. ROSS: I am quite willing to accept the suggestion the minister made just now. It was my intention to have such a provision inserted.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have not made a suggestion. I am pointing out that the resolution in its present form could not be accepted by the House. Let us now consider whether the House should determine to take these balances and transfer them to the Canadian Patriotic Fund, the banks remaining liable without indemnification or with indemnification. I think it would be most unfair to enact legislation under which these balances would be transferred to the Canadian Patriotic Fund or any other fund, the banks remaining liable to the parties to whom they are legally bound to pay these amounts upon demand; that would be manifestly unfair and unjust to the banks. What is the alternative? That we should transfer these unpaid balances to the Canadian Patriotic Fund, and that the Government should indemnify the owners of these unpaid balances, the banks being relieved of their obligations. Now, that to me seems in no wise different from the Government assuming a liability towards the Canadian Patriotic Fund. In case of need, I am sure the Government would assist the Canadian Patriotic Fund, but I do not see the necessity for this roundabout course.

My hon. friend has pointed out that while these unpaid balances amount to a considerable sum in the aggregate, it is only a comparatively small amount so far as each bank is concerned. I agree with my hon. friend in that, but I do submit that the principle of taking these amounts from the banks, who are legally bound to pay them, or from the depositors who have them lawfully on deposit, is unsound and should not be indorsed by this House.

My hon. friend has referred to the position of the Canadian chartered banks, and he is quite correct in saying that they are in a strong position. I do not put forward my argument on the condition of the banks, but on the ground that it is not proper legislation to confiscate money; I think that is the position that any Minister of Finance would be bound to take. My hon. friend has drawn attention to the fact that he has been unable to find any precedent except in the case of Australia, and that does not surprise me, as the course which he suggests is not one that would generally commend itself to legislators, especially under the British system. I did not catch what my hon. friend said in respect to unpaid balances in Australia, but it is my own view—and I am putting it forward only as my own view—that the only suggestion with regard to unpaid balances which would meet with the consideration of a legislative body is not that those balances should be transferred to any one or more funds, no matter how worthy they may be, but if there is to be a transfer it should be to the consolidated fund of the Government, the Government undertaking to indemnify the banks against any liability, and to make good to depositors these unclaimed balances should demand be made for them. Now, in my opinion, the time when a question of that kind should be considered is upon a revision of the Bank Act. I do not wish to be understood as in any way reflecting upon the propriety of my hon. friend bringing this matter up, because I know that he is actuated by the best of motives, but I do submit that even in so worthy a cause it is not wise to take a step which would seem to reflect upon the stability of bank deposits. I may say to my hon. friend that upon one or two occasions in the past when this matter was being discussed in the other House, I received inquiries from depositors, and it has been brought to my attention that a good deal of anxiety was manifested, because the general public do not understand these proposals as we understand them in this House. In addition to the arguments which I have advanced, it is, in my opinion, unwise to unsettle public opinion, especially at a time like this, in regard to so important a matter as deposits in our chartered banks. I am glad this matter has been brought up, because it has given me an

opportunity of presenting my views, and, such as they are, I submit them to the consideration of the House.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.): It is not very often that the Minister of Finance is so technical as he has been this afternoon on the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Ross). The minister discussed the resolution as though it were a Bill presented to this House, when he must have known it was only a resolution affirming a principle. Why, it is not once in a hundred times that a resolution like this goes into details. The hon. member for Middlesex distinctly stated that he did not ask the House to confiscate this money, because when you confiscate money or property you are taking away something which belongs to other people, and appropriating it for the benefit of the state or some other institution. The hon. member for Middlesex distinctly stated that if this resolution were adopted by the House and a Bill founded upon it there ought to be a provision that if any bona fide claimants came forward and demanded their deposits from the banks the Government should step forward and make good the amount; in other words, the Government should gamble to that extent.

There is about $1,000,000 of unpaid balances in the different chartered banks of this country. I understand that an unclaimed balance must remain five years on the books of a bank before it is transferred to the "unclaimed balances" column. We know that the banks keep a record of interest bearing deposits, and another list of non-interest bearing deposits; the banks, recognizing the fact that some people do not claim their deposits, either through death or going away, and sometimes because the deposit is only a small amount, have made a practice of transferring unpaid balances after a period of five years, and there is now about $1,000,000 of these balances in our banks. My hon. friend from Middlesex now raises the question whether this amount should be considered as the property of the banks, or whether in these times of stress it should not be handed over to the Canadian Patriotic Fund. That is what my hon. friend asks for; he is not asking for anybody's property to be confiscated, because he expressly suggested that if any claimant came forward afterwards and established his claim the Government should make good the amount.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance seemed to have great objections to confiscating property. But there have been many instances in the last two or three years where my hon. friend did not hesitate to confiscate other people's property. Only two or three months ago the Government confiscated the Ross rifle factory at Quebec without giving the owner five minutes' notice. They wanted the factory, and simply went in and took it. Nobody is finding much fault with them for that; they were only doing what they had a perfect right to do, but it was confiscating the property, nevertheless.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Why does the hon. gentleman say that we confiscated the Ross rifle factory? I understand that we expropriated it.

Mr. CARVELL: We will discuss that at a later stage. I happened to be in Quebec as visitor when the event took place, and, perhaps, I know a little more about it than other hon. gentlemen in the House. However, we shall have an opportunity of discussing that at a later date. The Minister of Finance thinks that the transfer of these balances to the Patriotic Fund would be a forced contribution, whereas, he said, contributions to the Patriotic Fund were entirely voluntary. In many parts of Canada to-day that is not the case. When the Patriotic Fund was organized, it was on a voluntary basis but in many municipalities it was soon found that one class of the public were contributing largely and another class contributing nothing. In New Brunswick, and also, I think, in many other parts of Canada, the method has been adopted of assessing for the Patriotic Fund. And in New Brunswick in this way we have raised half a million dollars. We go beyond the ordinary assessment. An unfortunate policy has crept into our municipal affairs in New Brunswick, and I presume in many other parts of Canada, of exempting certain properties from taxation. But so far as the Patriotic Fund is concerned these institutions and corporations are assessed. I cannot see any force in the objection raised by the minister because of the phraseology of the resolution. If this Parliament wishes to adopt the policy of taking these unclaimed balances out of the hands of the bank and giving them to the Patriotic Fund, the only question, it seems to me, is whether Parliament is willing to assume the responsibility of making good these balances to the extent that they may be afterwards properly claimed by the proper persons. I should like to see the money handed to the Patriotic Fund rather than left in the hands of the banks. Nearly

ninety per cent of the amounts will inevitably remain unclaimed, and so the liability which the country would assume would be very light. I have no quarrel with the chartered banks; they are doing a good work and are in splendid financial condition. But I am sure the shareholders of these banks do not need this million dollars to help them to pay dividends, and I do not think it will be any harm to pay the money over to the Patriotic Fund, the country undertaking to refund any sums that may be claimed by bona fide owners. I am strongly in favour of the principle of the resolution and intend to vote for it.

Sir HERBERT AMES (Montreal, St. Antoine): I have no hesitation whatever in giving to the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) the fullest possible credit for bringing in this resolution, for Middlesex is a county that has been from the beginning of the war one of the most patriotic and generous in its gifts to the Patriotic Fund. At one time Middlesex led all the other counties of Ontario in the size of its contributions to the fund. So I know that this resolution arises from the best motives and is presented to the House with the highest purpose. But it has been the glory of the Patriotic Fund from the beginning that it represented the giving of those who could not fight, and the slogan of the Patriotic Fund throughout Canada has been: "Fight or pay." The man who shoulders his rifle and goes to the firing line is released from financial payment to the Fund, and rightly so; but the man who remains and goes on with his work as usual, who enjoys the privilege of staying at home, is asked to make sacrifices which, while they may not be commensurate, will represent something similar to those made by the man who is giving his body and his life for our defence. To many people this is the only outlet they have. The man who is over age, the man who is tied up by business, the man whose home ties are such that he cannot leave, naturally welcomes the opportunity for self-sacrifice, and the Patriotic Fund has been welcomed by thousands and tens of thousands of our people because by contributing to it they are able to feel that they too are fighting the Huns. So, almost universally, the contributions have been voluntary. In the first year of the war eighty-five per cent of the contributions were not only voluntary but, so far as we were concerned, unsolicited. But it became necessary as the burden increased to distribute it. We found that the rural parts of the country were not giving as much as the cities. By experiment we found that the people there were as ready and as willing to give as were the urban dwellers, but the difficulty lay, we were told, in making collections. When you have a scattered rural community, to secure a committee and have it solicit and collect contributions is a physical impossibility. Consequently, from the farmers came the request that they might use the machinery they had, the machinery of the county and township councils, through which the money might be raised in rural districts It was found that, generally speaking, the farm a man occupies represents his power of earning, and so his relative power of giving. So we established the rule that where a municipal council unanimously made a grant, to be assessed upon the taxpayers, we would accept that. If there was a division of opinion, some members of the council wishing to give a larger amount and some a smaller amount, we said: Give us the smaller amount, but make it unanimous, because we wish to maintain the principle of voluntary giving So, while, to a certain extent the principle of taxation to help the Patriotic Fund has been introduced, it has been mainly as a matter of financing to facilitate the collection of moneys that people were glad to give. I think there are few instances on record in which money has been given to the Patriotic Fund through taxation in which the giving has not been by unanimous vote of the legislative body that had the right to give it. We have found, that, where grants were made by municipal councils with a certain timidity in the early part of the war, when we have gone back they have almost invariably increased the grants, showing, that they had taken the matter up with their constituents, and had found that more generous giving would meet with approval. So, I think that, from our Patriotic Fund point of view, there would be a certain taint if money were taken, you may say by force, from a class of people already generously doing their share. The bankers have been very generous in support of the Patriotic Fund. At the outset the Bank of Montreal gave $100,000 payable in two equal annual instalments. Another great bank has been equally generous. From the rapid calculation I have made since this discussion began, I think I am safe in saying that the bankers have given annually $350,000 to the Patriotic Fund, and that if the war lasts three or four years they will

have given voluntarily the full million dollars represented by these unclaimed balances. So, speaking for the Patriotic Fund, while we have the highest appreciation of the act of the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) and know it comes from the generous impulse of himself and those whom he represents, a generosity which they have again and again shown by their sympathetic attitude towards the Patriotic Fund, I do not think the motion should be passed if it has in view that the Patriotic Fund is to be the destination of the money. It is an evidence of the generosity of the people of Canada that though the Patriotic Fund is being drawn on for nearly a million dollars a month, and though we are taking care of between 50,000 and 60,000 families, so far each month has shown an amount coming in as large as that going out, and a little larger. The pledges given for 1917, all of which will be available, I am confident—because the amount of uncollectable pledges in the Patriotic Fund has been remarkably small—are large enough to carry the fund through the present year. We hope to maintain, if we can, the feeling that the Patriotic Fund is money coming from the heart, money that expresses a sincere desire to make sacrifices, money given by people who want to do their bit; and we would like to have the Fund as free as possible from any feeling that it is made up of moneys taken by compulsion.

Mr. CARVELL: Does the hon. gentleman include the half million dollars which is being raised by the province of New Brunswick by direct taxation as being tainted by not being voluntary? I would like an answer to that question because I think it is very important.

Sir HERBERT AMES: I may say that we regard the money that New Brunswick is paying as being practically a voluntary contribution because it was voted by the Legislature of New Brunswick unanimously if I remember rightly; because it was taken up by both parties and because, although the Government of New Brunswick has changed and although a different party is in power to-day, they are paying the money just the same as they did before and there is not the slightest question of repudiation. I think it would be doing an injustice to the people of New Brunswick as a whole to say that money was being taken from them to aid the Patriotic Fund, that they would not have given voluntarily, if that method had been adopted instead.

Mr. CARVELL: Are you willing to accept it?

Sir HERBERT AMES: Under these circumstances, yes.

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker I am greatly in favour of this resolution. I am not alarmed about the view that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) takes that this is in the nature of a confiscation. The banks accept as a right what is given to them by the Parliament of Canada; they have a right to use these funds through the Bank Act. That right was given to them by this Parliament and I maintain that we have a right to say later whether such funds can be taken away from them and used for some other purpose.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I did not question the right of Parliament.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I believe the money is, or will be, needed for the Patriotic Fund. I have been active on behalf of the Patriotic Fund from the first, and I have found that the people who are giving year after year are the same people. If an increased allotment is made to a district these same people are giving an increased amount each year. We find hundreds and hundreds of shirkers throughout the whole of Canada, not only in my own province, but everywhere, men of wealth, who are not giving a cent to the Patriotic Fund, the Red Cross, or any other organization. We have reached a stage where I believe we will have to resort to some other means, if the war continues, to raise a patriotic fund. I would like to see some means of reaching the people who are shirking. It is all right to get at the wealth of the country by the method of taxation adopted by the Minister of Finance but there are lots of people we are not getting at in that way who are making money out of the war and who are not contributing anything. As to the banks being generous, the banks have lots of money at the present time, any amount of it and they have a perfect right to be generous. They have great powers and great privileges given to them by this Parliament and they should give generously; more so perhaps than any other institution in the country. In my judgment, the banks have no right to these unclaimed balances. They would not suffer if they lost them. The president of the

Patriotic Fund does not seem to think that the fund is in need of the money but there are other patriotic causes that are in need of money, such as the Belgian Relief Fund, and if the Patriotic Fund does not want it why not offer it to the Belgian Relief Fund? These organizations are in need, the banks are not in need and if we decide to take this money away from them we have a perfect right to do so. I sometimes think that in this country we do not realize that we are participating in a world war and that we can establish precedents and can do things that were never heard of before. I presume it is possible under the War Measures Act to do a great many things that were never done before. It would be possible to take fifty per cent of the wealth of Canada if we wanted to use it to help the country at this time. There is nothing unusual in demanding at this particular time that this money should be used by the country for patriotic purposes and to help in carrying on the war. I am in hearty sympathy with the resolution moved by my hon. friend from Middlesex.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I do not see how it would be possible for this House to accept the resolution as it is worded without doing a very great injustice to many people. The resolution asks the House to agree to turn over any unclaimed balances at present in the chartered banks to the Patriotic Fund. All that hon. gentlemen have said in regard to the worthiness of the Patriotic Fund I heartily endorse but it does seem to me to be a very drastic proposal that we should take any unclaimed balances, no matter how long they had remained in the bank unclaimed, and turn these balances over to the Patriotic Fund. That, I believe to be a too drastic measure. But I do entirely agree with some of the statements made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Buchanan). I do not see why the banks should have this money. It seems to me that we should decide on a certain length of time that these unclaimed balances would remain in the banks and that on the expiry of that time these unclaimed balances would revert to the Dominion of Canada to be applied to the consolidated fund, the Government of Canada guaranteeing to indemnify the banks against any claims which subsequently might be put up. Why should this money stay in the banks, and why should they have the use of it for ten, twenty or fifty years? It is not theirs any more than it is ours. It is not theirs as much as it is ours; I mean the people of Canada. I can see no reason why that money should remain there, and I repeat that these balances should be taken charge of by the Dominion Government, the Government guaranteeing the banks that they would indemnify them should any persons, in the years to come, make good their claims to these balances, and that under these circumstances they would hand the money back to the banks. But to leave them in the banks for an indefinite period I think is decidedly unfair, and I see no reason why it should be done.

Mr. S. F. GLASS (East Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, I am in accord with the views expressed by my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards). They are exactly in line with the remarks of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White). As representing one part of the county of Middlesex, I appreciate the tribute which has been paid by my hon. friend from Montreal (Sir Herbert Ames) to the patriotism of the people of that county. Referring to the matter of making a distinction between funds voluntarily subcribed and those produced by taxation for the patriotic fund, I think that our experience amongst our rural municipalities has been very similar to that in the province of New Brunswick as referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell). It is not convenient or easy to collect these amounts by subscription in the rural districts, and therefore the rural districts have resorted to a method of taxation. It is not money taken from the people unwillingly, because the people are glad to have an opportunity by this method of equitably and patriotically contributing to this fund. Referring to the use of moneys left in chartered banks, it seems manifestly unfair that the banks should be allowed the use of this money for an indefinite period simply because the money has not been claimed.

I do not know whether I fully understand the Banking Act, but from the remarks made to-day I take it to mean that when a bank balance becomes an unclaimed balance, that is after it has been on deposit without claim for five years, it ceases to bear interest. If that be so, it is manifestly unjust that the banks should be allowed to continue the use of this money. The proposal made by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) and the suggestion of the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White)

along the same lines would seem to overcome that unfairness of the banks taking interest which properly belonged to depositors; and if the money were transferred in that way to the consolidated fund of Canada and the Government thus guaranteed depositors who in the future would present claims, the Government would have the use of the money. In the larger number of cases, in reference to the great proportion of this fund, no doubt claims will never be made. But at the same time, if they ever should be made, the money turned over to the consolidated fund of Canada would be ample security for all depositors, so that no matter what turned up in the future the depositor who had in good faith left his money in the care and protection of a bank would have security for the amount, whatever it might be, even with accumulated interest.

Mr. ROSS: I must thank the hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) for, I will not say his flattering reference, as it is only the truth, to the contributions made by my county to the patriotic fund. Those conributions have been most generous, and they will continue to be so. I do not think the Minister of Finance has really been quite fair in his argument here to-day. His whole argument from beginning to end and repeated time and time again, was that I was advocating confiscation which, of course, I am not. No one in this House knows better than the Minister of Finance that it is impossible, or almost impossible, and that it is not the practice, to include in any resolution all the details of any measure. I have not done so in this resolution, but I have tried to point out as clearly as I could that my intention was that this money should be paid to the Patriotic Fund through the Minister of Finance, and that the Government in the end would become responsible for any claims made by depositors. As several hon. gentlemen have said, and as I believe, the claims that will be made to the Government in regard to these unclaimed balances will practically be nil, they will not be one per cent. So that the burden that would be taken on itself by the Government would practically amount to nothing. The Minister of Finance dwelt upon there being no precedent. I frankly admitted that there was no precedent apart from the precedent in Australia, where they not only went further than I ever dreamed of going, because in the legislation in Australia, they did actually confiscate the unclaimed balances and said they would be the property of the bank. Reference has been made by the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Sir Herbert Ames) and the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) to the generosity of the banks. I admit that the banks have been, I shall not say generous, but probably fair. And why should they not be? Every member of this House knows that the banks of this country enjoy privileges which are enjoyed by the banks in no other country in the world. As pointed out by the member for South Ontario, in the committee that revised the Bank Act in 1913, the banks of the United States pay into the treasury of that country $3,700,000 for the privilege of issuing circulation, whereas the banks of this country do not pay one cent for that great privilege. So I think the chartered banks of Canada could well afford to be not only fair, but very generous and even over generous in their givings to the patriotic funds.

There is another thing that probably the Finance Minister did not catch in my remarks and what was said by the hon. member for St. Antoine division bears out my idea. The hon. member for St. Antoine said that so far as the patriotic fund was concerned they had sufficient to run them through 1917.

Sir HERBERT AMES: With what is pledged.

Mr. ROSS: And I believe it will be paid. But this demand for patriotic money is not going to end in 1917. No one in this House knows that better than the hon. member for St. Antoine Division. I have heard it alleged in this House that there will be two years after the war before the troops will come back to Canada. Their dependents will have to be taken care of during that time as fully and generously as in the past, and I repeat that I do not think the people will be as much up on the bit to contribute to the Patriotic Fund when the war is over as they are at present. That is all the more reason why this resolution, modified as has been suggested by the Minister of Finance, should be passed. I cannot see any chance of the credit of this country being injured by the payment by the banks to the consolidated revenue fund of the small sum of $1,000,000. I do not think that the financiers of the world are ignorant enough of the stability and strength of our banks to be influenced by the passing of this resolution or of legislation founded upon it. Our banks are in too strong a position

at the present time for that. And, moreover, I am not setting up this resolution as a precedent to be followed in the future. As the Finance Minister stated in this house on another occasion, this war made a revolution of everything, the world is upside down, and things that might not be done in times of peace are justifiable in times of war. I think in all fairness that this is one of the things that should be done during these times.

Resolution negatived on division.

TRANSPORTATION AND RAILWAY PROBLEMS.

REPORT OF ROYAL COMMISSION PRESENTED.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance): I have an important report which I overlooked to lay upon the Table at three o'clock and which, with the consent of the House—and I have consulted my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)—I desire now to lay on the Table. It is a report of the Royal Commission appointed to investigate the transportation and railway problems of Canada. I hope I may have the consent of the House to lay this report upon the Table.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not in order to bring in this report at this stage, but with the unanimous consent of the House I think there would be no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM: All right. May I ask if this report will be printed forthwith?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If my hon. friend will be good enough to consent, I shall be pleased to move, with your consent, Mr. Speaker:—

That the report of the Royal Commission appointed to consider the general problem of transportation in Canada, now laid upon the Table, be printed forthwith, and that Rule 74 be suspended for that purpose.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is my duty to point out that this motion can be passed only with the unanimous consent of the House.

Motion agreed to.

SUBSTITUTE FOR THE ROSS RIFLE.

On the motion of Hon. CHARLES MURPHY:—

That, having regard to the fact that the failure of the Ross Rifle as an active service weapon was known to the Government in the early stages of the war, and that notwithstanding such knowledge the Government has continued to equip Canadian soldiers with the said rifle, this House is of opinion that the Government is deserving of censure for its conduct in the premises as well as for its prolonged delay in providing an efficient substitute for the Ross rifle.

Mr. MURPHY: I desire to state, for the information of the House, that I have arranged with the Acting Prime Minister that this motion stand until after the return of the Prime Minister.

Motion stands.

ABOLITION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN RUSSIA.

On the motion of Mr. ROBERT BICKERDIKE:—

That, in the opinion of this House, this Parliament having learned with pleasure the fact that the Russian Government had abolished capital punishment, the following official message be sent to the Prime Minister of Russia, at Petrograd, tendering our hearty congratulations both as to the abolishing of capital punishment and their determination to free Russia from all German influences.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Clerk of the House draws my attention to the fact that in his judgment this resolution is not one which can properly be submitted to the House. In view of his having brought the matter to my attention, I deem it of sufficient importance to ask that the motion stand so that I may look carefully into the authorities with a view of making sure of my ground. In the meantime, therefore, I would ask that the motion stand.

Motion stands.

PROPOSED ENLISTMENT OF PRISONERS.

Mr. ROBERT BICKERDIKE (Montreal, St. Lawrence) moved:—

That, in the opinion of this House, and with a view to increasing the volunteer service and the prosecution of the war, the Government should permit all prisoners in the jails, prisons and penitentiaries in the Dominion of Canada to enlist for active overseas service, thus enabling them to wipe out the stain of imprisonment and to fill up the depleted ranks of our boys in the trenches.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that we have a great many prisoners in the penitentiaries, jails and prisons of Canada who should be given an opportunity to wipe out the stain of the disgrace of their being prisoners. It is a well known fact that voluntary recruiting for overseas service is pretty well exhausted, and that it is to-day costing Canada $2,000 for each man who volunteers for overseas service. I find no fault with that; I think the men are worth the money. I do feel, however, that these prisoners, instead of being shut up in iron

cages or kept at breaking limestone day in and day out should be given the opportunity to volunteer for service at the front. Some one has said: what would we do if these men deserted and ran away into the German lines? Well, I do not know that we would suffer very much in losing that kind of men.

I know of no other place in the world that has not instituted some prison reform different from what we have in Canada. The Government deals with this matter in a blundering, unscientific way, the basis of which is the stupid and savage idea of revenge—the idea that crime is to be restrained, if not prevented, by examples of punishment. Those who have made this problem a study very generally agree that punishment not only does not prevent or lessen crime, but tends, rather, to propagate it. This is so well understood to-day that the death penalty is no longer made a public exhibition because of its demoralizing effects. The harsh, cruel and revengeful manner with which our prisoners are treated will never in a slightest degree tend to reform them.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): I regret that I heard only a small portion of the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bickerdike) in support of his motion. I notice that his proposal is:

> That, in the opinion of this House, and with a view to increasing the volunteer service and the prosecution of the war, the Government should permit all prisoners in the jails, prisons and penitentiaries in the Dominion of Canada to enlist for active overseas service, thus enabling them to wipe out the stain of imprisonment and to fill up the depleted ranks of our boys in the trenches.

I confess that on a reading of the motion it seems hardly necessary that I should go into any very elaborate explanations of the reasons why I feel that the House should not accept it. So far in this war we have proceeded—we are proceeding, and we have it in contemplation to proceed—to recruit our ranks by a voluntary system. The hon. gentleman himself recognizes this, because the purpose of his motion is to increase the voluntary service by a system of voluntary enlistment. In response to the appeals made, the very flower of the youth of Canada have flocked to our banners and filled our regiments. The proposal of the hon. gentleman is that the Government of Canada should proceed indiscriminately to empty the penitentaries and the prisons of Canada to turn the present inmates of those institutions into the ranks of our regiments. From the point of view of the soldier who has responded to the call of his country, and in the interest of those of our young men who have so readily and so willingly made the great sacrifice imposed upon them, I cannot recognize that it would be desirable that we should proceed to call upon our young men to receive into their ranks, as their daily associates, all of the occupants of our penitentiaries and prisons without distinction and without discrimination. It must strike everybody at first glance that there are certain classes of criminals who undoubtedly would exercise a corrupting influence among those surrounding them. I do not purpose going into details as to the nature of the offences to which I am now referring, but we all know that there are amongst the occupants of the penitentiaries and prisons, men who are there for offences which indicate the most degraded character, and still the hon. gentleman would include them with all the others and ask us to open the doors of the jails and the penitentiaries in order that those men might be let loose to associate, on a footing of equality, with the young men of the class to which I have already referred. So far as that class of prisoners is concerned, it seems to me that the proposition is manifestly unacceptable, and clearly calls for no answer other than a negative one.

In addition to that, there is the fact that crime in varying degrees calls for punishment, and I for one cannot agree to treat the enlistment in our army and the taking part in the defence of our country and of the great cause for which our boys are fighting, as a method of punishment to be handed out to criminals. For that reason again, I think the motion of the hon. gentleman is most highly objectionable and one that it is impossible to entertain. I do not desire to suggest that amongst all the inmates of the penitentiaries or the prisons there may not be individuals who might possibly be released for the purpose of allowing them to enlist, but what is proposed here is a general jail and penitentiary delivery absolutely without discrimination. That, I for one will not consent to. There have been instances in which the exercise of clemency with a view to enlistment has been recommended, and where that recommendation has been acted upon. There will, no doubt, in the future be similar instances and wherever the circumstances of a case, in the judgment of those charged

with advising the Crown with regard to the release of prisoners and with regard to the exercise of clemency, justify such a course, we shall be glad in the future, as we have been in the past, to consider as a factor in ordering the release of a prisoner the readiness and the willingness of the individual asking for it, to redeem himself by offering his services to his country. Further than that, I feel convinced that we would not be justified in going. I feel absolutely convinced that the public opinion of the country would not uphold an action such as the hon. gentleman asks for; I feel the public would not uphold it in the interest of our soldiers themselves; or in the interest of the self respect of Canada and of Canadians. As I said, I have not had the advantage of hearing all that the hon. gentleman said in support of his motion. All that I did hear was a very general and very vigorous affirmation that our method of treating criminals was cruel—I have forgotten what the other adjectives applied to it were, but they were adjectives of a similar kind. Of course, if the hon. gentleman considers confinement in a penitentiary a degree of punishment that amounts to cruelty, I must, on behalf of our system, plead guilty to the imputation of cruelty. If, however, the hon. gentleman means to say that there is in the administration of any of those institutions any undue infliction of cruelty, I venture to suggest that he should be ready with evidence to establish an accusation of that kind before he comes to throw it into this House and to cast it out to the public as an imputation upon all of the officers charged with the care, the supervision and the control of our punitive institutions. If the general statement is intended as any charge or accusation against those officers, I am in no position to meet any such vague assertion as that; but I may assure the hon. gentleman that those of us who are charged with the supervision of those institutions, in so far as they are under the control of this Government, are certainly not aware of any such state of affairs, and that we are careful in our endeavours to keep ourselves informed as to what goes on in those institutions.

I do not think, as I said at the outset, that it is necessary for me to proceed, at any length or with any greater elaboration, to offer reasons why this motion should not be accepted. I think I may safely leave it in the judgment of this House, with the assurance that the House will be prepared to act upon the request which I make to it to reject the motion at the present time.

Right hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the remarks of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, whilst I would agree in the main with everything he said, were perhaps more sweeping than they ought to be. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike) that it would seem to me that his motion is certainly broader than he should have made it. There is a certain class of criminals who cannot be allowed to enlist and to be brought into the company of men of the character of those who have enlisted already and who are doing such splendid work; but my hon. friend (Mr. Doherty) will agree with me, I am sure, that there are, not in the penitentiaries but in the jails, many men, young men especially, who have been guilty more of indiscretions than of real offences, and that to those men the option might well be given of enlisting. Of course, they cannot be compelled and they should not be compelled to enlist, and I agree with what has been said by my hon. friend on that point. As to those who are confined in our penitentiaries, I am not sure but a similar discrimination might be made on behalf of a good many of them. My hon. friend said a moment ago that their crime must be punished, and I agree with him on that point, but there are degrees of punishment.

Years ago we introduced the system of ticket-of-leave, which I think has worked admirably. Under this system, men who have been found guilty of serious offences but who are not criminal by nature, who have been driven to crime, perhaps, by their environment or associates, and who have some redeeming qualities, are given their freedom before their sentence expires, and I am sure it must be the same to-day as it was under the previous Government, that many and many of the men so released turn out to be very good citizens. Ticket-of-leave, of course, is granted only upon certain conditions which ordinarily would not be deviated from, but I think the Minister of Justice might well consider the advisability of giving this class of offenders the opportunity of leading a better life by serving in the forces, and certainly they could not do better than to offer their services to their country. If my hon. friend will not accept the present motion, he might at least take the matter into con-

sideration with a view to arriving at some method which would be in the best interests of all concerned.

Mr. Turriff rose to speak.

At six o'clock the House took recess

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member now purpose to reply, closing the debate?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I will reply now, if I am permitted, hoping that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), who rose at six o'clock to speak on this motion, may be allowed to speak if he comes into the chamber later.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that would be quite in order. I delayed the resuming of the debate for some minutes, thinking that the hon. member for Assiniboia, who had caught my eye before six o'clock, might be in his seat.

Mr. DOHERTY: If the course suggested by the hon. member (Mr. Bickerdike) can be permitted, I do not think there would be any objection so far as we are concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the unanimous consent of the House is given, I do not offer any objection. In that case, the hon member (Mr. Bickerdike) would have the right to reply now, but that would preclude any other hon. member replying to the hon. member for Assiniboia should he wish to speak. With that understanding, there is no objection to the hon. member (Mr. Bickerdike) proceeding with his reply.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: The Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) I think, is not quite so conversant with the facts as some of us on this side are. Unfortunately, or fortunately, the hon. gentleman has no sons, grandsons, or nephews, in France. That is not his fault; I am not blaming him. But I speak feelingly on this question, as I have a son, two grandsons and seven nephews at the front—that is, I had seven nephews at the front, but two have been killed and two badly wounded. I do not think that anyone who has those near and dear to him at the front would object if some of the prisoners were in the fight and helping to save the lives of our boys. No such person would raise the question whether those men had been in prison or not. Of course, it is a disgrace to be in prison. But there are many in prison who perhaps should not be there. And I am quite safe in saying that there are a good many who are not in prison who should be there. A good many young men are in prison for the first time, some of them for comparatively slight offences. I think these men might be given an opportunity to wipe out the stain of their imprisonment, and at the same time fight for the honour of Canada. I do not think the mothers of the boys in the trenches would find much fault if a regiment or two of our prisoners were helping to save the lives of their sons over there. They would not think much about the dignity of Canada if their boys' lives were being saved. I knew that the Minister of Justice would have an excuse—he always has when I have a resolution to propose. I did not know just what the excuse would be in this case, but I know it now—the dignity of the country, and the wish to punish these fellows. I admit that they deserve punishment. But there is such a thing as being too revengeful, and, while I do not wish to be personal with the hon. gentleman, whom I have known since he was a boy, I will say that I have known very few of his countrymen, the Irish, but have good hearts and have no wish to punish everybody, including the poor criminal—to shut him up in an iron cage, to throw him into a stone-walled yard and make him break stones all his life. The hon. gentleman states that there is no justification for what I said with regard to the management of the penitentiaries. What I said was not nearly so strong as the reports of his own Royal Commission. I believe he has modified conditions to a certain extent, but not sufficiently even yet. I hope the hon. gentleman will accept the resolution, with modifications if he likes. For, of course, I do not say that every prisoner should be allowed to leave the penitentiary and enlist; I speak only of the better class of prisoners, the boys who are in gaol for the first time, and, it may be, for comparatively trifling offences. I have in mind the case of a man whom I know, who is in penitentiary for two years. He got drunk and stole a horse and buggy, and was condemned. But that man is no criminal; I would not be ashamed to have him fighting side by side with my own son. I do not know that there is anything more I can say. I do not seem to be able to touch the minister's heart. I have been trying it for four years, but unsuccessfully. I pleaded with him, whether he accept the resolution or not, to do all he can in the way of helping to save our boys at the front.

Motion negatived.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT—PROPOSED PLEBISCITE.

Mr. ROBERT BICKERDIKE (Montreal, St. Lawrence) moved:—

That, in the opinion of this House, in consideration of the fact that the Russian Government has just recently abolished capital punishment, and that the population of this Dominion of Canada are at the present time much exercised as to the advisability of discontinuing the extreme penalty of death in Canada, at its next general election, the voters of Canada be afforded an opportunity by means of a plebiscite of declaring for or against such continuance of capital punishment in this Dominion.

He said: It is a well known fact that Russia has recently abolished capital punishment. I think this action was taken about the last week of February. Capital punishment has been abolished by many others of the Allies of Great Britain. I have no doubt—and possibly the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) will agree with me this time—that there has been a considerable agitation, during the last three or four months at least, on the question whether the people of this country should have an opportunity to declare whether or not they are still in favour of capital punishment. I think that in every province except Ontario and Quebec the people have virtually come out in favour of abolishing the death penalty.

I would like to place on record for the benefit of the House of Commons and of the country in general the final disposition of the twenty murderers who were condemned to death in 1916. Let me take off my hat to New Brunswick as she was the only province that did not have a murder committed in the year 1916; I suppose, largely due to the close proximity of the State of Maine. My information is to the effect that a large majority of the inhabitants of that enlightened province are in favour of prison reform and opposed to capital punishment. Prince Edward Island had one murder committed, the criminal being sentenced to death but as the people of Prince Edward Island are in favour of prison reform and opposed to capital punishment strong recommendations were made in this case against the execution of the sentence and it was commuted to life imprisonment which my hon. friend the Minister of Justice will remember.

Mr. DOHERTY: We are not so hard hearted as you say.

Mr BICKERDIKE: Well, I am not through with you yet. Ontario, unfortunately, looms up worse than any other province. They had four murders in Ontario, and as Ontario up to the present time happens to be in favour of capital punishment and against prison reform, all four prisoners were sent into eternity, three of them by the scaffold and one of his own accord, he having committed suicide. As there is now an agitation going on in different parts of the country for the purpose of abolishing legalized murder, I have hopes for that province in the future. We only had one murder in the province of Quebec, at St. Johns, and it being a very brutal case and the population not being quite clear yet on the question of capital punishment, the man was hanged. The Yukon had one murder and the murderer got the extreme penalty. I have no information as to how the inhabitants of the Yukon regard the death penalty. British Columbia, although a mining country, had only two murders; one sentence was executed and the other commuted to imprisonment. As far as I can learn the people of British Columbia are now in favour of the life sentence in preference to the death sentence and they are very strongly in favour of prison reform. Saskatchewan had two murders; one of the sentences was commuted and the other executed. My information is that a large portion of the population of Saskatchewan still hold out for capital punishment but there is a strong agitation for abolition and prison reform. Alberta was not quite so fortunate; they had three cases of murder. Two of the sentences were commuted and one of the criminals paid the extreme penalty. The people of Alberta are strongly in favour of prison reform and of abolishing the death penalty as members from that province will ascertain at the next general election because when they go back they will be asked whether they are in favour of capital punishment, whether they are baby killers, or whether they intend to vote and work in favour of prison reform.

Mr. BRADBURY: It all depends on what you call a baby. A person 17 years old is not a baby.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) would like to out-Herod Herod himself; he had better just wait. Manitoba also had three murder cases. One of the sentences was commuted and two were executed. Manitoba, I am pleased to say, is seriously contemplating requesting the Government to abolish capital punishment and is also in favour of

prison reform. Nova Scotia was not so fortunate. It had three murder cases and the murderers were all condemned to death by the courts, but as the people of Nova Scotia are largely in favour of prison reform and the abolition of capital punishment, strong representations, were made for mercy and the three sentences were commuted to life imprisonment. When the news was received by the population of Nova Scotia that they had succeeded in saving the lives of these three prodigals and that their souls were not sent into eternity, a sigh of relief went up, and I hope and believe that many of the people of that province before retiring that evening went down on their knees and thanked God that these prodigals were sent to the penitentiary instead of into eternity. Any member of this House would be a bold man who would stand up in his place and declare that the province of Nova Scotia had suffered for that clemency and mercy or that society had been prejudiced in any way by sending these three men to the penitentiary instead of sending them into eternity. I hope the Minister of Justice will agree to this resolution at least.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bickerdike) expresses the hope that I may agree with him on this motion, I may say that one of my fondest hopes is that the day will some time arrive when I shall find myself in agreement with the hon. gentleman on some proposal that he may make. He says that he has been four years trying to persuade me that the law of this country providing capital punishment for the gravest offence should be altered and he describes my position as being one of hard heartedness. I do not know but that perhaps I might claim that my action was due to just level headedness. However that may be, I do not purpose to enter upon any argument on the general question of the desirability of the abolition of capital punishment and my hon. friend has not done so in supporting his motion. His proposal is that the question should be submitted to a plebiscite at the next general election. As a general proposition, it does not seem to me desirable that we should depart from what is after all our system of parliamentary government and say, without some very exceptional reason, that we should submit to the people directly the exercise of the legislative power which constitutionally is properly exercised by their representatives in Parliament. I confess that I am not in a position to know what the gentleman's sources of information are as to the prevailing public opinion in the different provinces as to the desirability of abolishing capital punishment. But, I may say for myself, that I have not had occasion to see any evidence that the public of Canada generally were so keenly alive to the necessity of any change in the existing system of punishment as to make of this question of capital punishment a subject which should be treated as exceptional and withdrawn from the control of Parliament to be committed directly to the decision of the people. I do have in my official capacity certain opportunities of appreciating what are the matters in regard to which the people of Canada feel that there is need for modification in our criminal law. I am in receipt of numerous communications making representations in regard to one disposition or another in the criminal law and suggesting, and in many instances even pressing for, modifications of the dispositions there referred to. If my memory is correct, and I think it is, I have not had anything approaching widespread representations that there exists a conviction on the part of the people of Canada, or a desire on their part, that the law as it now stands on that subject should be modified. Indeed it would be difficult for me to mention any particular representation made to me upon that subject. Under those circumstances I certainly cannot share the view of the hon. gentleman that there is any such general unrest among the public upon that question as to make it incumbent upon us or to make it desirable that we should take this extraordinary method of dealing with this particular subject for legislation, of calling upon the people themselves to deal with it direct. For this reason I regret that once more I find myself in the unfortunate position of not being able to agree with the hon. member and to accept his proposition.

Motion negatived.

ABOLITION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT —WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

On motion of Mr. Bickerdike:

That, in the opinion of this House, the best interests of this young nation would be conserved by amending the Criminal Code so as to abolish the death penalty in Canada, in so far at least, as it applies to women and children.

Mr. SPEAKER: This resolution bears such a striking similarity to a subject which has already been discussed in this

House this year and disposed of that I have grave doubt as to whether, under our rules, it is competent for the hon. member to propose it. Inasmuch as I am seriously in doubt, I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow this motion to stand until a later date in order that I may have full opportunity to consult the authorities upon it. But as at present advised I do not see that I could permit the hon. gentleman to proceed.

ABOLITION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT —THE SPAIN CASE.

Mr. BICKERDIKE moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, as there now lies within this Dominion a young lad of sixteen years under the condemnation of death whose father is at the present moment fighting with his regiment in the British Army in France in defence of the Empire, it is the sense of this Parliament that the infliction of the death penalty is contrary to the dictates of civilization and Christianity, and we hereby protest against the proposed hanging of this young boy of the tender age of sixteen years, which we consider would be a blot on the fair name of Canada and an everlasting disgrace to this young nation.

He said: Does my hon. friend the Minister of Justice agree to this resolution?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am afraid not.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: Then I should like to make a few remarks with regard to it. It is really my opinion that the best interest of this young nation would be served by amending the criminal code as here suggested, more especially as this little boy in Manitoba has been sentenced to death, the sentence to be carried out on the 15th of May. I think my friend will agree that he has been approached on that question. I think that there is a petition, I do not know whether it has yet reached the minister, with 15,000 or 20,000 names attached to it. The minister shakes his head. He will admit that he has been approached on this question through numbers of telegrams?

Mr. DOHERTY: There have been representations made, but there is no such a petition as that.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: While the House is not unanimous in respect to the abolition of the death penalty in its entirety at the present time, I do hope that the members will see their way clear to vote this resolution unanimously, so that we may be able to prove to the world that there are no baby killer members of this House, or at least very few.

[The Speaker.]

In an ever increasing number the different states of the Union in the neighbouring republic have abolished capital punishment. It is, in Canada, strongly argued that an individual indicted for a capital offence is tried by jury and has all the advantages of criminal procedure to make out his case. On the face of it this is true; but in the last analysis the person's life depends upon the good judgment, or the bad judgment, as the case may be, of one man only, the Minister of Justice. If the prisoner is too poor to secure witnesses, or too much of a stranger to have testifying friends, he is found guilty; but if he has the means to pay lawyers, or has friends to do so for him, he can have his case appealed to the Governor General in Council. That means simply to the Minister of Justice for the time being. It is on the recommendation of that same minister that the commutation or the allowing of the law to take its course depends. Scores of men have been hanged because they either had no means to push their cases to this last point, or else they were strangers in the land and had no friends to interest themselves for them. Herein lies a grave danger—a danger that would be obviated were there no capital punishment, but merely perpetual imprisonment. It is needless to dwell further on this phase of the issue.

It is in the interest of justice, in the interest of legal certainty, in the interest of the stranger, the poor man, the friendless one, the workman, the individual whose lines are not cast in the higher strata of our social life; in the interest of humanity and of civilization, that this remaining blot be removed from the face of our otherwise matchless system of law and government. Instead of being a step backwards it becomes a giant stride ahead in the direction of the higher civilization and a broader christianity. When this terrible war will have ended and peace will again spread her wings over our fair Dominion, we want to be more in accord with the teachings of the Prince of Peace on earth.

Let those who care to look into the problem deeper visit the Côte de Neiges Cemetery at Montreal. It was afterwards discovered that a mistake had been made and that they should not have been hanged. A similar mistake was made in Toronto when Lount and Matthews were hanged. There is no question about the fact that they were rebels, but they were misled. If all the rebels in Canada were hanged, we would not have as

large a population as we have to-day. The lives of these young men should have been spared; the Minister of Justice and the member for Rouville will not dare controvert that. The lives of the 18 or 19 men who were hanged in 1838 should have been spared, and if I had been alive I would have done all I could to save them. Were their lives worth saving? I submit that they were, and I stand or fall by that assertion.

I may not win in this fight, but I shall at least be consoled with the thought that the blood of these poor unfortunate women and children would not be on my hands if it were in my power to stop it. It seems a pity to me that presumably good men construe the Scriptures in such a way as to come to the conclusion that the state is justified in taking human life. The horribleness of the thing itself is enough to condemn it, regardless of the doctrine of the law of mercy and love as taught by the Master. Now I come to the boy to whose case reference has been made. Some one said that he was an Italian, and the member for Selkirk claims that all these murders are committed by English boys. The right hon. leader of the Opposition says that many of them are committed by Italians. Well, if I were to judge by this young man's name, he is neither Italian nor English. His name is Patrick Spain; most people would think that he was Irish. However, it makes no difference whether he is black or white, orange or green; let us remember that he is some mother's boy. This young lad when 14 years of age became a bugler in the army. When his comrades in the trenches come back, if they ever do, they will ask the Minister of Justice: what has become of our little bugler comrade? It is no use saying that you are not the bugler's keeper or your brother's keeper. That reply was unsatisfactory 6,000 years ago, and it will not suit when the boys come back from the front.

The question as to whether the world is growing better or worse has nothing to do with the awfulness of hanging a woman or child. The child is some mother's boy. He has sinned, that is true; yet to hang him is only doing the worst thing the State can do to him. The crime cannot be undone by taking the offender's life; nothing that society can do can heal the wounds of the injured one. Where, then, is the common sense in making other wounds, in bringing double disgrace on the parents, brothers and sisters of the offender? Any man who reads the New Testament knows that it says: "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty in all." How such a man can feel that he is justified in sitting in judgment and casting the first stone, is beyond my understanding. "There is one lawgiver, who is able to save and destroy; who art thou that judgest another?" Surely we are too enlightened to feel, as did the Pharisee of old: "God, I thank Thee that I am not as other men." Does not the Scripture say: "Let not him which eateth not, judge him that eateth." "Love worketh not ill to his neighbour; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." "If we love one another, God dwelleth in us." "He that loveth not his brother whom he has seen, how can he love God, whom he hath not seen?"

If I am wrong in my fight to save this boy, then it is wrong to be merciful. If my fight to save the criminal's life is wrong, then the law of love is wrong.

There is another reason, almost fundamental, why society should not execute its fallen members, and that reason is a sociological one. Experience shows that in the great majority of cases men who commit crimes either are born criminals or have lived under such conditions that their environment promoted criminal instincts and even criminal traits. Had organized government done its duty towards such persons they would never have been criminals. Investigation shows that the majority of the inmates of the penitentiaries are illiterate. Many of them have no moral or religious training, and, of course, none of them are criminals from choice. They are "weak vessels," depraved degenerates, and, in many instances, monomaniacs. Yet we cry: "Hang them; hanging is too good for them!"

It is estimated by sociologists who have scientifically studied the question that 90 per cent of crimes committed would have been prevented had care, prudence and charity been exercised by the state and municipal governments. For example, the four gunmen of New York city sentenced to be hanged were victims of environment. They had been agents for gambling houses and houses of ill-fame, and divided their spoils with the officers of the law elected by the people of a great city. In that manner the agents of society educated them in crime, and yet the state says they must forfeit their blood to the state that trained them in vice. They were trained in the

under-world from infancy to commit crimes, till they became callous and did not scruple in taking life.

No state has the right to kill men when it contributes to their downfall. It owes them the duty to educate them and to throw nothing but moral influences around them, and when it fails to do this organized society is at fault. You may ask: What will we do with them? Why, do your duty towards them, by placing them in a prison, reformatory in its character; teach them morality, and, if necessary, give them mental training, and allow them the right to expiate their crimes and prepare for the hereafter. Make men out of them, and give them in most instances, if not in all, the hope that they will be rewarded if they will reform and become worthy of again taking their places among their fellowmen. This young boy, Patrick Spain, went through the battle of Mons and was blown up by a German shell—a very severe case of shell shock. He was sent to a hospital, and as soon as he was able to be removed was moved to England. After spending considerable time in a hospital there, he was sent out to this country by some society, as they thought his nerves would have a better chance of being cured out in the prairies than in the city of London. It appears that this poor boy was brought up in the slums, knew nothing of education, moral or religious training. He was just a poor little waif. He claims that he was sent into the house to clean his master's gun, and in doing so the gun accidentally went off and killed his employer's wife. His employer, having heard the shot, rushed towards the house with a gun in his hand. The boy claims that he did not know what he was doing at the time, that his nerves were so unstrung from the accident and from seeing the husband rush towards him with the gun in his hand that he turned around and shot the husband. The whole thing was a matter of circumstantial evidence. The boy was only 16; surely we are not going to start hanging children in Canada. It is a long time since we have hanged a child and I hope that we shall not commence again in 1917. I have no doubt that few of the members of this House understand the nature of shell shock and the results which it causes. I do, a little. A grandson of mine was blown up by a shell at the battle of the Somme which took place several months ago, and he has been in an English hospital ever since and has not yet quite recovered. I am not sure but the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) met him; I think he did. My grandson's nerves are in a very shattered condition, and I question very much if he will ever be the same man again; and if this boy's nerves were in the same condition as my grandson's are in at the present time, he can hardly be accounted responsible for anything he did. It may be that the boy has killed or murdered. If my information is correct, he was tried, not for murdering the woman but for murdering the husband, but he was condemned to death for murdering the woman.

Mr. DOHERTY: The last portion of my hon. friend's statement is not correct.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: That is the information I have from the boy's lawyers: that he was tried for the murder of the man and confessed to the murder of the man, but he was sentenced to death for the murder of the woman, for which offence he was not tried. That is the justice that is so properly distributed in Canada. I have letters from the boy's lawyers stating that that is a fact. If my hon. friend doubts my statement, I will show him the letters.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not doubt any statement that the hon. gentleman makes of his own knowledge.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I hope Canada will not only save the boy but save our young nation from the everlasting disgrace of having hanged a child. I ask: Would society be any better protected now by sending this poor little boy into eternity than it would by sending him into a reformatory? Is there in this House to-day any man who will say he wants to hang a little boy of sixteen years of age? I do not think even the member for that constituency will say so. The hon. member was a little short the other evening and felt, like the Minister of Justice, that nothing but vengeance and justice would suit in this country, but on further consideration he did not, I think, feel quite so vengeful. This boy's father is still in the British Army fighting side by side with our young men at the front. The boy's sister is in a lunatic asylum in Ireland. My hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) shakes his head; but I am informed by the boy's lawyers, who, I understand, are a reputable firm, that such is the case. The family is an Irish one. The boy's father joined the British army and was sent over to England. The family moved to London and the little boy was brought up in the worst slums in that great

city. What could one expect? He went to the front as a bugler and his father is still in the army fighting for us. The poor little fellow sixteen years of age is now a stranger in this country, and we say: Hang him. God forbid that this young nation will be so disgraced as to hang that boy. When this boy's comrades return from the front, they will ask the Minister of Justice: Where is our little comrade? I do not think they will be pleased when they find that their little bugler has been hanged. I am not speaking about law; I know very little about law, and what I do know has been very expensive.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. GRAHAM: The House seems to be unanimous on that point.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: For the benefit of our warrior bold from Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), I would like to read this editorial from the Peterborough Evening Review:

> The right of one man to take the life of another in order to preserve his own has always been recognized in human enactments and set forth in Divine law. The fact must be established that the man so acting in his own behalf had every reason to believe that his life was in danger before he resorted to extreme measures to protect it.

I am reading this for the benefit of my good friend who was very much taken with the question of self-defence:

> This principle or legal maxim is one of the stock arguments of those who favor the retention of capital punishment. Society must be protected from the murderer, and to save its own existence must put all such out of the way. Surely society or the state is not threatened by the acts of a single individual, and is able to protect itself by adopting measures less harsh.
>
> A grown man attacked by a boy armed with a snowball or a bean-shooter may be annoyed, but it can hardly be claimed that his life is actually in danger. No matter what the inclination may be to play the role of Cain, adequate provocation is lacking. The boy can be suppressed and disposed of, made to see the error of his ways, reformed completely, perhaps, by some method short of shedding his blood. If his victim did take his life, the law would hardly uphold his procedure.
>
> The illustration cited above represents, too, the individual homicide and the State. The latter is too big and powerful to set up the plea that it is in any real danger by reason of the acts of one lone offender. It is necessary as well as advisable for the State to protect itself, but surely this can be done without resorting to extreme measures. What right has the State, whose authority is delegated to it by the individual, to take human life, any more than the latter has to avenge himself of his adversaries in the same way? There is certainly no warrant for such a line of conduct found in the teachings of the Nazarene, upon Whose precepts all human legislation is supposed to be based.
>
> A boy of sixteen, brought up in the slums of London, neglected, and surrounded with every form of vice, until he no doubt came to regard viciousness as the normal condition of humanity, was transplanted to new surroundings in Manitoba. The shifting of the scene was not sufficient to effect a change in a nature calloused by a youth spent in such environments as he had known. He committed a double murder under circumstances that at once stamped him as a moral and mental degenerate.
>
> The boy is to be hanged, despite his years. Society takes the cheapest method of getting him out of the way. The powerful State confesses itself unable to handle a boy of sixteen short of breaking his neck. A grown man who acted as the State does in this case would not only be laughed at but held to strict accountability.
>
> One of the objections to capital punishment is that it tends to breed in the community a class of individuals only a shade less reprehensible than the murderer himself. The marvel is not so much that the State, cold-blooded as it is, should decide to hang this boy, but that it should be able to find a man willing for a trifling monetary consideration to place the noose around the neck of the youth and spring the trap under his feet.

That is an editorial from, I think, the principal newspaper in my hon. friend's riding. If that boy's sister is in a lunatic asylum; if that boy was brought up in the slums of London with such an environment—if that is all true, is there a man in this House who would hang that child? I do not plead his innocence because he confesses frankly that he killed his boss. But surely no man will say that this was a cause of premeditated murder. It was committed on the spur of the moment, and many of the best lawyers think that it should have been a case of manslaughter and not of murder.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): I do not purpose for a moment to enter into any discussion of the hon. gentleman's motion. I think the House will realize how improper and impossible it would be for a member of this Government, which has imposed upon it the duty of advising His Excellency in the exercise of the prerogative of the Crown to grant leniency, to express any opinion on the matter in this Parliament. But realizing the very strong feeling of the hon. gentleman upon this subject, and not wishing to prevent his having the opportunity of making such plea as his heart might inspire on behalf of this young man, I did not when he moved this motion take exception on the ground

of its being out of order, nor do I now desire to make absolute affirmation upon that subject. But I do feel very strongly that I should submit to your judgment, Sir, the question of whether this motion is in order. I should like to point out that the exercise of clemency is the prerogative of the Crown, that His Excellency the Governor General exercises that prerogative under the powers conferred upon him by his commission. Under that commission he is required to act in capital cases upon the advice of his council, and in other cases upon the advice of one of his ministers, usually the Minister of Justice. Parliament does not appear to me to have any role to play in the matter, and from the practical point of view I think we can all realize what an unfortunate thing it would be if council, called upon to advise the Governor General say in this particular case, should find itself face to face with a vote of Parliament that this young man ought to be hanged; because if there may be a vote that he should not hang, there may equally be a vote that he should. In what position to act impartially, to weigh the circumstances pro and con with the knowledge derived from a careful study of the entire evidence in the case, would the members of the council be, if in advance they had the expression of the opinion of this Parliament (to which after all they are responsible), that the young man ought to hang? I think it is only necessary to point out that practical inconvenience, to strengthen the position that such a motion as is now made, inviting in advance of any action on the part of the Crown, an expression of opinion by Parliament as to what that action should be, is clearly out of order. I do not propose to go into the citation of authorities, because I did not come here prepared for that purpose, but the question is very fully discussed in Todd's Parliamentary Practice, and I think there is no conclusion that can be reached other than that this motion seeking to seize Parliament of this question at this stage is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Inasmuch as the hon. member for St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike) is an old and highly respected member of this House, and realizing how very deeply he feels upon this subject, I felt some hesitancy in ruling his motion out of order forthwith, and I left it to the judgment of the House for some hon. member to rise to a point of order as to whether his motion could properly be put. Since the point of order has been raised by the Minister of Justice, I have no hesitation in saying that in my judgment the resolution is out of order, not only on the ground suggested by the hon. Minister of Justice, but also for the reason that it deals with the question of capital punishment, which is the subject of another debate pending before the House, as will be seen by turning to the Orders of the Day, item No. 2 on Public Bills and Orders, "Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Bickerdike for the second reading of Bill No. 3, an Act to amend the Criminal Code and to abolish capital punishment."

Mr. GRAHAM: Might I be allowed to say a word?

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot permit debate, but if the hon. member for South Renfrew wishes to say a word and has the unanimous consent of the House I shall interpose no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM: We all sympathize with the hon. member for St. Lawrence. His heart is in this subject and he misses no opportunity of bringing it before the public, and I agree with his views in the main. But I see the point taken by the Minister of Justice quite readily. It would be impossible to submit cases of this kind for the approval or disapproval of Parliament. Just imagine the situation in which we might be placed! It would rather prejudice the object my hon. friend has in view, and might prejudice it very seriously. All we could do at this time would be to change the statute, if Parliament saw fit. Having said that, I think the Minister of Justice could not have said more or less than he did on the subject. He is the responsible minister who makes the report to Council, and Council acquiesces in the report or disapproves of it, and it is their recommendation that becomes the recommendation of the Governor in Council, and not that of the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice being called upon to make a recommendation to Council, and Council being called upon to decide on his recommendation, they could not possibly express any opinion to Parliament at this stage. I might say that as an individual I should be glad to sign a petition and urge the Minister of Justice to be lenient in this case, but as a member of Parliament I would not care to be called upon to vote on this matter, as I think we have no right to do so.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am in the same position as my hon. friend from South Renfrew

(Mr. Graham), and I wish to say just a word or two.

Mr. SPEAKER: I trust this debate will not be continued by members rising and craving the indulgence of the House to speak. I would rather the hon. member for Rouville did not insist upon discussing the subject.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: Let me just say one word. I quite agree with you, Sir, but in my opinion the Minister of Justice should have raised his point of order at the beginning of the debate. I think, according to the rules of the House, he had no right to raise his point of order and call for a ruling in the middle of the debate. However, Sir, I always submit respectfully to your ruling.

Motion withdrawn.

CIVIL SERVICE—APPOINTMENTS UNDER SECTION 21.

Mr. JOHN H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough) moved:—

A return giving a list of all appointments made by the present Administration prior to the date of this order under the provisions of Section 21 of the Civil Service Act, 1908, giving the names in full, former Post Office addresses, occupations, ages, present employment, department in which employed, salaries at time of appointment, present yearly salaries and the respective dates of the Orders in Council by which they were appointed.

He said: There is reason to suspect that section 21 of the Civil Service Act has been used for purposes that were not intended at the time the Act was passed. The Civil Service Act, which was passed in 1908, was an attempt to supersede the old practice of appointing favourites to positions in the Civil Service; it was an honest attempt, I believe, to introduce a system of appointment by merit after competitive examination. It was found necessary, however, to make provision for exceptional cases in which it might be found inadvisable to demand that the candidate for appointment submit to examination. It was pointed out at the time that occasionally the Government might wish to appoint an eminent engineer or some other officer who would refuse to accept appointment if it were made conditional that he should undergo an examination. Consequently this section was put in the Act, giving the Government power with the consent of the Commission to override in a sense, by Order in Council, the Civil Service Commission. When a man of such character as I have referred to is required for the Civil Service, the Government may appoint him by Order in Council, as I understand it. I asked the question a few days ago how many appointments had been made by the present Administration under this section and the Secretary of State (Mr. Patenaude) informed me that the number was 174. I submit that there is reason to think that there have not been 174 appointments of genuine experts to the Civil Service since 1911, and I am much inclined to suspect that many of these appointments were of men who were too old to be appointed under the Act, or were not well enough posted to pass the ordinary examination. Of course, I am not sure as to that, but the number of appointments strikes me as very large, and I think no hon. member will be of opinion that so many genuine appointments have been made under Section 21 within the last five years. However, I will reserve my criticisms until the report comes down. I would make special request of the Secretary of State not to delay the bringing down of the return. I find that there is a disposition this session to delay the production of papers. In my own experience and that of other hon. members, when a single question is asked the answer to which requires only a little work on the part of a clerk, the question is turned into an order for returns, pigeonholed and apparently forgotten, and it may be six months before the return is ready. I hope that will not be the case with this motion, as it is very important that we should stand by the intention of the Civil Service Act, and if there is an abuse in regard to section 21 the public and the House should know it. I submit that it would be right for the Secretary of State to make a special case of this motion and to speed the production of the papers as much as possible.

Hon. J. D. REID: I think it was when my Estimates were before the Committee of Supply a few evenings ago, that the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) mentioned the appointments made under section 21 of the Civil Service Act. So far as I am able to learn there has been no violation of section 21, as suggested by the hon. member. I think he was under the impression that if a department wished to appoint an official and evade the Civil Service Act, the appointment could be made by Order in Council, and that 174 appointments had thus been made in violation of section 21.

Mr. GRAHAM: Under section 21, not in violation of it.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I said that I thought the number large, and was afraid it might indicate an unfair use of the powers of the Government.

Mr. REID: I promised the hon. gentleman that I would bring this before each member of the Government, so that, as the Estimates of each department were taken up, the minister in charge might be ready to give a list of the names of those appointed under this section and to explain those appointments. The Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Prof. Shortt, evidently read Hansard the day after the debate to which I have referred, and he wrote me a letter which I would have been glad to read to the hon. member, but, unfortunately, I have not it with me. That letter will show the hon. member that he is mistaken as to appointments having been made otherwise than in accordance with the Act, or by abuse of the Act. I wrote to Prof. Shortt immediately on receiving his letter and asked if he could give me a list of the appointments made under section 21. I thought it probable that he could give that list readily, because in the case of appointments under this section the certificate of the Civil Service Commission is necessary, and none of these 174 appointments had been made without such certificate. I am satisfied that when I get that statement from Prof. Shortt the hon. gentleman will find that these appointments have been mainly of architects or other specialists, whose appointments were necessarily made under this section. I am sure the Secretary of State will have the return prepared as soon as possible.

Mr. MARCIL: I hope it is clear that appointments to the House of Commons and Senate are included under the motion, as I know that appointments to the Translating Staff of the House have been made under section 21.

Mr. REID: I will draw that to the attention of whatever minister has charge of the Estimates for Legislation, in order that he may be prepared to give information on this subject.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The appointments to the House of Commons are included under the motion, as it calls for "a list of all Appointments" made in the manner referred to.

LOSS OF GOVERNMENT DREDGE CAPE BRETON.

Mr. G. W. KYTE (Richmond, N.S.) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, approval should be given to any measure proposed by the Government towards meeting the claims of the wives, families and dependents, of the men who lost their lives in the disaster to the Government Dredge Cape Breton, off Shad Rock, Guysborough County, Nova Scotia, in the month of January last.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this resolution has reference to a very distressing disaster that occurred on the coast of Guysborough in January last. The Cape Breton was being towed from Lunenburg to Sydney. It was at a season of the year when, owing to the condition of the weather, the towing of such a helpless ship as this was extremely difficult. The result of this disaster was the loss of the lives of the members of the crew. Several of them belonged to the county I represent in this House; others were natives of other parts of the province of Nova Scotia. Those belonging to my county left wives and helpless families. Without desiring to introduce a harsh note into this discussion, I may say that the conditions under which the disaster took place imply that the Government is subject to more responsibility in regard to it than perhaps it otherwise would be. The moving of this dredge from Lunenburg to Sydney at that time was a proceeding that, with all deference to those who were responsible for it, should not have been undertaken. It has not been disclosed to my knowledge what urgent necessity there was for towing the dredge at that season of the year. It has been suggested that it was necessary to transport the Cape Breton on to Sydney for the purpose of having some repairs made to its machinery. I cannot understand why it was necessary to take the Cape Breton to Sydney at that season of the year. The repairs necessary to be made to the machinery, I am informed, could as well have been made in the town of Lunenburg, where there is a foundry and machine shop quite capable of supplying such machinery and repairs as were necessary. But, if the work could not have been done in Lunenburg it could have been done in the city of Halifax or in the town of Dartmouth. Another circumstance that contributed, I think, to the disaster, or, at all events, which reduced the possibility of the escape of those who were on the dredge, was that the life-saving station at Whitehead was at that time out of commission. For some years a very efficient life-saving station had been maintained at that point, which is a place very much exposed to the storms of the Atlantic, par-

ticularly during the winter season. For some reason of which I am not cognizant, the department of this Government having control over life-saving stations disbanded the life-saving crew, the boats were unfit to render service, and as a consequence of this, when the accident occurred to the Cape Breton, there was no life-saving apparatus available to assist in the rescue of these poor, unfortunate men. On account of these two circumstances, I suggest that the responsibility of the Government to make adequate allowance for the dependents of those who were lost in that disaster is greater than it would be under ordinary circumstances. In any condition the loss of the wage-earner is a very serious blow and entails very great privations in most cases upon those who are dependent upon him. At a time like this when the cost of living is so high and when it is very difficult for those who are capable and competent to earn their daily bread for themselves and their families to earn a sufficient amount for that purpose, what shall we say of the poor, unfortunate widow and helpless children who are faced with the necessity of earning for themselves a sufficient income to provide for the necessaries of life? What ever would have been the intention of the Government under ordinary conditions, I think the particular circumstances surrounding this disaster call for special treatment on the part of the Government. Some questions were asked in this House by my hon. friend representing the county of Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) as to what were the intentions of the Government in respect to this matter. The hon. acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Reid) was good enough to reply that the matter was receiving the attention of the Government. I move this resolution for the purpose of impressing on the hon. acting Minister of Public Works and the other members of the Government that this case is one not requiring ordinary treatment and I would express the hope that when this question comes before them for their consideration they will deal with it in the broadest and most generous way that they possibly can. I shall not press consideration of it further upon the Government than to urge upon them that they will place a just measure of compensation and assistance, in the way of a gratuity, in the hands of those who are dependent upon themselves for their livelihood on account of the accident to which I have referred.

Hon. J. D. REID: In the absence of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) I may say a few words in reference to this motion. When an accident of this kind occurs and loss of life results, it is a very serious matter. We all deplore an accident of this kind. I remember reading about the accident and I was very sorry to hear of the loss of life. Why the dredge was being moved at that particular time I am not able to say. The officials of the department of Public Works, as far as I can tell, are all competent and careful men and men of good judgment. They may have erred in this case in ordering the dredge to Sydney although I do not believe that they did. The storm arose, the dredge was caught outside and the accident occurred. This matter was brought to the attention of the Minister of Public Works some time ago by members from Nova Scotia, and I understand that he has the matter of the treatment of the families of those who lost their lives on that occasion under consideration. I am sure that when the supplementary Estimates are taken up these cases will be dealt with. The hon. member of course knows that when accidents have occurred in the past in any of the departments such as Public Works and Railways and Canals in which accidents are likely to happen, the department in every case has dealt with them in the supplementary Estimates for that particular year. The hon. Minister of Public Works will before the end of the session have his supplementary Estimates prepared. I shall again bring this case to his attention. I would ask the hon. member not to press his motion further, and to allow the matter to be dealt with as I have indicated.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I think it would be proper for the minister to give the House the results of the investigations made in connection with this disaster. As the member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) says, it was a very distressing case in which a number of men lost their lives, and the friends and relatives of the men who lost their lives are of the opinion that there was great carelessness somewhere. My information is that the hawser to which this dredge was attached parted. The dredge was being towed by a tug. It had no propelling machinery or steering gear of its own. A gale was blowing on to the shore and a wild and rocky shore it is, and as there was no boat and no way of doing anything to rescue the

men, once the hawser parted and the dredge was at the mercy of the sea the men had no chance at all. It is also to be remembered that the lifeboat was not available. There is a life station at Whitehead. The lifeboat crew at Whitehead had done splendid work for many years. They had on various occasions rescued men from perishing, and under the management of the department at the present time this lifeboat appears to have been out of commission. That, along with the fact that the dredge was moved so carelessly from one place to the other, that the hawser could not have been as strong as it ought to have been and that there was no spare hawser, in fact, that, insufficient precautions were taken to ensure the safety of those on board the dredge, would seem to call for special consideration of this case by the Government. I do not think that this is a case for a small amount such as we generally see given as a consolation allowance in cases of this kind. I think this is a case where the Government ought to carefully investigate all the circumstances, and if they find there has been carelessness on the part of the officials connected with the lifeboat or in the removal of the dredge from one place to the other, they should pay special damages to the dependents of the men who lost their lives in the service of the Government.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): One can hardly say anything on this motion without repeating practically the words used by the two hon. gentlemen who have already spoken. But I would like to emphasize just in a word what they have already said. I trust that when the Government come to deal with this matter they will make a very generous allowance to the dependents of those who lost their lives in this regrettable disaster. However, that is not the phase of the matter which appeals to me most strongly at the moment. I am inclined to the belief that there was gross carelessness in directing that this dredge and two scows should be towed from Lunenburg to Sydney in the month of January. I cannot make myself believe that there is anybody in the Department of Public Works so incompetent as to direct that it should be done. I think if the truth were known it would be found that the dredge was ordered to be removed from the port where she was lying to the port of Sydney for purposes other than practical ones. It is a most absurd error of judgment for any person to direct that that dredge and two scows be towed in the month of January several hundred miles from the port of Lunenburg to Sydney. One could hardly imagine a more hazardous task than the towing of a dredge and scows, particularly in the month of January. There was no reason why the scow should have been ordered to Sydney. She could not possibly have done any work there. It has been stated in the press in Nova Scotia that the dredge was ordered to Sydney for the purpose of repairs. That cannot be a good and sufficient answer. The dredge could have been repaired in the port of Lunenburg as well as in any other port in the world. The ports of Halifax and Liverpool were also available; in fact, it could have been repaired in any creek or cove in the province of Nova Scotia, because a dry dock or marine railway is not necessary for repairing a dredge. She might have been towed on the shore and repaired there, as is frequently done. I think that the whole incident is most reprehensible, indeed, and it is regrettable that we do not know all of the facts. It could not be possible that the dredge was intended to perform any public work for several months after that date in the island of Cape Breton, and the reason that is sometimes urged, that she was going to Sydney for repairs, is absolutely untenable. I think that while the matter is up it will not be amiss to emphasize the point made by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) in respect to the non-repair of the life saving station at Whitehead. I am informed, as was the member for Guysborough, that this life saving station had been out of repair for several weeks, and that the department were advised some five or six weeks before this disaster which we are discussing had taken place, of the condition of the life saving station. I understand it was reported to the Naval Department that the cribwork of the life saving station was out of repair, and that it took the officers of this department several weeks to find out that this cribwork was really a part of the life saving station and not a bed or crib wherein the men who manned the lifeboats usually sleep. In other words, they mistook cribwork at the life saving station for a bed in which the men engaged in the life saving work usually slept at night. If this is correct it is a most lamentable condition of ignorance, which possibly contributed to the regrettable loss of life on the occasion of the loss of the dredge. I have very much pleasure in supporting the resolution of the hon. member for Richmond, and I regret

that the House is not more fully apprised of all the facts in connection with the matter.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The minister did not say whether we would be favoured with the papers.

Mr. REID: I shall be very glad to lay upon the table of the House anything in connection with this investigation.

Motion withdrawn.

ALLEGED MISUSE OF MAILS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. TURRIFF: On Monday last I drew the attention of the House to a system of collecting money that was being carried on in Canada for the purpose of buying morphine to allay the sufferings of wounded in the hospitals of the Allies, and I expressed the opinion that either the Government was very much to blame for not supplying the necessary funds, or the collecting agency, which was in the city of New York, was a fake. Since then I have received considerable information on the subject, and I am glad to be able to inform the House that, so far as I can judge, the Government has not been to blame; neither was this a fake in any sense of the word. The facts of the matter, shortly, are as follows: Several months ago, when there was a great shortage of anæethetics in Serbia, three young nurses in New York, thought it would be a good thing to collect money in the United States to be devoted to the purchase of anæsthetics. They went to Miss Whitman, superintendent of nurses in a prominent hospital in New York, and asked her to act as treasurer. She refused to do so, but in spite of her refusal these young ladies started a chain of letters and Miss Whitman was soon deluged with correspondence and with money. She immediately drew the attention of the board of directors of the hospital to the fact, who notified the post offices and police authorities of New York. The police authorities made a thorough investigation and found that everything was being done in an absolutely straightforward and honest manner. But the hospital authorities were very much annoyed about it. They notified some of the papers in New York, among them the New York Times, and every possible effort was made to stop this chain of letters and to stop the money from coming in. In spite of their efforts, however, over $25,000 has come in to Miss Whitman. In order that everything should be done in order, the hospital authorities had a committee of prominent New York men appointed to look after the expenditure of this money. I understand that some small amounts of it have been expended for soldiers' comforts here in Canada and that they are going to use the money for the benefit of the soldiers. When I got this information I felt that I had done an injustice to Miss Whitman in stating that in my judgment the whole thing was a fake—because I could not believe that the Government had been remiss in that part of its duty. Miss Whitman is a Canadian.

Mr. GRAHAM: An unwilling philanthropist.

Mr. TURRIFF: She comes from the vicinity of Montreal, and is well connected in that city. Everything that was done in this connection was done with the view of aiding the Allies and in assisting the suffering soldiers. I make this explanation, as I do not wish that anything that I said should be a reflection on Miss Whitman, who has not been to blame in any respect. Everything has been straightforward and satisfactory, but the movement was a mistaken one, and once started was very difficult to check. As a matter of fact it has not yet stopped; no doubt a great deal more money will come in before it can be stopped, in spite of all the publicity that there has been in connection with the matter.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I shall be glad to draw the statement of my hon. friend to the attention of the Minister of Militia who, I believe, has been looking into this matter since my hon. friend brought it to the attention of the House the other day. One advantage at least will result from what my hon friend has done, because, by reason of what he has said as to the success of the chain, I think I will start one myself for the Government.

SCARCITY OF SALT FOR CURING PURPOSES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. SINCLAIR: I should like to direct the attention of the acting Prime Minister to a matter which is of special importance on the coast of the Maritime provinces, that is, the scarcity of salt for the curing of fish. My hon. friend is aware that tonnage is now very scarce and as salt is a bulky material, compared with its value, it is difficult to procure tonnage to

deliver it on the coast where it is needed to prepare for the season's fishing. There is great scarcity of salt, and great danger that it will not be available to the fishermen. I have had letters and telegrams from different points on the coast stating that there is little or no salt at Halifax, which was the place whence it was generally furnished, and that there is a prospect that it will be very scarce and that that scarcity will interfere with the fishing industry during the present season. My hon. friend is no doubt aware that the fishermen, like the farmers, are being urged to increase production, and it is of the utmost importance that they should do so. The fishing on the coast of Europe has practically ceased. Prior to the war, at least 3,000 steam trawlers were carrying on fishing in the North Sea and in the adjoining waters, supplying most of Europe with fresh and salt fish. The war has changed all that, nearly all those trawlers being engaged as mine-sweepers or as boats for the purpose of hunting the submarine, and little or no fishing is being carried on at the present time in Europe. It is therefore of the utmost importance that everything should be done to aid the Canadian fishermen, as they are at present supplying food to our soldiers at the front, large quantities of fresh fish having gone forward from Canada to France within the last number of months for that purpose. I do not know what steps the Prime Minister should take in the matter, but I have no doubt there are a good many transport ships coming across from the other side at the present time practically empty. Of course the ships are all loaded going east, but many of them come back in ballast, and there ought to be an opportunity of getting some of this salt taken over, possibly in some of the ships that are commandeered by the Government. It is at all events worth while for my hon. friend to look into the matter, in order to see if anything can be done to relieve the situation, which, I believe, is very urgent, and likely to become more urgent if some steps are not taken.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I shall be very glad to draw the matter referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) to the attention of the Acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries and to the notice of the officers of the department concerned, and see if anything can be done to relieve the situation my hon. friend speaks of.

[Mr. Sinclair.]

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

LIMITATION OF RACING MEETS.

On the Order:

House in Committee on Bill No. 2, an Act to amend the Criminal Code.—Mr. Wilcox.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY: When the Bill passed its second reading there was an understanding that it should be referred to a special committee, and I expected to be able to move this evening that certain members be appointed to act on that committee. This afternoon the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) asked me to allow the matter to stand until he was prepared to submit the names of members of the Opposition. I would, therefore, ask that the matter stand.

Order stands.

PROPOSED ABOLITION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. R. Bickerdike (Montreal, St. Lawrence) for the second reading of Bill No. 3, to amend the Criminal Code and to abolish capital punishment, resumed from April 19.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Blain): I may say that the hon. member is closing the debate.

Mr. R. BICKERDIKE (Montreal, St. Lawrence): Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate, I will naturally be very brief, but as some very distinguished statesmen have taken exception to my Bill, I will take the opportunity of replying briefly to them. They all undertook to oppose my suggested amendment to the Criminal Code for the purpose of abolishing the death penalty and substituting life imprisonment for the different crimes contained in our statute books, for which the extreme penalty of death is prescribed. In doing so I would call the attention of the leader of the Opposition to some of his remarks as reported in Hansard, to which remarks I desire to take exception. Before doing so, however, I would like to say a few words in reply to the Solicitor General. I want to make it very plain that my view is that capital punishment should not be abolished if hanging protects society. I take that ground at once. The first object that this Parliament should have is to protect society, and if it is necessary to hang our poor prodigals for the purpose of protecting society, then let us hang them. On

the other hand, if we can protect society equally well, or better, by life imprisonment, then let us have life imprisonment, but by all means let our first consideration be the protection of society. The Solicitor General took very strong grounds on that question the other evening.

Capital punishment is discriminatory. Because of its severity it is almost never inflicted upon a person of wealth or influence, and in general we hang only such as belong to the abjectly miserable portion of humanity. The long and short of the matter is that the death penalty is too severe to be inflicted upon the rich or the strong. It is one of the cruel inventions of caste—it is a class penalty, just as some of the laws governing it have been class laws. A penalty so severe as not to be enforceable has a basic objection; it produces unrest to have a constant miscarriage of justice. A wealthy malefactor, an influential murderer, a powerful assassin cannot go free, in a community where paupers and friendless foreigners are hanged, without the people acquiring a contempt for the laws.

There is, regrettably, a disposition on the part of some of our most worthy citizens (yes, Christians) to bring passages of Scripture to the support of capital punishment. We have heard unto the point of weariness the quotation of the Old Testament of " an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." We do not hear so frequently, however, of Christ's own allusion to the Old Testament in the following words " Ye have heard it said in olden times, ' An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth,' but I say unto you, love your enemies and pray for them that despitefully use you." If any one, however adept in placing construction on the English language, is able, in the light of these words, to attribute even tacit support of the death penalty to the Saviour of mankind he will exceed all bounds of mental agility within my comprehension. Again, we hear from those who would quote the Word in justification of legalized murder, the citing of that part of the sixth verse of the ninth chapter of Genesis, which reads as follows, " Whosoever sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed."

Some of our best people try to be governed exclusively by what the Old Testament says. I revere and respect their opinions, but I must confess that I always prefer to have same endorsed by the New Testament. Now, it is within the memory of many that a large number of Christians in the Southern States quoted the Old Testament in support of slavery. I also remember in my younger days Brigham Young quoting freely from the Old Testament in support of polygamy, but as neither slavery nor polygamy could be endorsed by the New Testament, they had to go, and for just the same reason will capital punishment have to go. I think that the environment in which we are living has a great influence on the community. Take, for example, was it not strange that Nero, " the monster of cruelty," should say during the first few years of his reign, when death warrants were presented him to sign, that he regretted that he had ever learned to write, so averse was he to shedding human blood. Later, when he became brutalized, he could sign them without pain, and put his own mother to death without remorse.

Now, Sir, the purest Being, the greatest Teacher, the holiest Judge who ever presided over the destinies of man, never wrote a sentence preserved in history excepting one when meditating upon capital punishment. He wrote with his finger in the sand and then immediately said, as if an interpretation of what he wrote: "Let him who is without sin cast the first stone." The old law read: "Let her be stoned to death." As all men are sinners, this harsh and cruel law of death, written in the Old Testament, was reconstructed and repealed by the Saviour of man, and savage justice was tempered with the saving influence of the Master's mercy.

The next in order to attack the Bill was the right hon. leader of the Opposition. I am pleased to see the Government and the right hon. leader of the Opposition getting so close together. The Government has given the right hon. leader of the Opposition free wheat, and the leader of the Opposition, not to be outdone in politeness, has given the Government free hanging.

Mr. DOHERTY: I wonder who gets the best of it?

Mr. BICKERDIKE: I have no doubt that in time, especially when the Hon. Sir Robert Rogers returns, who I have no doubt will be a knight by then, they will make a very happy family. I am pleased to see these indications of a rapprochement, a symptom of what might lead up to a coalition Government until after the war—something that all of us in this country who have boys in the trenches are hoping for—and if it should be that sacrificing my interests would act as a stepping stone to this much desired object I submit respectfully that I am willing to be sacrificed.

When we were democratic to the hilt we would not have invoked custom for the purpose of continuing any great national crime such as legalized murder by the State, sending the soul of our poor prodigals into eternity, when society can be just as well protected by sending them to the penitentiary. The right hon. leader of the Opposition made a reference to President Fallières, who was really the greatest President the French Republic ever enjoyed, and probably purified France more than any other public man in the republic, not even excepting President MacMahon.

Mr. DOHERTY: He was Irish.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: You cannot always tell by the name. The leader of the Opposition claims that Patrick Spain was an Italian. President Fallières says:

> Among the unpleasant duties of the President of France is that of signing all death warrants issued in the Republic.

That is well. He says, however, that there should be a slight change in the arrangement, as follows:

> The Judge who sentences the man to die should also act as his executioner.

If the Minister of Justice and the leader of the Opposition had to do the hanging, I think they would send the men to the penitentiaries instead.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have too many jobs already.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: President Fallières claims that if this were the case it would do away with all legalized homicide. He further says:

> I will not ask any man to do that which I myself am unwilling to do. I will do no murder, even for the State.

President Fallières therefore commuted all death penalties to life imprisonment. Where there was a reasonable doubt about a man's guilt he pardoned him. He also says:

> France must learn to take care of her criminals without killing them. It is a poor use to make of a man to take his life. It is an acknowledgment of our inefficiency. Then, a life sentence should hold out to a man the promise that a number of years of good behaviour and useful work will make him free. Penology must be made a science to the end that when we imprison a man we do it for his own good, with the intention of turning out a better man than we took in. Just as long as the State sets an example of killing its enemies, they must expect that individuals will occasionally kill theirs.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition says:

> Whether or not the penalty of death is a deterrent is a much mooted question. Education has more to do with the prevention of crime than even the deterrent effect of the punishment, and in this country it can happily be said that cases of murder are very few, in fact, amongst the native population; they are becoming less and less frequent.

With that statement I quite agree. The right hon. leader of the Opposition goes on:

> All the cases which have taken place recently have been amongst a class of foreigners who come from a country in which the crime of murder is a daily custom. Without being invidious, I believe that many crimes of that nature have been committed by Italians who came from the South of Italy, where it is the pernicious habit of every man to carry a stiletto.

With this latter statement I can hardly agree. The only execution in the province of Quebec during 1916 was that of Paul dit Lepine Renaud, and judging by the name, he could have hardly been an Italian. The name of the young lad lying under sentence of death in Winnipeg is Patrick Spain; that does not sound like an Italian either. So I think the contention of the right hon. leader of the Opposition that all the murders in Canada are committed by men who come from the south of Italy is wrong. I have no doubt the right hon. gentleman is aware that Italy abolished capital punishment years ago. Further on he said:

10 p.m.

> What is the most effective law? Shall we continue the law which we have had on the Statute Book ever since the country has been a country, and which is still a law among the most civilized nations of the earth? Or shall we be carried away by a feeling of humanity which is most commendable and most honourable?

Now, Sir, I think I have proved to the right hon. gentleman that it is not the foreign element in Canada who are committing all the murders. With regard to the claim that capital punishment is right because it has been on the statute book ever since this country has been a country, and because it is still the law among the most civilized nations of the earth. I remember well the time when the right hon. gentleman refused to follow custom, and claimed that this young nation was now grown up and should make the laws that were considered most necessary for our Dominion. Custom never did make right. With regard to his claim that this is still the law among the most civilized nations of the earth, I must also join issue with him. He claims that it is the most civilized nations of the world that retain capital punishment. On the contrary, the nations that have abolished capital punishment are not the

heathen or uncivilized nations, but just the reverse. According to the right hon. leader of the Opposition China is one of the most civilized nations of the world. China, Turkey, Japan, Germany and Austria-Hungary all have capital punishment. The other three nations that retain capital punishment are England, France and Spain. I am prepared to say that these are civilized nations, but they are the only civilized nations that retain capital punishment. Now, I desire to place opposite to these the names of the anti-hanging countries—I suppose, the right hon. gentleman would call them "the uncivilized nations." They are: Russia—surely, not an uncivilized country—Italy, Holland, Belgium, Norway, Portugal, Haiti, Switzerland and the United States (in part). I cannot understand the statement made by the right hon. gentleman. He quotes the "civilized nations" as the excuse for retaining capital punishment, and the greatest nation that retains it is China. If he holds China to be one of the civilized Christian nations of the world, of course he is quite entitled to his opinion.

I hold that the death penalty is the most atrocious form of bookkeeping in existence. The only way we can balance a debit is by a credit; you can only balance a negative by a positive; the only way to balance evil is by good. It is a most ridiculous thing to have a death entered on one side of the ledger, and then expect to balance it by turning to the other side and writing down another death. That is the style of bookkeeping of the Minister of Justice, so far as this branch of his business is concerned. I would like to see capital punishment abolished for the sake of the innocent men who have been executed, and there have been a number of them. I wish to quote from a letter written by the man who, I suppose, is the greatest authority on prison reform on this side of the water, if not in the world—Thomas Mott Osborne, of Sing Sing fame. He says:

> As warden of Sing Sing I executed forty men, and I am convinced that four of them were innocent. One was a boy of 20 years of age, and I knew he was innocent of the crime for which he was condemned, because I know who committed the crime. But the ethics of the underworld are that one must never 'squeal on a pal.' This boy lied, evaded, faced his trial, was condemned, and afterwards went to his death, just because he would not 'squeal on a pal.' Was not that boy worth saving?

Is there any man in this House who will say that it was not worth while to try to save such a boy? Innocent of the crime, he would not go back on his pal, but kept his course even though it led to the electric chair. I say to the Minister of Justice that if boys of that kind are not worth saving, then life is not worth living.

Now I desire to say a few words in answer to the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). Hon. members will recollect that he quoted the Old Testament very freely. But the Old Testament is a record of the Jewish race, and it is difficult to see how it can be made the standard for Christians, especially when the Master enjoins His followers to forsake the old commands and gave them the new ones instead. He did not preach revenge but exhorted His followers to love their enemies. It must be recalled that the ancient prophets also looked to the time when swords would be beaten into ploughshares, and spears into pruning-hooks.

The great promised Messiah was to be a Prince of Peace; not one who took life but one who reformed it. There are very few students of the New Testament who attempt the tremendous task of defending capital punishment on its authority, for its teaching is mercy, long suffering, kindness, forgiveness, and these are not compatible with breaking a man's neck. The Master, as we are told in the 12th chapter of John, commutes the sentence of stoning to death, which the Jewish law imposed upon the adulterous woman, to the sentence "go and sin no more," bidding her accuser who was without sin to cast the first stone.

Life sentence is practical. I am not asking for a substitute for capital punishment which has not been tried. The states and nations that have actually substituted life imprisonment for capital punishment bear the testimony that it works well. Governor Washburn, of Wisconsin, said in 1873:

> It is twenty years since we have abolished capital punishment and no state can show greater freedom from homicidal crimes.... With a population embracing almost every nationality, statistics show that crime instead of increasing with the growth, has actually diminished.

Senator Jessup, of Iowa, says:

> Murder in the first degree has not increased but has for four years decreased,

And he gives figures to prove the truth of his assertion, and adds the significant expression—"there is more lynch law where the scaffold is retained."

Under life sentences juries convict and that speedily. The Chief Justice of Rhode Island says:

> My observation fully justifies me in saying that conviction is far more certain now in proper cases than when the death penalty was in vogue.

Chief Justice Denman says:

> Extreme severity has operated more as a preventitive to prosecutions than a preventitive to crime.

Judges often find their juries returning and asking, "Can we find a verdict of manslaughter"? and when the judges say, "No you cannot," they return with a verdict, "Not guilty."

Capital Punishment Is Not Effective.—Capital punishment is no punishment to the criminal, it is a greater punishment to the innocent members of his family. It is no punishment to break a man's neck. Juries hesitate to convict when they know a man is going to be hanged, and as a consequence only one in seventy-three murderers brought to trial in United States is convicted on first degree murder.

Capital punishment does not deter from crime. It is a fact which can be demonstrated by statistics that where capital punishment flourishes murder likewise flourishes. Crime was on the increase in England until the two hundred odd capital offenses were reduced to two, and the same promptness in convictions in England without the death penalty would prove more efficacious in preserving law and order.

Men who witness and who read of capital punishment become vindictive. The chaplain of Newgate prison says that he "never knew a condemned criminal that had not been at an execution." (Westminster Review, '81: 162). Rev. J. Roberts of Bristol says that out of 180 persons whom he visited after the sentence of death, 164 had attended a public hanging. Those who see the brutality of the death chamber are only made more brutal. Capital punishment often leads to such public sympathy that the hands of justice are thwarted.

Capital punishment is not moral.—The state sets a wrong example to its citizens by punishing its offenders with death. Capital punishment diminishes the sacredness with which we should regard life. It destroys the moral sense of the public. It arouses the worst passions in man. During public executions in England, the gallows were scenes of wild debauch, the public eating, drinking, cheering and railing at the victim. Suicides or deaths of an exciting nature are likely to be followed by others of like nature

There are many who question the right of one man to take another man's life except in self-defense when other means of defense fail. Wendel Phillips says:

> The theory of government, as is universally held, is that a government is a social compact, a voluntary association of individuals, therefor, as an individual has no right to take his own life, he cannot confer on the government the right to take it.

Capital punishment is not justice, for often it endangers the lives of the wrong persons. Many of our criminals are murderers by circumstances; men of wealth are rarely hanged, and often innocent people have been unjustly deprived of their life.

The judgments of judges and juries are not always infallible. The great Lafayette said:

> I shall personally demand the abolishment of punishment by death until I have the infallibility of human judgment demonstrated to me.

There are a few who defend capital punishment from the authority of the Old Testament, but it must be remembered that the Lord set a mark on Cain, the first murderer, and let him go. Moses taught a life for a life.

I must say a few words in reply to my hon. friend from Montcalm (Mr. Lafortune). I do not wish to be rude to him but he is certainly one of the greatest and most successful Crown prosecutors in the province of Quebec if not in the Dominion of Canada. But his trade has diminished considerably as we only had one case of murder in Quebec in 1916 and that was out of his jurisdiction. I would advise him, if we keep on diminishing our murders in Quebec, to make a contract for so much a year instead of so much a head. I was going to say in reply to the hon. member that in comparatively recent years there have been striking instances of the fallibility of the most carefully constituted tribunals. My hon. friend claimed that justice was all right in the province of Quebec especially and all over Canada. He said that if a poor man was accused of a serious crime the court appointed a solicitor to defend him and that he had fair play in every instance. Now, I shall just give you a few instances in which men have been hanged when they were not guilty of the crimes for which they were hanged. In 1865, for instance, an Italian named Pelizzioni was tried before Baron Martin for the murder of a fellow countryman in an affray at Saffron Hill. After an elabor-

ate trial he was found guilty and sentenced to death. In passing sentence, the judge took occasion to make the following remarks which should be remembered when the acumen begotten of "sound legal training" and long experience is relied on as a safeguard against error:

> In my judgment, it is utterly impossible for the jury to have come to any other conclusion. The evidence was about the clearest and most direct that, after a long course of experience in the administration of criminal justice, I have ever known. I am as satisfied as I can be of anything that Gregorio did not inflict this wound and that you were the person who did.

The trial was over. The Home Secretary would most certainly, after the judge's expression of opinion, never have interfered. The date of the execution was fixed. Yet the unhappy prisoner was guiltless of the crime, and it was only through the exertion of a private individual that an innocent man was saved from the gallows. A fellow countryman of his, Mr. Negretti, succeeded in persuading the real culprit—the Gregorio so expressly exculpated by the judge—to come forward and acknowledge the crime. He was subsequently tried for manslaughter and convicted, while Pellizioni received a free pardon.

Again, in 1877, two men named Jackson and Greenwood were tried at the Liverpool Assizes for a serious offense. They were found guilty. The judge expressed approval of the verdict and sentenced them to ten years' penal servitude. Subsequently fresh facts came to light and the men received a free pardon.

Once more, in 1879, Hebron was tried for the murder of a policeman. He was found guilty and sentenced to death. An agitation for a reprieve immediately followed. The sentence was commuted to penal servitude for life. Three years after, the notorious Peace, just before his execution for the murder of Mr. Diason, confessed that he had committed the murder for which Hebron had been sentenced.

Mr. Charles Burleigh Galbraith, writing for Friend's Intelligencer for October 6, says: "Juries and Judges are still fallible."

Maud Ballington Booth, writing under date of September, 1908, gives details of two interesting cases:

> A man was sentenced to life imprisonment and served sixteen and a half years. Most of the evidence had been purely circumstantial and he was convicted mainly on the testimony of one witness. He was saved from the gallows only by the earnest efforts of those who had known of his previous good character. Last winter the woman who had been the main witness against him came to what she believed was her death-bed, and, sending for a priest, confessed that she had committed perjury. The matter was brought to the attention of the Governor, and the man at once liberated. He still lives. The State took sixteen years of his liberty, but did not shed his innocent blood. At present I know a man—

—continues Mrs. Booth,

—who has served nine years and is still in prison, where he has been visited by the boy whom he was supposed to have murdered.

> The fact that, in our day, justice may thus miscarry, must give men constant pause before they seek remedial vengeance in the death penalty.

Mr. Buttrom, present Attorney General for the Second Judicial District of Tennessee, in talking to me recently, said:

> I am against capital punishment because men are too liable to err. Before I was elected Attorney General, a white man was convicted in my county of murder in the first degree. He pleaded accidental killing. He was a poor fellow, and the court had appointed a lawyer to defend him. I thought at the time the verdict was rendered that the jury had erred. The people were bitter against him and had threatened to lynch him. Some of the jury wanted to hang him outright, but they finally reported mitigating circumstances as a part of their verdict and the judge sentenced the prisoner to life imprisonment. From later developments it became evident that the man was innocent, and for that reason Governor Hooper pardoned him recently.

Capital punishment is a relic of the days when men were forced to tread red-hot ploughshares to prove their innocence. I do not believe in taking a man's life for having committed a crime. That is a barbarous custom, a relic of ancient days. We must be progressive, and more humane toward our fellow-mortals. It seems to me that in a Christian land, with all our boasted Christianity, we should practice such, and abolish this terrible method of punishment. Capital punishment does not prevent crime. We make use of it, yet murders are continually committed. Why not try the other method? When a man's life is taken at the end of a rope, his usefulness is done for. He is of no value to the State, or to society. Why not try my plan? For a good many years we have been trying the plan of the Minister of Justice; that is hang them up. Why not try the other plan for a little while? Why not try it for a year as an experiment? Would Canada suffer if you tried it for a year? Stop hanging for one year and if you stop hanging you will stop most of the murders. I do not know whether the present Parliament will abolish capital punishment; I

am afraid not. I hope that if this one fails some future Parliament will do it and it will do it for two very good reasons; first, that it is not necessary as a preventive of murder and, second, because it is an unholy and barbarous crime in itself. Man has no right to take what he has not given —man has no right to say to this man, "Thou shalt die," when God himself has ordained, "Thou shalt not kill." When the Christ of Galilee came to earth it was to preach the kingdom of God upon earth—and it was his wish that man should not slay his fellow-man.

The most powerful case cited by Mr. McConnico was the Durand case, in California. I am not sure whether I have mentioned this Durand case on previous occasions to the Minister of Justice. It was a case in which a young man was hanged for the murder of a young woman. They were both members of a Methodist church, both teachers in the same Sunday school, both singers in the same choir. One day the young lady disappeared. Suspicion immediately fell on the young man. He was arrested, tried and sentenced to death. He delivered a little, short speech—I remember the case well—just before he was sent into eternity. He said to the people there: I am not guilty of this crime; I am going to be hanged for a crime that I did not commit; and I say it before God and man. He lifted his eyes to heaven, and asked the Lord to forgive those who had sworn him to death. Sir, less than twelve months after that young man was sentenced to eternity, the minister of that congregation took sick and confessed that he was the man who had killed that girl. Well, the young man had gone into eternity. Now, I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the Minister of Justice, if life imprisonment will serve society just as well, if life imprisonment will protect society as well as the death penalty, then why not let us make the experiment?

I must say a few words in reply to my good friend the member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury). I accused him this afternoon of being one who out-Heroded Herod. But I take that back; I should not have said that. I want to say to him, however, that the state does not kill people merely because they are worthless, and to be rid of them. Insane asylums are built at great expense for the incurable, upon whom relatives cannot bear to look, who personally might be better off dead. The state tenderly cares for all such cases. This is done because the example of kindness and humanity to the unfortunate is of an inestimable benefit to society. It is not possible to imagine the effect society would feel if we were to destroy all imbeciles and the incurably insane. What a horrible example would be set for the people of the state to follow. No calculation could be made of the injury to the morals of the state by countenancing such conduct. One of the greatest advantages to the state from the preservation and tender care and treatment of the hopeless insane is this example of humane treatment and of tender consideration of a human life, however useless and pitiable it may seem. Our citizens are taught to be kind and gentle to the unfortunate by this example of the state. May I ask the people of Canada if they believe any boy—any mother's son, black or white, however depraved—should be hanged, killed just to get rid of him? Can we afford to do it?

Chief Baron Kelly says that from 1802 to 1840 he traced twenty-two men who were wrongly convicted of murder in England, seven of whom were hanged. Mackintosh says that in the same country, taking a long period of time, one innocent man is hanged in every three years.

It may be safely asserted that the thousands who were put to death, at the stake and otherwise, for witchcraft, were not guilty of the crime with which they were charged. Again, there is no way of ascertaining to a certainty the guilt of any one charged with murder. Felonious intent is the essence of crime. The jury must determine, then, in each instance the state of mind of the accused. In many cases this is a difficult task, and in not a few the verdict is a mere guess. A confession of guilt, if voluntary, would seem to be a strong evidence, but by way of illustrating a general rule, it will be remembered that a number of men confessed to the murder of Nathan in New York city, all of whom were innocent. In some cases of acknowledged murder the supposed victim has turned out to be still alive, and in at least one instance interrupted the trial.

Whatever may be the testimony of a witness, it cannot be certain to a demonstration, in most cases, that he is not committing perjury, or is not mistaken.

Of course I am aware that many will disagree with me, for I have never been able to get everybody to see my way and be right in their view, but I am sure that, as men grow more civilized, capital punish-

ment grows less popular, and wholesale murder, in the shape of war, is regarded as the last resort by the civilized nations of the earth, and the time will come when human life will be rightly valued and war shall be no more. If this is not to be the case, Christianity will have proved a failure, to become an effete religion, cast by intelligent humanity upon the religious scrap pile of the ages.

Is it not time to put aside the unwarranted penalty of capital punishment and adopt the more humane and effective punishment by life imprisonment, put beyond the reach of one-man pardon? The capital punishment experiment has proved a failure, so far as its being a remedy for crime is concerned.

No matter how great any man's respect for the Old Testament may be, the most that he can say for the ceremonial and criminal law of the Hebrews is that it was adapted to men in a very crude condition, who were making their first advances in the rudiments of moral and religious truths; that it taught them only as much as they were prepared to receive, with a promise of something better to come after. The clergy admit that the ceremonial law of the Jews is no longer binding. They insist that God's covenant with Noah, in which occurs the verse, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood by man shall his blood be shed," is binding for all time and upon all nations. They do not understand that it is repealed, both in the language and the spirit of the New Testament. If they believe as firmly as they pretend that killing the murderer is pleasing to God and a duty sacredly enjoined upon man, they should act as executioners: they certainly should not hesitate to pull the string or cut the rope that sends the soul of a murderer to the answering bar of God.

One word in conclusion, in reply to my good friend, our warrior bold from Peterborough. He does not attempt to out-Nero Nero himself, but he comes a very fair second. Nero killed both his wife and his mother, while our friend would be quite satisfied with hanging his wife—if he had one. It might be well for the marriageable ladies of Peterborough to sit up and take notice. He says positively that if he had a wife he would have no objection whatever to hanging her.

Society has erected the gallows at the end of the lane, instead of the cross, the guide post and direction board at the beginning.

There is a wonderful growth of interest in the question of capital punishment. Students of criminology everywhere are discussing this theme. There are four hundred reform societies in the world pleading, as I do now, to spare human life whenever it is possible. A rising tide of humanitarianism is sweeping all the barbarities of the past before it, and as this matter is to be put before the voters of Canada, it is vitally important that we consider it at this time. In the hope that further study of the matter will be stimulated, I am presenting what is merely an outline of this great problem, and giving a few of the reasons why capital punishment should be abolished in Canada.

The abolition of capital punishment is the inevitable trend of history. While capital punishment may have been necessary in early history, there being no adequate prisons to hold extreme offenders of the common law, states and commonwealths are now rapidly abolishing it. During the last one hundred years there has been a wonderful decrease in the number of crimes punishable by death, because the death penalty was found to be ineffectual in preventing crime. A century ago England imposed the death penalty for two hundred and some odd transgressions of the civil law, but these have been reduced to two—murder and treason. Lord Eldon and Lord Ellenborough predicted chaos if men should not be hanged for petty larceny.

Holland abolished capital punishment in 1870. The statistics show nineteen murders from 1861 to 1870, while from 1870 to 1879 there were only seventeen murders, with an increase of population.

Finland has had no executions since 1824. A judge of the Court of Appeals writes: "The security of persons or property has not been in the least diminished by the abolition of capital punishment."

Switzerland abolished capital punishment in 1874. Later three cantons voted to sustain the death penalty in their jurisdiction. The remaining nineteen still thrive without the death penalty, and murder has not increased.

Other countries and states which have abolished the death penalty are Portugal, Holland, Italy, Norway, Rumania, Tuscany, Costa Rica, Brazil, Ecuador, Guatemala and Venezuela. Denmark has had no hanging since 1890. Belgium none since 1863. Russia has recently abolished it entirely, and in none of these countries has crime increased.

If the Master had not given His thought on this Law of Moses, as found in the ser-

mon on the mount; if he had not set up a standard immeasurably higher, then we might pretend that this Law of Moses for the punishment of murder was a statement for all generations and all forms of civilization. But His teaching is actually as much or more in advance of Moses' Law as that was in advance of the ideas and practices of men when it was given. This Law of Moses is all there is in the Bible which can be pleaded as an exception to the commandment. "Thou shalt not kill." Jesus did enforce this law against killing, but he did not, directly or indirectly, recognize any exception to it. "Thou shalt not kill is more a command than God's covenant with Noah. It is binding on nations as well as on individuals—on the Government and on the Minister of Justice—for there are no exceptions. What right have we to make any?

Thirdly, some accept every expression as they do Chicago canned and labelled goods. They swallow, and think no more.

Fourthly, it is argued that the brutality of crime justifies capital punishment. Yes, some crimes are brutal beyond conception, beyond the reach of the ordinary mind. But to balance brutality against brutality and play the part of the savage is unworthy of a great and humane people.

> Cease not from striving, till our law
> Is clear from bloody stain,
> And reformation, not revenge,
> In principle sustain.

I plead once more with the Government to give me a committee. You give a committee on horse racing; you give a committee on gambling; I ask for a committee to look into a question of life and death. What harm would result from our getting all the information available on this question?

I wish to say a word in deference to the Solicitor General, who treated this matter in a very gentlemanly way. I claimed that he had said that capital punishment had been abolished in some countries and subsequently reinstated. I took exception with the Solicitor General on that point, and it was largely on that ground that the debate was adjourned. I understood him to say that Germany and Austria-Hungary had abolished capital punishment and reinstated it. I have no knowledge of that, but I think that was an error. One thing is certain: Austria-Hungary and Germany are to-day practising it very freely, and I should be sorry if this country were asked to follow the example set by them. I endeavoured to get cables through to those countries in order to prove my assertion, but it was impossible; the censor would not let them through. I did telegraph to Mr. Thomas Mott Osborne, asking him to give me the names of the states in the Union that had abolished capital punishment, and I received the following reply:—

> Capital punishment abolished in following states: Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Washington, Wisconsin, to which Missouri has just been added. Maine forty years ago restored death penalty for six years but convictions for murder diminished so seriously it was again abolished. No other state has returned.

I mention that because the Solicitor General was very courteous in the matter. Neither of us knew whether he was right or wrong—and I am not any surer now, because I was not able to get the cables to the other side.

The House divided on the motion of Mr. Bickerdike.

YEAS.

Messrs:

Bickerdike,	Lemieux,
Boyer,	Loggie,
Carvell,	McKenzie,
Gauvreau,	Nicholson,
Graham,	Pacaud,
Lanctot,	Proulx,
Lapointe (Montreal, St. James),	Tobin, Verville.—15.

NAYS.

Messrs:

Blain,	Patenaude,
Boivin,	Reid,
Boulay,	Roche,
Burrell,	Schaffner,
Clark (Bruce),	Sevigny,
Clarke (Wellington),	Shepherd,
Davidson,	Stevens,
Doherty,	Stewart (Lunenburg),
Lafortune,	Thompson (Yukon),
Meighen,	Wallace,
Merner,	Webster,
Morphy,	White (Sir Thomas),
Papineau,	Wright.—26.

Motion negatived.

On the motion of Sir Thomas White, the House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Thursday, May 3, 1917.

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

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READING.

Bill No. 44 to incorporate Alliance Nationale.—Mr. Achim.

REPORT.

Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1916, Part VI.—Sir Thomas White.

INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 45, to amend the Insurance Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is almost in the same terms as that introduced by the late Mr. Lancaster a few years ago and in view of the fact that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) has a notice on the paper for the introduction of a Bill to amend the Insurance Act, I would ask that this also be allowed to go to the same committee and perhaps the two could be taken up together. This amendment which I ask leave to introduce has reference to companies upon the backs of whose certificates were endorsed certain terms as to the payment, and the rate of payment, of the premiums. It is alleged that one company, which I need not name, have, by arbitrary action, gone outside of the terms and conditions which they have at times made with insurers and it is to place these persons who have been insured in a fair position that this amendment is introduced. The discussion of this matter will be of considerable length and I would ask that it be postponed until the bill is before the committee.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE (Montreal, St. James) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 46, to amend the Bank Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to detain the House just now with any lengthy explanation of the question which underlies the principle of the Bill I desire to introduce, in amendment to the Bank Act. An opportunity for the discussion of this question will occur later on. I may say that this is a most important question to the public at large and I believe there are hundreds of thousands of people in Canada who will be grateful for such legislation. The purport of the measure is to have the rate of interest fixed by statute on saving bank deposits at not less than four per cent. The amendment would read as follows:

Section 92 of the Bank Act, chapter 9 of the Statutes of 1913 is amended by striking out the word "whatever" in the first line of said section and inserting in lieu thereof "not less than four per cent".

My intention is to have an understanding with my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) on the subject of this Bill before its second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

I.C.R.—COST OF HANDLING FREIGHT.

Mr. MACDONALD:

What was the cost per calendar month during the winter of 1916-1917 at Pictou, Charlottetown and Georgetown respectively, of handling freight going to and from Prince Edward Island?

Mr. REID: Charlottetown, November, 67c. per ton; December, $1; January 1st to 10th, 73c. Georgetown, January 10th to 31st, 45c.; February, 44c.; March, 40c.; April 1st to 21st, 38c. Pictou, January, February and March, .626c. At the present time freight is handled at Pictou for Prince Edward at a cost of .434c. per ton.

NEW GLASGOW—MOUNTVILLE MAIL ROUTE.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Who is the mail contractor for rural route No. 2, from New Glasgow to Mountville, County of Pictou?
2. When was the contract let?
3. When does it expire?
4. What is the annual payment to the contractor?

Mr. PATENAUDE:

1. Charles D. McKay.
2. 23rd April, 1917.
3. 31st March, 1921.
4. $934.

MAJOR ALFRED LEFEBVRE.

Mr. PAPINEAU:

1. Where, and at what date was Major Alfred Lefebvre enrolled in the 206th Battalion?
2. What length of time has he served in the said battalion?
3. How much did he receive per diem, as officer, for field pay, and for any other item, respectively?
4. Did his wife receive the separation allowance?
5. If so, what amount has been paid to her each month, and during what time?
6. Is the said Alfred Lefebvre still employed in the Active Militia?
7. If not, when was he discharged?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. Montreal; 10th February, 1916.

2. 143 days.

3. Field pay, 75c. per diem; regimental pay, $3 per diem; subsistence, $1.50 per diem.

4. Yes.

5. $40 per month, 10th February, 1916, to 30th April, 1917. A refund is being obtained for the period overpaid.

6. He is still on the reserve of officers of the active militia, but not actively employed.

7. His appointment in the 206th Battalion was cancelled with effect from 16th July, 1916.

PAYMENTS TO N. W. WHITE, K.C.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

What was the gross amount paid by the Government to Mr. N. W. White, K.C., of Shelburne, N.S., for services by way of salary, allowance for travelling expenses, etc., in connection with his services as Commissioner of Indian Reservations?

Mr. ROCHE: Salary, living allowance and expenses paid Mr. N. W. White, chairman and commissioner of the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs for British Columbia:

1913-14: Salary, commissioner, March 31 to December 31, 1913; March 14 to March 31, 1914; 276 days at $20 a day, $5,520; living allowance, 276 days at $10, $2,760; travelling expenses, $316.85, total, $8,596.85.

1914-15: Salary, commissioner, April 1 to 16, 1914, 16 days at $20 a day, $320; chairman, April 17 to November 30, 1914, 228 days at $25 a day, $5,700; December, 1914, $415; March 1 to 19, 1915, 19 days at $25 a day, $475; living allowance, 263 days at $10 a day, $2,630; travelling expenses, $325.65, total, $9,865.65.

1915-16: Salary, chairman, April 1, 1915, to March 31, 1916, 366 days at $25 a day, $9,150; living allowance, 366 days at $10 a day, $3,660; travelling expenses, $121.75, total, $12,931.75.

1916-17: Salary, chairman, April 1, 1916, to July 13, 1916, 104 days at $25 a day, $2,600; living allowance, 104 days at $10, $1,040; travelling expenses, $149.12, total $3,789.12.

Total, $35,183.37.

PUBLIC WORKS EXPENDITURE, 1916-1917.

Mr. MACDONALD:

What was the total amount of the expenditure in the Public Works Department ending fiscal year 1916-17 upon Public Works (a) out of Consolidated Fund; (b) Capital Expenditure?

[Mr. Papineau.]

Mr. REID: Approximately: (a) consolidated fund, $9,540,239.90; (b) capital, $6,408,664.23; total, $15,948,904.13.

CIVIL SERVICE SALARIES.

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to propose any legislation at the present session looking towards an increase in the salaries of the civil service, either by way of additional salary or bonus?

2. Has it been brought to the notice of the Government or any member thereof, either officially or otherwise, that the civil service of the United States have had an increase granted them of 10 per cent to all employees receiving $1,800 per annum, or less, and 5 per cent to all receiveing over this amount?

3. If the matter contained in question 2 has not been brought to the attention of the Government, will it take any steps this session towards verifying same, with a view to treating the civil service of Canada as equitably as that of the United States?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. It is the intention to introduce legislation relating to the salaries of certain of the lower grades of the Inside Civil Service. With respect to the Outside Service, the action which may be taken by the Government will be indicated in the Supplementary Estimates.

2. The information, so far as I am aware, has not been especially drawn to the attention of the Government.

3. We shall have to deal with the situation here on its merits, and having regard to our financial and other responsibilities, without reference necessarily to conditions which prevail in the United States.

ARMAND LAVERGNE.

Mr. PARDEE:

1. Has Armand Lavergne any official position under the direction of the Militia Department regarding recruiting in Quebec for Home Defence?

2. If so, is he in receipt of pay?

3. What is his allowance, and how long has he been drawing same?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. No.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

HOME DEFENCE FORCE.

Mr. PARDEE:

1. How many men have been enrolled for the Home Defence Force?

2. What will be the duties of the Home Defence Force?

3. How many men are expected to be in training at various Militia Camps in Canada by June 1st next?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. Figures up to date are not available, but the total is small.

2. In time of peace, much more in time of war, it is necessary to maintain armed forces within the borders of a country for the maintenace of law and order, and to meet emergencies, the exact nature of which it may not be possible to foresee. In Canada, since August, 1914, this function has been discharged by the considerable bodies of the C.E.F. which have been undergoing training. But with the opening of the great offensive in France has come a change of policy, and it is desirable to be able to send reinforcements overseas as quickly as possible. The presence in Canada of the C.D.F. would enable the military authorities to follow this course, if events should render it desirable. Moreover, it is hoped that many men who enlist in the C.D.F. will later volunteer for service in the C.E.F.

3. It is regarded as inexpedient in the public interest to submit an estimate.

INSPECTOR OF MILITARY BUILDINGS.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Is there a position known as Inspector of Military Buildings?
2. If so, what is the name of the inspector?
3. When was he appointed, and what position, if any, under the Government, did he hold prior to said appointment?
4. What are his duties and salary?
5. Why was not the position given to a returned soldier?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. No.

2, 3, 4 and 5. Answered by No. 1.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BOULAY:

What was the number of employees of the following departments after 1896, and after 1911, respectively, viz.:—Inland Revenue, Interior, Public Works, Marine and Fisheries, Militia and Defence, Labour and Department of Trade and Commerce?

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. What amount has been paid for stenographic reporting for the different commissions or inquiries which have been held by the Government since November, 1911, to the present time?
2. What are the names of the persons to whom these amounts have been paid for stenography and the respective amounts paid to each of them?

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. How much merchandise has been exported from Canada into foreign countries since the first of August, 1914, to the present time?
2. How much of these goods have gone through the Port of Hamburg?
3. What countries have imported this merchandise from Canada, and what are the respective amounts for each of them?

CANADIAN NAVAL AEROPLANE SERVICE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. J. D. REID: The hon. member for Pictou on the 27th April asked me to bring down papers with reference to the work of the naval aeroplane service of the country. The answer furnished to me by the Deputy Minister of the Naval Service is this:

The naval officers state that there are no papers or correspondence in the department with reference to a naval aeroplane service in Canada which could be brought down at the present time, and I concur in the opinion.

THE HIGH PRICE OF FLOUR.

MOTION TO ADJOURN THE HOUSE TO DISCUSS QUESTION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GEORGE W. KYTE (Richmond, N.S.) asked for leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the necessity of taking action to prevent further undue advances in the price of flour in Canada, and to reduce the same to an amount representing the price of wheat received by the farmer, plus the cost of milling and distribution, but eliminating the increase due to stock exchange manipulation.

And leave having been granted,

Mr. KYTE: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the householders of the city of Ottawa on picking up the morning paper this morning were very much disturbed by the information which it contained to the effect that the price of flour, already far too high, had increased $1.20 in the last twenty-four hours. In the market reports of the Ottawa Citizen this morning I find:

Chicago, May 2.—Reports that the German Chancellor had postponed a speech in which he was expected to outline new peace terms, brought about a sensational advance to-day in the wheat market here. After a jump that in some cases amounted to 17 cents, the market closed unsettled at net gains of 4¾ to 12 cents, with May at $2.69.

Winnipeg, May 2.—Once again all records of a wild market have been broken. May wheat advanced 26½c to 31½c from the opening

price and fluctuated 33½c during the session, finally closing at the high point of the day, $2.80½. This is the highest closing yet recorded. Bids were made at $2.82 last Saturday before censorship was established and prices dropped.

With regard to the price of flour, I find that in Montreal yesterday it is stated that in sympathy with a record advance for wheat in one day of 33½ cents per bushel, the tone of the flour market was strong and prices for spring wheat grades were marked up $1.20 per barrel, but the trade was quiet.

The Citizen says:

Flour climbed to its highest pinnacle in Ottawa last night, millers marking up the price $1.20 a barrel, making it now $14.50 for first patents.

This sensational rise followed the frenzy in the wheat markets yesterday when wheat closed at $2.69½ a bushel in Chicago, for May delivery, and at $2.80½ in Winnipeg. The steep climbs in the price of wheat are made more remarkable as at both exchanges the openings yesterday morning were comparatively low. The jump at Chicago represents an increase on the day of 14½ cents, while on Winnipeg 'change the day's gain is 30½ cents.

That is to say that the manipulations in the stock market in Winnipeg resulted in increasing the price of wheat by 30½ cents, whereas in the city of Chicago it resulted in an increase of 14½ cents only. The report goes on:

Prices of flour and wheat are now at record "wild" prices. Never in the history of Canada has flour reached such a price. Millers have given up guessing or speculating as to what the next exchange in price will be. Sensation follows sensation. Few looked for a climb of $1.20 a barrel for flour after the drop of 60 cents Tuesday.

"It is all because Von Bethmann-Hollweg didn't make his new peace proposals in the Reichstag yesterday," said a miller last night. "Wheat was still declining when the market opened, and then came the news that the Hun Chancellor's peace speech had been indefinitely postponed. That was the signal for a wild rise in wheat, and we base the price of flour on the current price of wheat. It is impossible to forecast what will happen next. On the first genuine sign of peace from Germany, wheat will come tumbling down and that will mean a corresponding fall in flour.

"Some of the millers," he added, "have provided for all wants during the summer by buying ahead from regular customers to be delivered in the next two or three months. Contrary to expectations, the demand for flour, despite the fantastic prices we are asking, is great, although not so much so as if the price was lower. It is also a fact that there has been the least sign of panic among the public, people accepting the present situation with calmness if not actual indifference."

The increase yesterday in the price of wheat to the amount of $1.20 a barrel was not due to a proportionate increase in the amount of wheat available for the manufacture of flour. You will observe from the stock market notice which I read that this flour has been manufactured from stock which the millers have had for many months, and it is said that they have a sufficient amount of wheat on hand to provide all the flour they will require during the next three or four months. The condition is not brought about, therefore, by excessive demands on the part of the farmers, or, as respects the actual cost of milling their products, by excessive demands on the part of the millers. It was due entirely to the fact that Bethmann-Hollweg did not make his peace speech in the Reichstag yesterday. If the duty is taken off wheat the price of flour to the consumer is immediately increased. If the duty is not taken off wheat still the price of flour to the consumer is increased. If there is a rumour of peace it increases the cost of flour to the consumer, and if there is no rumour of peace the same result obtains. Whatever happens from day to day is taken advantage of by the speculator and by the stock exchange manipulator for the purpose of increasing the price of flour. For several months the condition of affairs with respect to the price of that commodity has been exceedingly alarming. We may discuss in a general way the rise in the price of the other commodities which constitute the daily food of our people, but it cannot be denied that the price of flour is the standard of the cost of living. Every person is a consumer of flour; no matter what the conditions or vocations of our people may be, they must buy flour. The farmer in the province of Nova Scotia who produces potatoes and turnips and dairy products is not a grower of wheat. The farmers in the Maritime Provinces are not usually growers of wheat. When any of our people go to the market for the purpose of purchasing supplies they purchase whatever flour they may need. If a farmer goes to town to purchase a barrel of flour and finds that the price of flour has gone up 50 cents a barrel he naturally concludes that in order to meet that increased price he must add to the price of his potatoes. It is the same with regard to every other commodity that the common people have to sell. Whenever there is an increase in the price of flour there must be a corresponding increase in the price of the other food necessities that are grown in the Maritime Provinces. Nothing that happened yesterday in the city of Winnipeg or anywhere else in Canada justified the in-

crease of $1.20 a barrel in the price of flour except the manipulation of the stock exchange, whose members were betting as to whether or not Von Bethmann-Hollweg would make a peace speech yesterday. Unfortunately, those who bet that he was not going to make the peace speech won, and the consumers of Canada are the poorer to the extent of $1.20 on each barrel of flour that they buy.

I can scarcely imagine that the Government is indifferent to this condition of affairs. Appeals have been made to the Minister of Labour from all over Canada to take action with respect to this very much discussed and very distressing question. But apparently the Minister of Labour does not keep awake long enough to see the wistful faces of the wives and families of the consumers, and he sleeps too soundly to hear their clamours. But in Parliament the people's representatives must speak out again and again until their voices shall be heard. This report from the Ottawa Citizen significantly asserts that there has been no panic among the people; that they are simply determined to meet the conditions, such as they are. That speaks very well for the fortitude and philosophy of the consumers of Canada. They simply draw their belts tighter, set their teeth a little harder, knowing that no relief will come under the present circumstances. They must grin and bear the adversity under which they are suffering until they obtain relief at the ballot box. The Finance Minister intimated on Tuesday last that he is not willing that there shall be a general election in Canada. If he is not willing, then I suggest that he had better take prompt and effective steps to remedy the disadvantages resulting to the consumers of our country by reason of the increased cost of living. I am not, however, going to deal with any other aspect of the question to-day except the subject of flour.

There is apparently no limit to the operations of the manipulators of the stock exchange. Some few months ago, when the price of flour went up to $9.50 a barrel, everybody felt that the worst had come, that under no possible circumstances could it go any higher. Even two weeks ago, when it was learned that there were in the elevators and in the hands of the millers of Canada 81,500,000 bushels of wheat, and that owing to the submarine menace, not one bushel was being exported from Canada to Great Britain, the consumers felt that at all events they would be relieved from any further exactions in the way of increases in the price of flour. But the manipulators knew better than the consumers. All they have to do is to start a wild rumour as to peace or no peace and the result is always the same. The price of flour having risen from $9.60 a few months ago to $11, and from $11 to $13, and from $13 to $14.50, what guarantee have we that we shall not within the next few months be consuming flour costing us $20 a barrel? In fact it has been stated by dealers that it is quite within the realm of possibility that within the next few weeks flour will be selling in Canada at $20 a barrel. This, I say, at a time when the elevators in Canada are stocked with wheat and when we are shipping no wheat whatever to Great Britain.

We are willing to make great sacrifices for the purpose of assisting the Allies, and more particularly of assisting that Ally of which we form a part. When the cry went out from Great Britain that wheat was becoming scarce and that it was likely that the people of Great Britain would be put upon ration allowance, we were all willing that our wheat should go to England to assist in feeding the people there. If our wheat had gone to Great Britain we should probably have been philosophic and patriotic enough to be willing to pay more for our flour, having regard to the purpose for which our wheat was being shipped out of the country. But no such thing has happened. Within the last four, five or six weeks, probably not a bushel of wheat has been shipped out of Canada; nevertheless, we are not relieved. The situation is growing worse and unless drastic measures are taken we shall find ourselves, although we are 3,000 miles from the firing line, suffering all the discomforts and privations that those countries actually within the theatre of war are suffering.

Some few months ago an issue arose in Canada among the publishers as to the unduly enhanced price of newsprint. The demands of the newsdealers were communicated to the Minister of Finance and, to remedy their grievance, he took the proper and, perhaps, the only course that could be taken under the circumstances. He passed an Order in Council authorizing him to take possession of all the newsprint paper in Canada and to fix the price of that commodity to the newspaper publishers. The moment the newsprint manufacturers saw that the Government meant business, they agreed to fix for newsprint a reasonable price which the newspaper publishers

accepted, and thus the difficulty was removed. As that has been possible with regard to newsprint, I cannot, for the life of me, understand why the same thing cannot be done with regard to the price of flour.

The Minister of Finance might very properly ask me what remedy I propose. The remedy I propose is a very simple and effective one, and one not without precedent. My proposition is that under the special circumstances existing to-day, and under the assurances that we have that this stock manipulation will continue until the price of flour soars even far beyond its present high altitude, the Government are justified in commandeering all the wheat in Canada that is not actually in the hands of the farmers at present, and having commandeered the wheat, they should ask the millers upon what terms they will mill that wheat and place it on the market. If the millers are not fair and reasonable in their demands, if they will not agree to mill and distribute that wheat at a reasonable price, then it is the duty of the Government to take possession of the flour mills, have that wheat milled into flour and distribute the flour to the consumers throughout the Dominion. I do not think that is an unfair or unreasonable suggestion for the Government to accept. Apparently the Minister of Labour has been wrestling with the problem for the last six or seven months, but no results have accrued from his labours, he having so far found no solution for the difficulty. I would therefore suggest that he cease playing with the question and hand it over to the Minister of Finance. The Government have all the powers necessary to enable them to deal with this matter; and while the course I suggest is a drastic one, it is not any too drastic to deal with the conditions as they are to-day. We have no guarantee that the limit to the price of flour to the consumers in Canada has by any means been reached. The commandeering of wheat will solve the question for the consumers, and it will be a guarantee, at all events, that there is standing between the Canadian consumer and the stock speculator, some person having the authority to deal effectually with the situation.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: If the statement is correct that 47,000,000 bushels of wheat are at the present time held by the farmers of the Northwest, would my hon. friend also commandeer that, and if so, at what price?

Mr. KYTE: I would commandeer it from any person who entertains the same lack of consideration for the Canadian consumer that the stock speculators do. The farmers are the growers of wheat; the stock manipulators are not the growers of wheat, but the latter are exacting this undue profit from and they are imposing this undue privation upon the people of Canada simply and solely to enrich themselves. If the Government will commandeer this wheat and will ask the millers upon what terms they will mill and distribute it, and if a satisfactory agreement is not made with the millers, then the Government have the power to take over the mills, mill the wheat themselves and distribute the flour to the consumers in Canada. That is being done in Great Britain. The Government of Great Britain have taken over the mills, in that way guaranteeing to the British consumers that they will have their flour at the lowest possible price consistent with the conditions existing at the present time. Perhaps I may not have succeeded in impressing upon the Minister of Finance the real gravity of the situation as it exists throughout the Dominion and more particularly as it exists in that part of Canada with which I am most familiar, namely, the Maritime Provinces. I cannot imagine that the Minister of Finance will continue indifferent to the existing situation and I implore him to take immediate and effective steps, not only to prevent any further increase in the price of flour, but to restore the price of flour to that which will be reasonable, having regard to the price which the farmers have received for their wheat. My motion sets forth the necessity of taking action to prevent the undue advance in the price of flour, and the desirability of taking action to prevent further undue advances in the price of flour in Canada and to reduce the same to the amount representing the price of wheat received by the farmers, plus the cost of milling and distributing, but eliminating the increase due to stock exchange manipulation.

I do not think there is any hon. gentleman within the hearing of my voice who will state that that is an unfair or unreasonable demand. All I ask at the present time is that the element of speculation, for which no return is being given, should be eliminated from the price; that the consumer in Canada should be obliged to pay for his flour only that amount which represents the cost of the wheat to the farmer plus the cost of milling and distribution, but no excess profits to any person who contributes nothing to the production of the

wheat or flour supply of the Dominion of Canada.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the officers of the Statistics Branch of my department have been, from day to day, following very closely the fluctuating prices of wheat and flour and an investigation has been in process in that branch for several weeks past. I noticed the item in the Morning Citizen referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Kyte) and I may say that I immediately gave instructions to a commissioner in my department who is a very capable man to go at once to Montreal, and he is on his way there now, to look especially into the matter to which my hon. friend refers, viz., the sudden rise in the price of wheat and flour.

Mr. CARVELL: Did your officer find that flour was going up?

Mr. CROTHERS: That is really a very clever question.

Mr. CARVELL: He has been a long time finding it out.

Mr. CROTHERS: Mr. O'Connor, the gentleman to whom I refer, is on his way to Montreal to see what can be done to remedy the evils which my hon. friend has brought to the attention of the House. I might draw the attention of the House to a movement that we find on the other side of the House, and which is not new. One day hon. members opposite start a movement for the purpose of influencing the farmer to believe that they are very anxious that everything he has to sell will be sold at the very highest possible price, and the next day, they get on foot a movement with a view to influencing the consumer to believe that they are very anxious that he will get flour and bread and every other article of food at a very low price while they are at the same time pursuing an agitation to ensure for the farmer a higher price.

I will first give some figures touching the price of flour at Toronto and other centres.

PRICE OF FLOUR AT TORONTO.

Strong Bakers.

	per barrel	per 100 lbs.
1913.		
July	$4.80	$2.45
August	4.80	2.45
1914.		
July	5.00	2.55
August	5.10	2.60
1915.		
July	6.50	3.32
August	6.50	3.32
1916.		
July	6.00	3.06
August	7.60	3.88
1917.		
February	9.00	4.59

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the latest quotation?

Mr. CROTHERS: I think the last quotation was $11.60.

Mr. NESBITT: It was $13.40 yesterday.

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes, it went up $1.20 yesterday, and fell 60 cents the day before.

Mr. NESBITT: Has the minister the figures for wheat?

Mr. CROTHERS: The weekly closing prices per bushel of cash wheat No. 1 and No. 2 Northern at Port Arthur and Fort William are as follows:

WEEKLY CLOSING PRICES PER BUSHEL OF CASH WHEAT AT PORT ARTHUR AND FORT WILLIAM.

No. 1 and No. 2 Northern.

1913				1914				1915			
		No. 1	No. 2			No. 1	No. 2			No. 1	No. 2
July	1	94	94	July	6	90½	88¾	July	6	129	126
"	7	97½	94½	"	13	89¼	87	"	13	336¾	133¾
"	14	97¾	94¾	"	20	89⅞	87⅞	"	20	137	133
"	21	97	94	"	27	92	89½	"	27	136½	133
"	28	95½	92½	Aug.	3	98⅓	96½	Aug.	3	128⅝	126
Aug.	4	96¼	93¾	"	8	109½	107½	"	10	132½	131
"	9	..	93	"	17	102½	100¾	"	17	108¾	106¾
"	18	94½	93	"	24	108⅜	107	"	23	99¼	97¼
"	25	97¼	93¼	"	31	115⅜	113⅞	"	30	94¼	92¼
"	30	87¼	84¼								

WEEKLY CLOSING PRICES PER BUSHEL OF CASH WHEAT AT PORT ARTHUR AND FORT WILLIAM—*Concluded.*

No. 1 AND 2 NORTHERN—*Concluded.*

1916				1917			
		No. 1	No. 2			No. 1	No. 2
July	3	113 7/8	112	Jan.	2	177/8	174/8
"	11	114 3/8	112 5/8	"	9	185/8	182/8
"	18	115 3/4	113 3/4	"	16	183/4	188/4
"	25	120 1/2	118	"	23	178/4	174/8
Aug.	1	128 1/4	126	"	30	170/8	167/8
"	7	137 3/4	135 3/4	Feb.	6	168	165/4
"	15	148 3/4	149 1/2	"	12	170/8	167/8
"	22	158	156	"	19	172/8	168/8
"	29	154 3/8	....	"	28	178/4	174/8

I should like to give the House the export and import figures of wheat for the last four or five years:

Exports or wheat from Canada.

August 1st to July 31st.	Bushels.
1912-13	95,512,000
1913-14	114,904,000
1914-15	63,903,000
1915-16	235,742,000

Imports of wheat by Canada.

August 1st to July 31st.	Bushels.
1912-13	619,000
1913-14	130,000
1914-15	1,964,000
1915-16	131,000

Exports of flour from Canada.

August 1st to July 31st.	Barrels.
1912-13	4,496,000
1913-14	4,597,000
1914-15	5,077,000
1915-16	7,426,000

Imports of flour by Canada.

August 1st to July 31st.	Barrels.
1912-13	60,000
1913-14	51,000
1914-15	48,000
1915-16	39,000

Exports of wheat from Russia.

August 1st to July 31st.	Bushels.
1912-13	100,461,000
1913-14	164,235,000
1914-15	5,296,000
1915-16	7,949,000

Hon. gentlemen will see from these figures what a comparatively small quantity of wheat has been exported from Russia since the war. Here are some figures on the world's wheat production in 1913 and 1914. The total production for North America in 1913, which includes the United States, Canada and Mexico, was 1,005,497,000 bushels, and in 1914 1,060,297,000 bushels. The total production for South America in 1913 was 131,490,000 bushels, and in 1914 192,470,000. Without giving the details for each country, I might say that Europe's total production in 1913 was 2,126,370,000 bushels, and in 1914 1,660,173,000; total production in Asia in 1913, 541,024,000 bushels, and in 1914 526,281,000; Africa, 83,190,000 bushels in 1913, and in 1914 57,437,000; Australasia, in 1913, 119,303,000 bushels, and in 1914 30,408,000. The grand total of the world's wheat production in 1913 amounted to 4,006,874,000 bushels, and in 1914 to 3,527,066,000 bushels, which represents a falling off of about 500,000,000 bushels in one year.

In conclusion, this matter will be specially looked into at once by the commissioner, Mr. O'Connor, and the Government will take whatever steps are thought advisable.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (South Cape Breton): Mr. Speaker, I had intended making a few remarks on the high cost of living before the Budget debate closed, but I will take this opportunity and say what I have to say now. The motion of my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte) is, to my mind, a very important one, and I think the Government should take immediate steps to tackle this question. It is all very well for the Minister of Labour to tell us that his officers have been following the price of flour in this country for the last three or four years. So have the consumers, and the officers of the Government have done nothing so far as I can see to remedy the evil. But the time will come, I hope, in the not far distant future, when the consumers of this country will be in a position to remedy this evil. In my humble opinion, the efforts of the Government to reduce the high cost of living in this country are a mere farce. Several years ago the Department of Labour appointed a commission to investigate the high cost of living, and, after in-

quiring into conditions for a year or two, the commission presented a very voluminous report. The only actual bit of information I could find in that report, and I perused it carefully, was that the price of commodities in this country was generally regulated by the demand for them. During the two years this commission was making its inquiries the price of commodities in this country was rising higher and higher. I do not remember this commission ever telling the Government or the people of this country how they were going to reduce the cost of living. Since then commission after commission has been appointed by the Department of Labour to investigate the cause of the increase in the price of the necessaries of life throughout the Dominion. The trouble is, Mr. Speaker, that these commissions, which the people of this country have to pay for, are doing no good. They gather a lot of information which is never acted upon. What will be the result of the visit of the officers of the Department of Labour to Montreal to-day, for example? Will the Department of Labour take some action that will result in the people being able to get flour for less than the present prices? Or will they simply send in reports and allow prices to continue to soar?

Mr. KYTE: What can they learn in Montreal more than in Ottawa?

Mr. CARROLL: I do not see what information they can get in Montreal more than is contained in the Citizen newspaper. I know very well the gentleman whom the Department of Labour has called upon to investigate these matters, Mr. O'Connor. He is a fine man, and a good, sound lawyer. But what has his investigation amounted to? The consumers are not interested in a commission's findings, that in which they are interested is the abnormal increase in the prices of commodities. The Minister of Labour has had an Order in Council passed. I will not deal with that now, as I shall have something to say about it on the Budget. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) has suggested that we keep away from the Minister of Labour, as that hon. gentleman does not want to do anything, and look to the Minister of Finance. I am very much afraid that the Minister of Finance will come to conclusions in this matter that are not very favourable to the interests of the consumers. At Aldershot, to which my mail was sent, I received, among other things, a pamphlet sent out, I presume, by the Minister of Finance. It was a résumé of an address he delivered before some church organization, I think in Montreal. In that address the minister had something to say about the high cost of living. His advice to the people, as I recall it, was that they should tighten their belts. I suppose that that means that when the children get hungry and go to their father asking him to buy them food, it will be his duty to tell them to take the advice of the Minister of Finance. I sent the pamphlet back to my wife and told her to read it carefully, and then if the children got very hungry to get a stronger type of belt, and, if necessary, call in the neighbours to help in pulling those belts tight enough. Unless the Minister of Finance has changed his opinion, I am afraid the hon. member for Richmond will find but little solace in anything that hon. gentleman has to tell him on the subject. But if the hon. minister does anything to keep prices from soaring, he will have my thanks, and, I am sure, the thanks of every other consumer. We talk of "consumers" and "producers," but what is the dividing line? In some parts of the country immense quantities of wheat are grown, but in the Maritime Provinces, as pointed out by the hon. member for Richmond, we do not grow wheat. This, however, is not a case of juggling with names. It is not even a question of the farmers. Take the figures given by the Minister of Labour, showing the prices of wheat and flour, and see how they compare. In 1913, flour was $4.80 a barrel, and wheat was 94 cents a bushel. In July, 1914, flour was $5 a barrel and wheat 90 cents a bushel. In 1915 the price of flour was $6.50 a barrel, and that of wheat $1.29 a bushel. In 1917 flour had risen to $9 a barrel, and wheat was $1.13. In February, 1917, flour was selling at $9 a barrel, and wheat at $1.78.

Mr. EDWARDS: I ask the hon. gentleman's permission to put a question: Would he favour commandeering wheat at present prices?

4 p.m.

Mr. CARROLL: I would be in favour of commandeering wheat that is being held, first, by the farmers, without any real good reason—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CARROLL: My friends on the other side laugh. And I would be in favour of commandeering the enormous quantities of wheat in the grain elevators, which must be held, I think, for the purpose of securing

a largely increased price. The millers of this country have sufficient wheat, bought months ago—

Mr. EDWARDS: I am afraid I did not make my question clear to the hon. member. I asked, would he be in favour of commandeering wheat at present prices?

Mr. CARROLL: I do not see why I should. Let me make a distinction. The present price of wheat to the farmers is not the price of wheat that is obtained on the grain exchange in Winnipeg and Chicago.

Mr. EDWARDS: But would the hon. gentleman commandeer wheat at the price to the farmer of the West now?

Mr. CARROLL: I understand the Government have tried that, but—

Mr. EDWARDS: How many bushels of wheat does it take to make a barrel of flour?

Mr. CARROLL: If the hon. gentleman will follow up the figures, given by the Minister of Labour—and I presume he is fairly good at calculations of that kind—he will see that the rise in the price of flour is altogether out of proportion to the rise in the price of wheat.

Mr. EDWARDS: How many bushels of wheat does it take to make a barrel of flour?

Mr. CARROLL: I am not a miller—

Mr. EDWARDS: I can tell the hon. gentleman. It takes five bushels of wheat to make a barrel of flour; and on that basis—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. EDWARDS: I asked, and thought I had obtained, the permission of the hon. member (Mr. Carroll) to ask a question. I did not ask the permission of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte).

Mr. CARROLL: I understand that the hon. member (Mr. Edwards) asked a question and that the question was answered. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman asking a question, for that courtesy is always granted. But I understood him to go on and to give some information which I am glad to have, and for which I thank him. It does not matter, however, for the purposes of my argument, how many bushels of wheat it takes to make a barrel of flour. The point is that the rise in the price of flour has been out of all proportion to the rise in the price of wheat.

[Mr. Carroll.]

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. CARROLL: Well, figure it out. In 1915, flour was $6.50 a barrel and wheat $1.29 a bushel. In February last, the price of flour was $9 a barrel, and the price of wheat $1.78 a bushel. But at the present time, the price of flour is not $9, but $14.50.

Mr. BURNHAM: And wheat over $2.80.

Mr. CARROLL: Let hon. gentlemen take time to make a comparison of the figures and they will see that the rise in the price of wheat does not justify the rise in the price of flour.

Mr. CROTHERS: I want to call my hon. friend's attention to the price of wheat and flour. The price of wheat yesterday was $2.82¼ a bushel which will account for the higher price of flour. I think my hon. friend was a little in error in regard to the price of wheat and the price of flour because he quoted the price of wheat in 1913 at 94 cents and of flour at $4.80.

Mr. CARROLL: Those are the figures I got.

Mr. CROTHERS: Then, in February of this year he quoted flour at $9—of course it has risen a good deal since then—and of wheat at $1.78. If he follows out these different percentages he will see that there is about the same relative difference between the price of wheat and the price of flour. He is quite wrong in giving the price of wheat to-day at $1.78.

Mr. CARROLL: I did not give the price of wheat to-day as $1.78, but I gave that as the price on the 4th February, 1917.

Mr. CROTHERS: But did not the hon. gentleman give the price of flour at $14.50?

Mr. CARROLL: No, $9.

Mr. DEVLIN: Are these last figures which have been quoted by the minister obtainable?

Mr. CROTHERS: That is the price yesterday. I have nothing later.

Mr. DEVLIN: Then why did the hon. minister send Mr. O'Connor to Montreal?

Mr. CROTHERS: He will get some information in Montreal that he is not in a position to get here.

Mr. DEVLIN: What information?

Mr. CROTHERS: I cannot tell you what information he is going to get.

Mr. CARROLL: In case Mr. O'Connor does not return from Montreal, I can give the minister some information. Wheat in Winnipeg tops the $3 mark. That is the latest information. It jumped 18 points in less than half an hour this afternoon.

Mr. LALOR: Can the hon. gentleman tell us the price in Chicago to-day? We have free wheat now.

Mr. CARROLL: I am not interested in the price at Chicago. What I am interested in is the price at which the consumers of this country are paying for flour. The hon. gentleman can follow out that proportion. But the strong point after all is that the millers of this country are not paying $2.80, neither are they paying $3, neither are they paying $1.80 for the wheat out of which they are making the flour for which they are charging the consumers $14.50 per barrel. The great bulk of the flour that they are selling to the people at $14.50 a barrel is flour ground from wheat bought in February or last fall at $1.13, $1.59 and $1.78 a bushel. They have in their possession at the present time sufficient wheat, according to their own statistics, to keep them going for the next three or four months. Yet, they are charging the people $14.50 a barrel for flour when the wheat out of which that flour was made cost them fifty per cent less than wheat is costing to-day. The Minister of Finance admitted the other day that the millers had been making more money than any other class of manufacturers. If they have been doing that, is it just and fair that they should be allowed to continue to do so in view of the fact that they are not paying this high price for wheat? Is it fair that they should be allowed to raise the price of flour to the people of this country to a point which will make it almost impossible for the great majority to have flour in their possession at all? Of course, it is most humiliating that we should have had from the Minister of Labour a statement of the large amounts of wheat produced in Russia. He tells us, of course, that the figures from Russia are very interesting. That is something that will be most consoling to the housewives throughout Canada when they complain to their husbands that flour is $14.50 a barrel and that there is a possibility of it going to $20. Somebody will say to them: The Minister of Labour says that the figures with reference to wheat from Russia are very interesting, you must look at the long strings of figures which the Minister of Labour brought down to show that you are not in need of wheat and flour at all and that it is all right to pay $14.50 a barrel for your flour, although labouring men are only making $1.25 or $2 per day. If the labouring classes of this country were getting sufficient pay to enable them to buy these commodities at the present high rates, my voice would not be heard in Parliament to protest against the prevailing prices. But, they are not. There is only one class of labourers who are getting wages somewhat proportionate to what they are paying for the necessaries of life, and those are the people who are working in the munition factories. They are getting good wages.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the coal miners are not getting largely increased remuneration?

Mr. CARROLL: I am very well versed in what the coal miners are getting. The coal miners got an increase of ten per cent last year, but when it is remembered that many of these men previous to that were earning only $1.75, some $2 and, of course, some $6 and $7 per day, which is all right for those who are getting their coal out by quantity, you will see what a magnificent addition that ten per cent makes to their wages.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Is my hon. friend aware that in Halifax to-day bunker coal is sold to supply vessels at $12 per ton which is an extraordinary price?

Mr. CARROLL: I am aware of no such fact. The Minister of Labour is only paying $4.20 and we had a most vehement protest from the Premier of this country less than two months ago that they had offered the Dominion Coal Company and other coal corporations $10 per ton for coal.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I suppose my hon. friend is aware that the cost to the consumer of Nova Scotia's coal has almost doubled since last year?

Mr. CARROLL: I am aware of no such thing.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I am.

Mr. CARROLL: Well, I am not. I am sorry if my hon. friend is being imposed upon by some coal dealer in Nova Scotia because the coal dealers are not getting those prices. The coal companies have not doubled up, have not increased their prices by fifty per cent or forty per cent or twenty-five per cent. If my hon. friend will take the trouble to compare the

prices that the Department of Railways and Canals are paying for their coal at the present time with the prices which they paid last year, and the year before, he will see that the amounts I stated are perfectly correct.

I have taken up more time on this subject than I had intended but it is a most serious question. It is a question which should demand the immediate attention of the Ministry of this country. There may be difficulties, there may be troubles, in the way, but we are living in troublesome times. The problem may need an extraordinary remedy but we are living in extraordinary times. I have to plead not only for the general consumer in this country but for the wives and children of the men who have gone to the front. Many of these men were getting very good wages before leaving their homes to fight for King and country. They are getting to-day, I need not tell this House, $1.10 per day, their wives are getting $20 per month separation allowance, if they are privates, and most of them are privates, and they may also be getting a little from the Patriotic Fund which is a God-send in itself. But, at the same time, if for no other reason than the fact that we have thousands and hundreds of thousands of men at the front who have left families, large in number and small in stature, and who are receiving not fifty per cent of the wages that they get in times of peace, this Government should be loyal to these men and see to it that their wives and children should not be left to starve on the mere pittance they are getting and that the millers of this country should not be permitted to impose on them to the extent of a 100 per cent advance in a few months in the price of flour.

Of those who went to the front from the town of Glace Bay, from which I come, I am sorry to say there are 176 on the death roll. That is a large number for a comparatively small town. There are 176 graves on the fields of France of men who enlisted from my town, and a great proportion of these were married men. I know to my sorrow that these women have had a hard time to struggle on, and they will have an equally hard time under the present pension system, which, after all, is fairly good as compared with other pension systems. But I think that the Government of this country should take some steps to see that these people at least, who are all consumers and dependents on this Government, are not further imposed upon by the manipulators, the contractors, and especially the millers of this country, who I think have imposed upon the public at least in their present exorbitant advance in the price of flour.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe): It is rather pitiful to think that the hon. member for South Cape Breton having escaped the dangers of the battalion to which he belonged, which has gone to the front to face bullets, is now face to face with poverty or rather starvation almost, if we are to judge by what he has said.

Mr. CARROLL: Did I understand the hon. member to say that I was face to face with poverty?

Mr. CARVELL: He said that you had escaped the bullets and are now face to face with poverty.

Mr. CARROLL: I did not escape them. I was right in the trenches my friend. I did not attempt to escape them—and I did not go there as a colonel either.

Mr. CARVELL: Take that back, take it back.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Take it back.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: I have nothing to take back.

Mr. CARVELL: You ought to be ashamed of yourself.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: I congratulate him, if he was at the front and escaped.

Mr. CARVELL: Why don't you take it back like a man?

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Of all the gentlemen in the House—

Mr. CARROLL: Perhaps if you have a doubt about it the secretary of the Militia Department will be able to tell you.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: —an hon. gentleman who for years and years strutted around the country in all the feathers of an artillery major or something else, but who when the war broke out is found safely here and not at the front—the last gentleman who should speak on military affairs is the hon. member for Carleton. He is at home where he is safe, while the fighting members of his brigade are at the front.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think it is only fair to the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) to say that he offered his services to this country, and that the former Minister of Militia declined to accept them.

Mr. CARVELL: I did not intend to bring this matter up, but that offer was put in writing. It is in the hands of the department to-day. It is all marked private but one letter. The very moment that the department or the ex-Minister of Militia will remove the seal of confidence from that, I will be only too happy to give it to the public.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: The country has had the proud satisfaction of seeing thousands of brave men from Vancouver to Sydney go to the front who have never written to the Minister of Militia asking if they could go. They went, and that is all they required, and that is all the country required them to do. There was no time on their part to sit down and write confidential letters. They saw their duty and went to it like men, but this gentleman who indulges in letter writing, he is still here and refuses to go.

Mr. CARVELL: My letters are not confidential; the Minister of Militia's are. I will read mine any time I get permission from the Minister of Militia to read his. You had better take back what you said, but if you want to get into a fight of this kind you will get all you want. I have the file upstairs in my desk now.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: I do not propose to have any words with the hon. gentleman.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. CARVELL: You can have all you want with the member for Carleton at any time you want it, and I want you to take back the nasty insinuation you have made. It is the mark of a coward, nothing else.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I want to remind the House that the question before it is the high price of flour.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: If the honourable and irritable member for Carleton will refrain, I will proceed with my remarks on flour.

Mr. CARVELL: Be gentleman enough to take back your nasty insinuation.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: I cannot imagine that I could say anything nasty about that gentleman. He requires something much worse than nasty. The hon. member for Sydney (Mr. Carroll) was a proper party to rise and address the House, as also was the member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte), for this reason, that I assume they both stand in the same position; they have no farmers in their constituencies who grow grain, and consequently they will not jar with any farmers in their localities or constituencies. The debate is about on the same line as the reciprocity campaign of 1911. Everybody knows what happened in the city of Toronto. There was the Toronto Star newspaper store vending all kinds of product brought from the United States, endeavouring to demonstrate to the people that the stuff imported from the United States could be sold cheaper in Toronto than if it was produced in Ontario. Then, on the side lines, were to be found men like my friend from Oxford trying to demonstrate to the people in Ontario that reciprocity would enhance the prices for the Canadian farmer and the Ontario farmer. Brought face to face, what was the result? In the great province of Ontario, where the right hon. gentleman had sometimes almost broken even, the Liberal party returned only some dozen members from that whole province. They know it. And it was by reason of the fact that they endeavoured to carry on a campaign of humbug and cant and hypocrisy in the province of Ontario. So to-day they stand in that position in this debate. What does the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) say when I ask him if they are prepared to take the 47,000,000 bushels of grain that is held by the farmers of the West and commandeer that, what does he say? There is not a gentleman on the other side of the House who says they will do that to-day Will the member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) go into the barns of the farmers of his county, or any other man who comes from the province of Ontario, and commandeer the grain that is held by the farmers in Ontario? Certainly not; they will not do it. Why? Because the farmer in Ontario and in the rest of this Dominion is having a chance to-day; that is the reason. Compare the price of all kinds of produce with the price of flour. The farmer of Ontario who feeds corn has to pay what price? According to the Toronto figures, American corn is $1.50 a bushel. Is it not time that the farmers should have a chance and an innings while these high prices rule? Take the price of oats. Oats are proportionately higher than wheat; they are 85 cents a bushel. The hon. member comes from the riding of Sydney. He will not say that he is prepared to commandeer the steel down in that country, which to-day is sold at a price 300 per cent higher than it was in 1914. The hon. gentleman would not dare to open his mouth on that question. The farmer is to-day being taxed abnormally for all his implements. Why? On account of the enhanced price of steel.

Mr. CARROLL: I accept that challenge. If the price of ordinary steel is enhanced by the Dominion Iron and Steel Company to the extent of 300 per cent, I will certainly say to the Government: take it and give it to the people of this country, who require it for purposes of war.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: After the applause has subsided, we will recall what the hon. gentleman said. He referred to the price of "ordinary steel," and he would be all the afternoon heckling as to what the price of ordinary steel was. He may be referring to some particular class of steel, but it is a fact that the price of ordinary steel has not increased 300 per cent. Everybody knows that when the war commenced shell steel was selling at about $30 a ton, and it is now $90 a ton.

Mr. KYTE: Is it not a fact that the Munitions Board fixed the price of steel which is used in the manufacture of shells?

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: I am not aware whether or not that is a fact; therefore I cannot answer the question.

Mr. KYTE: That is a fact. What are you complaining about?

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: The hon gentleman says that there should be no complaint if the farmer has to pay an enhanced price for his machinery.

Mr. KYTE: The hon. gentleman cannot complain, because the Munitions Board, which represents his own Government, fixed the price.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: I hope that the whole of the Opposition will not become irritable; they should try to calm themselves a little bit. The price of flour to-day depends on one point, and that is the world's visible supply. The price may be influenced to a certain extent by speculation, but what can the Government do as to that? The grain exchange at Winnipeg, the only large one in Canada, has been closed. Every farmer in this Dominion is a grain speculator. I know farmers in my county who are holding wheat for the increased price that they think will accrue to them; yet hon. gentlemen endeavour to make the people believe that by a stroke of the pen they could decrease the price of flour. They say that they would do it by fixing the price of wheat and that they would commandeer every bushel of wheat in Canada. I challenge the hon. gentleman to make a straight motion that the Government should at this time commandeer all the wheat in Canada. If the hon. gentleman should do this, you would not fail to observe the celerity with which hon. gentlemen from the province of Ontario on the opposite side of the House move out of the Chamber.

The hon. member for Richmond made one wild statement. He said that all the flour that is to-day being sold at these enhanced prices was manufactured last February. He does not know a thing about it. The mills have all been running ever since, and they have been paying their price for the wheat.

Mr. CARROLL: Does the hon. member not know that a miller in Montreal made a statement to the press—to a representative of the Citizen, I think—that the millers had enough wheat to keep their mills going for three months, and that this wheat was bought several months ago?

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: I suppose that some millers bought in a prospective way, but the millers in Ontario have been buying only in car lots, from one day to another. What would the hon. gentleman do with the grain in the elevators which is not owned by the millers? There are gentlemen in the city of Toronto and in every city who from time to time have millions of bushels of grain in these grain elevators. Would hon. gentlemen commandeer that grain? Not at all. Hon. gentlemen will not dare, before this debate closes, to make a motion that the Government commandeer all the wheat in the country. They want this buncombe to go to the country so that the impression will be created that they are the friends of the people.

The hon. gentleman says that the price of coal has not apparently increased in his riding. Well, that is his assertion, but I have the statement of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House that while coal was selling about three years ago at $2.75 a ton, to-day the people of the Maritime Provinces are being held up for $8 and $9 a ton.

Mr. CARROLL: Your first statement is absolutely wrong.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Can hon. gentlemen tell me what the railway companies are paying per ton for coal?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: The Minister of Railways has offered $4.25 a ton this year for coal for the Intercolonial railway. and has closed a contract with several com-

panies at that price. If my hon. friend had been here last week he would have heard the Minister of Railways speak in regard to this question. The minister took the position that $4.25 was the ruling price.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman says that the price is now $4.25; formerly it was $2.75.

Mr. MACDONALD: The price last winter was $3.50.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: But in 1914 it was $2.75. The hon. member for Pictou did not tell the whole story. The companies did not sell at $4.25.

Mr. McKENZIE: The difficulty—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am delighted to get such a reception from hon. gentlemen opposite. I was going to say to the hon. gentleman that the difficulty about the price of coal is not so much the price of the article as it is the cost of transportation.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: While hon. gentlemen opposite may not agree with gentlemen on this side as to prices, I can tell the House that in the province of Ontario we know what soft coal is selling at to-day. The price is governed by the enhanced prices in Nova Scotia. Soft coal is 200 per cent more expensive in Ontario than it was in 1914.

Mr. KYTE: As a matter of fact, is it not United States soft coal that is consumed in Ontario?

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Yes. I am informed that the Minister of Railways, in his statement the other night, said that while the offer of $4.25, or whatever the amount may have been, was actually made, the companies were utterly unable to deliver the coal, and the contract has fallen through. They were perfectly safe in making the offer, because they knew that they could not deliver.

Mr. MACDONALD: You had better get some more information on that point.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: The House and the country are waiting to see what hon. gentlemen opposite are going to do; whether they are going to make this a matter of discussion or a matter of action. The hon. gentleman this afternoon had a splendid opportunity to move that every bushel of wheat in Canada should be commandeered at a certain price by the Government. If hon. gentlemen are prepared to vote for a motion of that kind, I am prepared to vote against it. But hon. gentlemen are simply indulging in buncombe, as usual, and do not intend taking any action this afternoon.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.): Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to take part in this debate to-day, and I should not have done so had it not been for the very unfair method followed by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. W. H. Bennett) in his remarks concerning myself. There was a time when I should not have expected very much better than this from the member for East Simcoe, but I must say that during the last five or six years he has given considerable evidence of being a gentleman. I am surprised, therefore, at his conduct this afternoon.

It is a fact that I belonged to the Militia of Canada for a number of years down to about seven or eight years before war broke out in 1914. I belonged to the Field Artillery. The time came when I must either take command of my battery or retire, and as I was too busy to take command of the battery, I retired. The facts will be found in the Militia List, and there is no question as to them. At the time of the declaration of war I was 52 years of age, and I was too old to enlist as a private, so I went to the Minister of Militia and offered my services, if they were of any use to him, as an officer, and asked for the right to raise a battery of field artillery. This occurred during the month of August, 1914, about three weeks after the declaration of war. Nothing further came of the matter until the latter part of April, 1915, when the minister started a correspondence with me which was carried on for some time, all the documents except one being marked "confidential." I got a little suspicious that I was not being treated by the minister as though he wanted my services, and therefore I wrote him on the 4th of September, 1915, a letter which is not marked "confidential," which must be in the public files of the Militia Department and which I propose now reading to the House, and when I have done so, I have no further comment to make upon it. The remainder of the file is marked "confidential"; it is in the hands of either the present Minister of Militia or the ex-Minister of Militia, and as they are both alive and on the earth, they can produce the remainder of the correspondence. I have here all the original letters received by me from the minister and copies of the letters written by me to

him. This letter was written on the 4th day of September, 1915, being the day when the ex-Minister of Militia returned from his trip to England during that summer:

Woodstock, N.B.,
September 4, 1915.

Major-General Sir Sam Hughes,
Ottawa.

My dear Sir Sam:

I wrote you last re my request to be allowed to recruit a battery of Field Artillery on July 2, and on July 8 received an acknowledgment from Col. Winter, stating that "inquiries were being made regarding my appointment, and as soon as a reply was received, I would be communicated with." I have heard nothing from that date, and nearly two months have now gone by. If anything is to be done, there is no time to lose, especially as I would not want to raise a battery to remain in Canada during the coming winter. If you think well of my proposition, and as I read the times, the Empire needs all the help possible, I trust you will set the machinery in motion at once, and if nothing comes of it, then please let me know and I will know what to do.

Believe me, sincerely yours,
(Sgd.) F. B. Carvell.

The reply to that, also marked "confidential," was received by me on the 10th day of November, 1915, or two months and one week after my letter was written. While I cannot give the contents of the answer, it is needless to say it was not an acceptance of my proposition or I would not be here to-day, because, without casting any reflection upon any other member of this House, I may say that when I made a proposition to raise a battery of Field Artillery I intended to raise it not to leave it in England but to stay with it to the end, and that end probably meant forever so far as I was concerned. I have nothing more to say, but that I am rather sorry that my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. W. H. Bennett), who has been in this House with me for many years, thought it was his business to refer to a personal matter of this kind; but as he has done so, I believe I am justified in giving this much information to the House.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Had the hon. gentleman kept his seat and not interfered with me I would have let him alone. He will never interfere with me without having me touch him up.

Mr. CARVELL: The law presumes that every man is a gentleman, and there is no presumption that I know of that justifies any man ceasing to be a gentleman, and no provocation ought to be sufficient to any man to make him cease to be a gentleman. All this correspondence is in the hands of my hon. friends opposite and they have the opportunity of giving it to the public at any time they so desire.

While I am on my feet I wish to say a word with reference to the motion of my hon. friend. I do not know why the hon. member for East Simcoe and the Minister of Labour should see such wonderful difficulty in trying to reduce, to a certain extent, the cost of living to the people of this country. We have had all sorts of bugaboos thrown broadcast to the country as to the difficulties, and member after member on the other side has asked members on this side: Would you be willing to commandeer the wheat in the farmers' granaries? Would you be willing to commandeer steel down in Sydney? I want to give an answer in language so explicit that there can be no doubt of my position in the matter. I represent a farming constituency that produces more potatoes than any other constituency in Canada, and what is true of wheat is true of potatoes, because potatoes to-day are just as unreasonable in price as is wheat. Not only would I be willing to see the Government commandeer wheat and potatoes, but I think it is their duty to do so.

Mr. DAVIDSON: At what price would you commandeer potatoes?

Mr. CARVELL: At a fair price.

Mr. DAVIDSON: How much?

Mr. CARVELL: If my hon. friend from Annapolis thinks that he can draw me away from this question he has got a pretty hard task on his hands. I had some potatoes, and when the price reached $1.75 a bag I sold them, because I was ashamed to keep them any longer, and I think I got more than they were worth, and if my neighbours got that much they did pretty well, too. It is not, however, a question what price I would say. I say, under war conditions, with prices soaring, with many people finding it almost impossible to make a living, it is not a question of how much the farmers could get, or would get; it is a question of the duty of the Government to take these matters up and grapple with them as men would do, from the standpoint of fair prices and fair profits. The British Government did not hesitate to grapple with these questions. Within the last five months we have seen in the Old Country newspapers such statements as: You shall not sell such and such a commodity at more than a certain price. This Government, only two months ago, took that attitude in regard to newsprint; they

said to the newsprint manufacturers: You shall not charge beyond a certain price and the newsprint manufacturers submitted. The whole difference is this. The newsprint is sold entirely to the newspapers publishers of Canada, and the newspapers of Canada were in a position so to bombard the Minister of Finance that he was compelled to comply with their request, and when sufficient pressure was put upon him he had no hesitation; there were no lions in the path; there were no constitutional difficulties; he had the War Measures Act and under it he said to the newsprint manufacturers: You must sell this paper at a certain price, or I will make you. Those gentlemen at once complied with the request and are selling the paper to-day at that price. I believe this matter of the price of foodstuffs comes within the Department of Labour, but I have grave doubts of his settling it. At all events, the Government as a whole might say to those in Canada who have wheat or potatoes in store—I do not care whether they are producers or middlemen—you must sell them at a fair price. Down in the Maritime Provinces we are paying forty to forty-five cents a pound for bacon. Why cannot the Government say to the men who have thousands of pounds of bacon stored away in the storage houses: You must sell that bacon at a fair price. Why cannot they say to the men who have meats and food products of all kinds stored away, and who have been gambling with the necessities of the people in order to make exorbitant profits, "You must sell these articles at a fixed price." The thing is all very simple. A great many things have been done in this old world within the last few years that people said could not be done before, and perhaps a great many things which would not have been thought justifiable before. But to-day this old world is at war, and thousands of people in Canada are barely able to keep body and soul together. There are women and children in this country who have not tasted meat for a fortnight, and that is true of all our cities and towns. They have not the means with which to buy meat or potatoes. In view of these conditions, why should not the Government interfere? If the Government have not the nerve to interfere, why do they not make way for men who would?

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Where are they?

Mr. CARVELL: The people will show you where they are. There are a great many people in Canada, both inside and outside of Parliament, that could show this Government what they would do, and it will not be very long probably, before they will have an opportunity. I am not here to prescribe a remedy; we are discussing principles. My hon. friend from Simcoe challenges some one on this side of the House to draw up a Bill. But we are not drawing up Bills to-day; we are simply asking the Government to adopt certain measures. We are saying that the time has arrived when it is the duty of the Government to see that the common people of this country get the necessities of life at a reasonable price. There need be no trouble about providing machinery, as ample power is given under the War Measures Act to do all that is necessary. The Government can take over the Ross Rifle factory, they can fix the price of paper, and put wheat on the free list. There is nothing they cannot do, and they can just as easily regulate the price of commodities. It is not merely within the power of the Government to do this, but I maintain that it is their bounden duty at once to take steps to reduce the terribly high cost of living under which the people of this country are groaning to-day.

Hon. Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take part in this debate, but the subject under consideration is an exceedingly important one, and it seems to me just as well that the opportunity has been afforded of discussing here to-day not only the high price of flour, but the high cost of living generally. We are living in most serious times, the most serious in our history, and I believe in the history of the world. I do not suppose that at any time in human history has there been so much dislocation of commerce as at present. There has never been a time of such profound change; never a time in which there has been so much human suffering in the world and so much anxiety, or when public opinion was so sensitive, and subjected to such severe strain as to-day. This is a time when governments charged with the responsibility of carrying on the affairs of a country are the subject of much criticism. It is proper that governments should be subjected to fair criticism, but I believe it to be the duty of the opposition in any House such as this, to approach a question such as is now under consideration, judicially, fairly, and in a statesmanlike manner, and not with the object of making political capital out of it at a time like

this. I propose, therefore, to discuss this question somewhat at length, as it is a question that should be discussed, and discussed fairly. If the Government is at fault with regard to the high cost of living, I want to know it, and in what respect, and if it can be shown that we are at fault we shall endeavour to the best of our ability to rectify what may be wrong. We are not seeking and never have sought to evade responsibility for our conduct of the war, and so far as our conduct of these affairs in every respect is concerned, I say there is absolutely no room whatever for national self-depreciation.

With these preliminary remarks, I address myself to the subject which has been drawn to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte), namely, the rising price of flour. The Minister of Labour has stated that the rise of $1.20 per barrel yesterday attracted his attention, as it did the attention of every one in this House, and he has taken the steps which it devolved upon him to take, of setting immediately upon foot an inquiry to ascertain the reason for that rise, and whether it was justified.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why did he not start the inquiry long ago?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I will tell my hon. friend before I get through what has caused the increase in the price of flour. The hon. member for Richmond, the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll), and the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell), have not approached this subject with the desire of ascertaining and laying before this country the reasons for the increase in the price of flour, but have rather sought to create the impression that the Government had control of the price of commodities in this country—

Mr. CARVELL: Could not control them.

Sir THOMAS WHITE—and was at fault for not having reduced the cost of living. In addressing myself to the subject I intend to inquire first, what is the cause of the high cost of living, and what is it that determines prices? When we have elucidated that, we can deal with the question under consideration, and ascertain whether or not any blame or censure properly attaches to this Government. The only suggestion put forward of a practical nature by the hon. member for Richmond was this, and it is not often that we get a suggestion from him that even savours of the practical; he is strong on criticism, but not strong on constructive suggestion.

Mr. KYTE: He gets a royal commission once in a while, though.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: And he fails on that.

Mr. KYTE: And the Finance Minister is short of a colleague as a result of it.

Mr. CARVELL: We will discuss that with you some day.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would point out that the Minister of Finance has the floor, and except with his permission no hon. member should interrupt him.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The hon. member for Richmond put forward the suggestion, and I submit it to the common sense of this House—I put it on no different ground from that—that there are 90,000,000 bushels of wheat in Canada, that we should commandeer that wheat, pay the price, take possession of the mills, mill the wheat and distribute it to the public, thereby reducing the price of flour. I think, myself, that there are 100,000,000 bushels of wheat in this country. Let us see where the suggestion of my hon. friend leads. He lightly puts forward the suggestion that we should purchase 100,000,000 bushels of wheat at $3 a bushel.

Mr. KYTE: I did not say that.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Does my hon. friend say $2.50 a bushel?

Mr. KYTE: No.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: $1.75?

Mr. KYTE: I said nothing of the kind.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Would my hon. friend force the farmers of this country to sell their wheat, which has been quoted at from $2.75 to $3 a bushel, at $1.50 a bushel?

Mr. KYTE: What did the Minister of Trade and Commerce offer when he proposed to commandeer the wheat a year ago last fall?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I will ask my hon. friend—no, I will not ask him, because I never get a direct reply. My hon. friend dare not suggest that we pay the farmers $1.50 or $2 per bushel for wheat that is quoted at $2.75 or $3 a bushel. Let us see where his suggestion leads. He would commandeer all the wheat in Canada. He puts forward that suggestion right manfully. Now, to buy 100,000,000 bushels at $3 a

bushel we should have to raise $300,000,000; at $2.50 a bushel we should have to raise $250,000,000, and at $2 a bushel we should have to raise $200,000,000. The hon. gentleman talks as if all you had to do was to touch a button to raise $200,000,000 or $250,000,000 or $300,000,000, and buy all the wheat in Canada. But let us suppose it done. Where are we when we have done that? The hon. gentleman did not pause to inquire how many bushels of wheat make a barrel of flour. Well, it takes a little less than four and a half bushels. He would commandeer wheat at $2.80 or $3 a bushel. Four and a half times $3 would be $13.50; so that the wheat alone would cost as much as the flour costs to-day. That is the beautiful suggestion he puts forward for the serious consideration of this House. I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything more on that head; the members of this House are too intelligent—when they get away from politics—not to know that flour has gone up in price because wheat has gone up in price. And why have the prices of wheat and of every other commodity in Canada gone up—yes, every other commodity in the world? I propose to tell the House why, in my opinion, prices have gone up. Unless we take account of what has happened in the world, we shall not be able to discuss this question intelligently.

The world to-day is at war. Twenty-five millions of men are under arms, taken from industries of all kinds and now devoting their energies to mutual slaughter. The first effect of that is to cause a shortage of labour, and the effect of that in turn is an increase in wages—an increase not only in those countries that are at war but in every country. This results in an increase in the price of every commodity which is produced by labour, that is, every commodity in the world, including, of course, agricultural products. More than that, the cost of capital—interest—has gone up. And interest is a factor in price. Interest has gone up because the great governments of the world are pouring out floods of securities in order to raise money to carry on the war. They have taken possession of the market. In Great Britain industrial concerns are not allowed, except under special circumstances, to raise money by the sale of securities. Securities that used to be sold on a two and a half per cent basis are now sold on a five, six and seven per cent basis, and in the case of some foreign governments, their securities are sold on the basis of eight and nine per cent. This is another cause of increase in the cost of production. Again, the withdrawal of these millions of men from the fields prevents cultivation of the soil from being carried on upon anything like the scale on which it was carried on before the war. Not only is cultivation not so extensive, but it is not so efficient as it was. And a great deal of territory formerly under cultivation is ravaged by war and is not under cultivation to-day. All this affects supply—and demand and supply regulate prices. Another important feature in relation to supply is the shortage of tonnage. The world's transportation system is dislocated. The whole food supply of Australia is shut up by reason of the submarine menace and the shortage of shipping. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) had the temerity to criticise the Minister of Labour because prices were lower in Australia than in Canada. What is the reason for that difference? Australia is four times as far from Great Britain as Canada is, and freights and insurance are greatly increased. Then there is the shortage of tonnage. The hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Webster), who made one of the best speeches I ever heard in this House, pointed out that New Zealand had 400,000 boxes of cheese, and, as I recollect it, 3,500,000 carcases of mutton for which she could not get transportation. What must be the effect upon local prices? Of course, local prices must be lower than in England, or Canada, or the United States.

5 p.m.

Now, there is one point I wish to make, and to make it clearly. You cannot compare this country with England. This is an exporting country, like the United States. We raise wheat and other farm products for export. My hon. friend points out what they have done in England, in taking possession of supplies. But England is in an entirely different position from ourselves, for it is an importing country.

Mr. MACDONALD: What about the United States?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have no time to stop now, but I will come to that a little later.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why not—

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Will the hon. member be patient? He is the most impatient member in the House, in many ways.

Mr. MACDONALD: But I notice the hon. minister does not answer my question.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is because the hon. member asks questions that should not be answered.

Mr. MACDONALD: Leaving aside personalities, will the hon. minister allow me a question? Will he distinguish between the United States and Canada, and tell us whether, in the United States, they have passed legislation giving their government power which this Government has not taken?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I will come to that. I usually finish up a question before I get through, I believe, and I will try to do that on this occasion. I have shown that the food supply of the world has been greatly diminished by reason of conditions arising out of the war. I failed to mention that the supplies of Russian wheat have not reached their usual market by reason of the closing of the Dardanelles. So much, for the side of supply.

Now, what about demand? While supply has fallen off, demand has increased. Why? One reason is that the armies in this war are better fed than armies ever were before in the history of the world. There are thousands, if not millions, of men, especially in the continental armies, who are better fed to-day than they have ever been fed in their lives before—many of those that were engaged in industrial life are very much better fed. Consequently, the demand for food for these armies is very great. In addition, the high wages paid to workers in munitions and other industries mean that the people have money to spend. Besides that, there is less unemployment in the world than ever before in the lifetime of any man in this House. And the people, having good wages, spend more for food than they did before. The hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell) talks of the "misery" in this country at the present time. There never was a time in our history when there was less unemployment and less distress than there is at this moment. I give my word that since this war broke out—or, at least since a few months after its outbreak, because there was a complete dislocation of business in the early days of the war—it has never been suggested to me in my public position that there was any real distress.

Mr. CARVELL: The hon. minister ought to go to some of our towns and cities and learn the conditions of some of the people—

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The hon. member (Mr. Carvell) poses here as the tribune of the common people. I have as much sympathy with the common people as he has—I ought to, because I am one of them myself. They are the best people in the world, and that is the reason why the Lord made so many of them. As I was saying: there is greater demand from the armies and greater demand from the European centres of population where the people are earning higher wages than before. This is another reason besides the shortage of supply, why the cost of commodities has risen. It is a world condition. Now, I am not speaking about combines. If there are combines and monopolies to enhance prices, that is an entirely different matter, and is to be considered by itself; I am speaking of the ordinary conditions under which the farmers of this country work.

Prices are determined by the laws of supply and demand, by world laws which it is within the power of no Government to wholly control. Great Britain herself tried to do it in regard to sugar at the outbreak of the war and signally failed. The British Government's effort to deal with the sugar question was a failure. The hon. member for Richmond says that it is due to wheat manipulation. There is an element of truth in that but it is not nearly so great as my hon. friend suggests. Another hon. gentleman—I think my hon. friend from Carleton or some other hon. gentleman opposite said: Never mind Chicago; do not bother about Chicago.

Mr. CARVELL: No.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I accept the disclaimer of my hon. friend from Carleton. But how can you absolutely ignore market conditions for wheat in Chicago and Minneapolis when you are dealing with the prices in Canada? There is an approximation between the prices at Winnipeg and Chicago. It is true, there may be a corner or something of that kind at one place or the other but the condition created in that way is only temporary. Suppose you undertook to fix the price in Canada? Suppose you said that you would not allow a higher price in Canada than $1.50 a bushel at a time when you are appealing to the western farmer to raise more grain? Here is a point I desire to make: Things tend in this world to cure themselves. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) who is one of the best economists in this

House, would, I think, agree with me in saying that if you have a high price for anything the tendency is for industry and capital to flow into that particular industry and to remedy the situation. If farming is profitable, farming will be prosecuted. My own opinion is that the prevailing high prices are more than likely to be ameliorated by the farmer feeling that he is getting a fair price for his labour than they would be if we were to step in and say: No, you must take an artificial price. Suppose you fixed a price for wheat in this country lower than it is in the United States, would the farmer in the West sow his grain this spring for the harvest next fall? Would he not rather say: I will go to some place where I can get the world price for my wheat? Would he not say: I will go across the line and engage in farming.

I am indicating some of the difficulties in dealing with this question. It seems to be a very simple question for hon. gentlemen opposite. Do hon. gentlemen opposite say: Take away from the farmer the world price, cut it in half? The farmer might very well say: Why should I be put in such a position of disadvantage in an exporting country? I doubt very much if hon. gentlemen opposite would suggest that the farmer should be deprived of the fair world's price for his product. The hon. member from Brockville (Mr. Webster) showed the House conclusively the other night that the cost to the farmer for labour and for the commodities which he uses has greatly increased. We cannot therefore say to the farmer: You must take the price that you get in ordinary and normal times, notwithstanding the fact that your cost has increased. I do not believe there is an hon. gentleman opposite who would dare get up and say that to the farming community and I think it would be a most unwise course for the Government to pursue.

Mr. TURRIFF: If that is the case, will the minister explain why this Government, within the last five or six weeks, tried to buy the whole of the western crop at $1.30 a bushel at Fort William when it was quoted 30 cents higher at Chicago?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend is wrong in his facts; this Government did not attempt to buy the wheat crop of this country at all. More than that my hon. friend from Assiniboia knows this just as well as I do. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) passed on an offer from the Imperial Government, not from this Government, in respect to the western wheat crop. It has been stated that the Government might reduce the high cost of living by some action it might take. It is very easy for hon. gentlemen to get up and say: Reduce the cost of living. Where are you going to start? You start with the farmer and the farmer will say to you: I work long and I work hard, I rise early and I retire late, my costs have gone up all along the line, I am not in any combine, I want my fair price and I submit that my profits are not abnormal. That is what the farmer says.

Mr. CARVELL: Do you think that the farmer who is selling potatoes at $8 a barrel or $4 a bag is getting a fair price?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not know what kind of farmers my hon. friend has in his district, but I have no doubt there are a lot of honest men there. I will say that I have never known the farmers of this or any other community to obtain profits to which they thought they were not reasonably entitled because I know how hard they work. I have worked on a farm and I have worked in an office. I have heard people talk about the heavy responsibility that men have in offices but I take notice that an hon. gentleman like my hon. friend from Carleton, and myself, and the rest of us, would very much rather have the responsibility, with six hours a day in an office, than get up at five o'clock in the morning and finish at eight o'clock with the very slender profits derived by the farmer. It is all right enough for hon. gentlemen opposite to attack the farmers but while I am just as much interested as any body in reducing the high cost of living I maintain that the farmers of this country are entitled to a fair deal.

My hon. friend asked: What about the millers? And he spoke about the large profits of the millers. I would like to point out to my hon. friend that the Government have not been unmindful of its duties regarding the millers. Of all the profits that the millers make, and they have been pretty large in the last two or three years, the Government steps in and takes a large portion by virtue of the business profits war tax. I will point to another thing, and I do so because after all we should deal with these matters fairly and try to reach a sound conclusion. The profits of a particular industry may be large, but they may

bear a very small relationship to, indeed, they may be only a fraction of one per cent of, the volume of business transacted. I should not be at all surprised if all the profits derived by the millers of this country would be a very small percentage indeed of the increase of the price which has taken place in regard to flour. If I were arguing this with the idea only of political expediency, it is possible that I would not say this, but I think it is desirable that in this House we should ascertain the truth. What is the fact? If my hon. friend would distribute all the profits made by the milling companies in Canada over the cost of living in Canada, they would represent an exceedingly small percentage indeed. I am not in sympathy with these large profits at all. I like to see men make fair profits, but it must be borne in mind that traders, keen traders, capable men, even under world conditions, that are not subject to control by combines, make large profits.

As long as there are no combines, as long as there is no monopoly, as a general thing you do more harm than good when you interfere. But what a Government could do and what this Government has done is to say to people who make enormous profits in war time: Gentlemen, we are going to take away from you a very substantial portion of those excess profits for the prosecution of the war. Hon. gentlemen have charged the Government with not reducing the cost of living. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers), I know, has used his best endeavours in this most difficult matter. We have accomplished something. It is not possible for any Government to accomplish very much with respect to the reduction of the cost of living. At all events, I have never seen a practical suggestion put forward, apart from that one question: Is there a monopoly, is there a trust, is there a combine? If you have a monopoly, a combine, a trust, then something can be done by a Government in order to take away the undue advantage which a trust or combine or monopoly possesses. But, generally speaking, outside of that, the laws of supply and demand govern. Let us see what the situation is in regard to the United States, a question raised by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). What is our position? Here we have a boundary line of 3,600 miles from east to west, with their products flowing over to us and ours flowing over to them. Can you fix the price of wheat in Canada without the price being fixed in the United States also? Does my hon. friend think that if you fixed the price of wheat at Winnipeg at $1.25 a bushel it would at once affect Chicago to the same extent? It would mean that the business of Canada would be done in Chicago.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is the hon. minister aware that a Bill has been introduced in the Congress of the United States providing for the fixing of minimum and maximum prices of all food products? There is no reason why this Government, under its War Measures Act, could not do that, and why Sir George Foster should not arrange about this question while he is in Washington.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I would like to give my hon. friend the advice which I think Sarey Gamp gave. She said: Do not proticipate. She meant, do not anticipate. My hon. friend has referred, as if he had a monopoly of the knowledge, to the fact that some legislation is being proposed in the United States to fix maximum and minimum prices. We read the newspapers on this side, just as my hon. friend does. The legislation, I believe, has been introduced. My hon. friend may be surprised to learn that one of the subjects being discussed at the conference at Washington by Sir George Foster, whom he criticises, is this very question.

Mr. MACDONALD: Then he is doing something, although you said he could not do anything.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MACDONALD: He asked me a question.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: With the exportable surplus of food products in this country to-day being bought practically by the British Commission, for Great Britain and the Allies, it is almost impossible, if not impossible, to deal with a situation on one side of the line unless it is dealt with also on the other side of the line.

Mr. CARVELL: That is coming pretty near to trucking and trading.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend seems to be sore on that point. He does not—

Mr. CARVELL: I admire the volte-face of my hon. friends on that subject.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must say that it does not make for decorum of debate when hon. members insist on interrupting from their seats. If they wish to ask questions, they should at least rise.

Mr. CARVELL: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: So that the question of the fixation of prices for food products in this country must depend to some extent at least, and I think to a considerable extent, upon common action being taken on both sides of the line. Upon the question whether that will be advisable or not, I pronounce no opinion, for this reason, that it is so full of difficulty; but I do know this, that it is one of the questions at present under consideration at Washington in a conference in which Canada is represented in the person of the Right Hon. Sir George Foster.

There is another matter. It is an extraordinary thing to have a debate on a subject like this taking place without hearing diatribes against the tariff. Strangely enough we have not heard anything from the other side about the tariff. The price of flour has been going up. But we took all the duty off flour, not only with regard to the United States. Flour comes into Canada free from all over the world. We made it free to Australia, free to Great Britain, free to any country in the world, as well as to the United States. And yet the price of flour has been going up.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This is politics.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No, it is not politics. I will tell you what was politics, the suggestion that this Government is blamable for the manipulation by speculators on the Chicago and the Winnipeg exchanges was politics; and if it was not politics, I will tell you what else it was not, it was not sense. I would like to make one more observation about the Winnipeg situation. The committee of the Winnipeg Exchange took steps a short time ago to prevent the speculation to which my hon friend refers; I tell him now that so far as Winnipeg is concerned, I have reason to believe that these price fluctuations are not due to manipulation in the sense he puts forward to-day. I will tell him to what they are due, because some of us go into these questions more deeply than the hon. member for Richmond. The principal buying in Winnipeg and even on the other side of the line is on behalf of the British Commission, and what I think is that the export buying of these contract grades has about exhausted the available amount, and the result is that others who have contracted for wheat are working on a much narrower margin than before. And I will tell my hon. friend another thing, that if we commandeered all the wheat in this country, most of the wheat we would commandeer in the West would be wheat that is owned by the British Government and bought by the British Government for the purposes of the people of Great Britain. That is the wheat he wants us to take away from them.

My hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte) does not realize, when he approaches a world question like this, that it cannot be dealt with so flippantly as to say: Why does not the Government reduce the price from $3 to $1.25? That is the unfair feature of charges brought by hon. gentlemen opposite against this Government, especially in a time like this. We all realize that this is a serious question, the question of the high price of flour, the high cost of living generally. We all realize that, but the world is out of joint. The world is upside down. And the unfairness of it is aggravated by the fact that, the country being at war, the public mind is under a great strain and speeches such as we have heard, unless the facts are presented at the same time, are apt to disturb the public mind and to create a most erroneous, a most unfair impression as to the Government and its powers over the price of commodities.

It was only for the purpose of clearing up the situation and indicating the conditions which underlie world prices, that I have risen to my feet. In a way, I am glad that it has come up, not only because we are able to meet the charges of the members for Richmond (Mr. Kyte), South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll) and Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Carvell) but also in order that this discussion may to some extent inform the people as to the conditions which have brought about these high prices, from which we all suffer, but over which even governments have comparatively limited powers of control.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) was more interested in making a defence of the Government against real and imaginary criticisms than he was to deal with the critical situation now confronting the people of Canada and, indeed, most of the countries of the world. I am sure that the House is grateful to the member for Richmond (Mr. G. W. Kyte) for having introduced by his resolution a subject which, as the Minister of Finance says, is exceedingly

grave. Hon. gentlemen in this House should be glad to avail themselves of the opportunity—indeed, should be glad that the hon. member for Richmond has presented the opportunity to them,—of discussing a problem which is serious, which is world-wide, and which will be a grave question for several years to come.

The Minister of Finance complains that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have interjected a political tinge into the debate. I deny that most emphatically. I heard the remarks of the hon. member for Richmond, the member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll) and the member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) and I am within the judgment of the House when I say that every fact presented by these hon. gentlemen was relevant to the resolution. Who interjected politics into this debate? Did not hon. gentlemen on the other side interject small politics, personalities and irrelevant issues into the discussion of a matter that is of paramount importance to the people whom we represent?

I agree with the Minister of Finance when he says that this is a very serious question and that we should discuss it in a serious way, in the hope that some light may be thrown upon the problem and that some advantage may accrue as a result of our deliberations. What I complain of respecting the Government and hon. gentlemen opposite is that while they admit the existence of the problem, they do not give evidence of any effort to procure a solution. The Minister of Labour read us a great array of figures which were known, in a general way, to every member of this House and to everybody in the country. The figures may be interesting, but only in an academic sense, whereas the cost of the necessaries of life is a practical question. The Minister of Labour produced figures showing that the world's production of wheat was much less than that of one or two year's ago. Well, that was a mathematical proof of one of the causes of the problem confronting the country. He ended his speech, however, without proffering any suggestion or telling us what his department was doing in the premises. In fact, he displayed no interest whatever in that question. He informed us that an officer of his department was sent to Montreal this afternoon. What has that to do with the question? Of what possible interest can the departure of that official from this city be to this House? It would be just as interesting had he informed us of his having dispatched that officer of his department on an aeroplane flight three or four miles above this city. This is the theatre of action for the Department of Labour; here is where the minister and his officers should work. The dispatch of his official to Montreal, while stated in very serious fashion by the minister, cannot but be regarded as a deliberate evasion of a serious question.

I should like to emphasize what the Minister of Finance said this afternoon, that a very serious problem confronts us. If the Government would sincerely view it in that aspect, they would endeavour to do something to meet the situation. It may be difficult to secure from people generally the interest which this subject justifies, because we are blinded by an artificial prosperity, and our perspective is out of focus. Nevertheless, the problem before us, while recognized as acute at the present time, is well known to be a problem which will stay with us for many years. As the Minister of Finance has properly remarked, the labour of 25,000,000 people has been transferred from productive spheres into war fields. That condition necessarily involves a dislocation of the economics of the world, and imposes serious responsibilities upon us charged with the administration of public affairs.

In some countries the seriousness of prevailing conditions is realized. In England the seriousness of the situation in Great Britain was recently impressed upon the public by Lord Davenport, who, I think, is Controller of Foodstuffs. They are even contemplating the destruction of dogs and the rationing of horses; the 24th day of this month is being set aside for the making of a nation-wide appeal against waste. These things all indicate serious thought on the part of the people in that country. So important do they regard the shortage of wheat and the high price of flour that they are seriously considering the abandonment of meatless days, which are causing a greater strain to be made upon the bread supply. Take the United States; are they not exhibiting a more intelligent and active interest in this question than we are, although, perhaps, there is less reason for their doing so than we of Canada? An investigation is now being conducted before the United States Trade Commission, assisted by the Department of Agriculture. Forty states of the American Union are represented in that convention. They recognize the seriousness of conditions

there; there has been a failure of the winter wheat crop.

There has also been a failure of the winter crop in Canada. The weather prevailing in the past few days is regarded as a very serious matter by wheat growers in this country, and if the unfavourable weather conditions of the past week continue, the result may be very serious. These unfavourable weather conditions seem to be recognized more keenly and acutely in all other parts of the world than they are in Canada. The question of the shortage of flour and the high price of bread is very serious; it is a more serious one for the industrial classes than for the well-to-do classes, who can substitute other foodstuffs for bread, but bread is the staple foodstuff of the industrial classes and it is necessary that they have sufficient bread to maintain industrial efficiency. The high price of foodstuffs affects the whole social and economic fabric of this and all countries. It aggravates social unrest; it intensifies the labour difficulties of the country. The Minister of Finance asks what can be done; he proclaims to us that the Government are willing to do anything if the way is pointed out to them. Many things might be done and should have been done long ago, aye, even years ago. Desperate diseases require desperate remedies. We all know, as does the Minister of Finance, the general conditions that in normal times affect the prices of all commodities. There are the causes of demand and supply, transportation, waste, extravagance, the cost of high living and other things. These are well known to the world. There is available to every one who chooses to read it a wealth of literature which will give him in all amplitude the general reasons and causes for high prices of foodstuffs in normal times. But we are not living in normal times, and in order to meet the conditions, measures, which in ordinary times might be considered quite radical, must be taken. That is the only way in which we can meet the situation with success. Everything that is uneconomical and unlawful should be prevented by law, and we should not hesitate to take action. Anything that tends to the withdrawal of products from the markets of the country is in some degree preventable. There is nothing wrong in our endeavouring to control by license or by some other method every one who is engaged in the manufacture, transportation, sales, storage or distribution of food. This cannot be done effectually by any one formula, but there is surely some remedy available to the Government if they chose to study the situation carefully and were fully seized of the seriousness of it, and if they really desired to ameliorate conditions. Under certain circumstances the Government would be fully justified by the people of this country in fixing prices; there would be no objection to the Government taking absolutely under their control the flour mills of this country. What possible objection could there be to that in all the circumstances prevailing to-day? Would there be any objection to the Government taking control in certain localities of our railway systems, so as to effect a more direct and effective control over transportation and rates? There is no limit to what the Government might not attempt to do if it were fully seized of the seriousness of conditions. I have followed very carefully what the Government have done during the past two or three years with respect to these matters, and I say emphatically, seriously and honestly that there has not come to my notice any single effort in this direction on their part, which I consider indicates a lively and intelligent interest therein. I do not think the Department of Agriculture has been alive to the situation in this country since the beginning of the war; it has carried on no propaganda throughout the Dominion in regard to the matter of production. We have had the Minister of Finance and a few other hon. members during Parliament intermittently stating: We want production and more production, but that does not mean anything; that does not produce results. We can produce results by propaganda, but it must be properly organized; it must be energetically and intelligently carried on, not spasmodically and in restricted localities, it must be nation-wide and carried on persistently, and systematically from one end of the country to the other. No man will say in this House that the efforts made by the Department of Labour in this connection have been intelligent or serious. I do not like to say of any public administrator that his work lacks sincerity, but one is compelled to use that expression in regard to the work of the Department of Labour in respect to this matter. The Minister of Finance gave to the House this afternoon the general and fundamental reasons for the high price of commodities, and in a general way he was correct. But why did he not tell that

to the Minister of Labour a year or more ago? Why did he go to the expense of appointing commissions which never investigate and which never will report—and it is just as well they do not report, as their reports at this late date would be absolutely useless, because conditions change so rapidly these days that one can hardly predicate upon existing facts an opinion to-day that would be worth anything to-morrow. The Department of Labour should be active—and the country expects it to be active—upon this question. The Minister of Finance complains that the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) charged the Government with stock manipulations in the wheat market. I deny that. I think that was rather an unjust, an incorrect imputation against the hon. member, and I certainly did not understand him to say that to-day.

Mr. KYTE: Had I known that the Minister of Finance had intimated that I made any such statement, I should have denied it on the spot. I did not understand him to impute that to me.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: What is the statement that the hon. member for Halifax has made? Let me answer it in anticipation by saying that if he gathered the impression that I said that the hon. member for Richmond had charged us with manipulations of the stock market, he is quite in error, but he did charge us with being responsible for permitting them to continue—which is a very different thing.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I accept the explanation of the Minister of Finance. Nevertheless, he did seek in some form or another to leave the impression on this House that for political purposes, and he emphasized "political purposes," the hon. member for Richmond in speaking to his resolution, connected the Administration with wheat market speculations. The Minister of Finance says it is unfair to charge the Government with the high prices prevailing to-day. That is a fair statement for him to make, and in a sense it was absolutely unnecessary for him to make it, for we do not think the Government are absolutely blamable for the high prices prevailing throughout Canada to-day. But we do say that in many cases the high prices are preventable, and might be modified. We do not ascribe to hon. gentlemen opposite divine powers. We recognize that their limitations are very, very great indeed; but great as they are, we say that if they would only display a more active interest in these matters, they could not help bringing about an improvement in the conditions which we are discussing and which bear so heavily on the great mass of our people to-day. It is true that there is prosperity in this Dominion, but it is largely an artificial prosperity, and there are thousands of people to-day in this country who are living either just on or below the poverty line. They are earning large wages, it is true, but the purchasing power of that wage is much below the purchasing power of their wage some few years ago, when it was considerably lower. We are not as prosperous as would appear on the surface, and the Government should not let themselves be lulled to sleep by the fact that wages are high. They should not fail to recognize that the question involved in the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Richmond this afternoon is a very serious one, and deserving of their most serious consideration and drastic action. If it should mean fixing minimum and maximum prices, let us have it. If it means the taking over of the flour mills of this country, let that be done. If it means a more direct and effective control of the transportation agencies in this country, I say let that be done. If it means the closing of the wheat exchanges of this country, let that be done, although to my mind that might be a very doubtful procedure.

I should also like to enquire why the Government was not in consultation long ago with the Government of the United States on this question. It is all very well for the Minister of Finance to say that at this moment the Minister of Trade and Commerce is in consultation with the British and French Commissions and with the Government of the United States. I venture to say that the Minister of Trade and Commerce would not be in the United States at all if he were not there on the invitation of the British Commission. Instead, he would be wasting his time, as he has been doing for the last two or three years on some abstract questions from which the people of this country can expect nothing in the way of results. If the United States and Canada could but act together they would exert a tremendous influence in settling this problem in some degree, not only on this continent, but throughout the whole world. Though the Minister of Trade and Commerce is at Washington, his time no doubt is taken up with many other questions. This problem alone is big enough for any one man, or for

many men, to study, and I think it should be taken up as a special and distinct question with the United States, and a joint commission be appointed by the two countries to study and deal with the whole problem.

I shall not detain the House any longer. I think hon. gentlemen should be grateful to the hon. member for Richmond for having introduced this subject. It is one, I think, we should have discussed in this House long before now. If it might appear that we upon this side of the House are discussing this matter in rather a censorious spirit we may be forgiven because we think that that is the only method by which we can urge this Government to action. We would like hon. gentlemen opposite to participate in this debate, giving friendly advice to the Government and exhorting them to the accomplishment of the results which hon. gentlemen opposite, I am sure, feel this country desires to see attained.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. A. B. McCOIG (West Kent): No resolution could be more timely or opportune than the one we are now discussing, for the high cost of living is the burning question now before the people. Of course, there are many to whom that question is comparatively unimportant, because their incomes are sufficient to enable them easily to provide for their wants, but to the average mechanic and labouring man it becomes a very serious and pressing problem, especially in view of the possibility of even the higher prices in the future. But I believe that this problem is one that the Government can deal with. The workers who are called upon to increase production are responding nobly. When at home at last week-end, I found that a number of men had taken up the question of cultivating garden plots in the city of Chatham. But one of these gentlemen, who, by the way, works at his regular occupation from seven in the morning until six at night, brought to my attention one serious handicap under which those engaged in these operations must work. If they send to the United States for seeds, as many of them do, believing that they can get a better class of seeds for their purpose, they have to pay specially high duties. On seeds in packages weighing over one pound each the preferential tariff is five per cent, and the general tariff ten per cent. But when the packages weigh less than one pound each, the duty from the United States is 25 per cent, with the addition of 7½ per cent war tax, making 32½ per cent altogether. Most of these people order less than one pound of any one kind of seed, and so they have to pay this higher duty. In order to be sure of the matter I took it up with the Commissioner of Customs, and he gave me these figures. These people naturally ask how it comes that, with everybody urging them to increase production, they should be put under this handicap when they seek to comply with the demand..

The high cost of foodstuffs is particularly the problem of the labouring man, and we hear it on every side from men of this class that the Government is not in sympathy with them. We hear it said that the Government is made up largely of millionaires who do not feel the pressure of the present high prices. It is said also that the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. Crothers) is a man not in sympathy with the workers. He may be a gentleman, so far as that is concerned, but he is a professional man, they say, and never did a day's work in his life, and knows nothing of the needs of the labouring man. I have heard that said by many labouring men. It is a point which any future Government in this country will be called upon to consider. Whoever may be at the head of that Government, it will be necessary to have a practical man as Minister of Labour, because the labouring men are going to have something to say about that matter. But we leave that to the electors for the time coming.

Many believe that the prices of foodstuffs are unduly raised through the action of cold storage concerns. When a fire took place in one of these establishments in Lindsay, it was shown that there were thousands of dozens of eggs stored there, as well as other foodstuffs. These were not put on the market, but were held for high prices and exorbitant profits. That is something that, it seems to me, the Government could regulate. Of course, no person will dispute the advantage of the cold storage system; but, on the other hand, nobody will say that that system should be made the means of holding foodstuffs back from the people for unduly high prices. It is a subject of general complaint that the prices of bacons and hams are exorbitant. But it will be remembered that while there was a large crop of producing hogs last year, there was

a great shortage of feed. The result was that the farmers had to take almost any prices they could get for stock which, if it were in existence now, would help to keep down prices. This is a case where the Minister of Agriculture was sleeping on his job. In the part of Ontario in which I live, this problem of shortage of feed for hogs was a very serious one, but the minister never once visited that section that he might find out how the people were placed. Government reports inform us that fifteen per cent of the grain crop of the West was practically unfit for market as grain. But, though we needed it so badly for feed, we could not get it, and so, as I have said, had to dispose of hogs at far less than their real value. And the same was true, to a large extent, of cattle. In the county of Kent dozens and hundreds of cattle were sold at low prices because the farmer could not get feed for them if he wished to hold them over. Had the Minister of Agriculture taken his duties seriously, and had he kept in touch with the wants of the producers, he could have taken steps which would have resulted in a vastly better situation for the consumer to-day. The Minister of Agriculture has not visited that part of the province of Ontario west of Toronto except on one occasion, and that was to address a political meeting. The Department of Agriculture should be largely non-political, and the head of it should keep in touch with the affairs of the country. But how can he do this unless he keeps going around among the people? Let me give one instance of how this shortage in feed worked out. One farmer in the township of Dover sold a part of his farm and gave the money to one son to move west, while the other son stayed on the home farm. The brother who remained at home wanted feed for his animals. The brother who had gone west had the material to spare. But when the westerner tried to ship the material there was an embargo that would prevent it coming east of Fort William. So the man in Kent county had to sell his stock at sacrifice prices. I believe that the Government should have seen to it that such an embargo was not placed on feed coming east of Fort William, considering how much it was in the interest of the country that that material should be transported to where it was so much needed. We are told that there was no rolling stock to be had, but I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that at the very time when we were told they could not get cars to bring in feed for the stock in Ontario, the automobile concerns were getting trains of cars in which to ship their output. Automobiles, a mere luxury, could be shipped, but necessaries could not.

The Minister of Finance has stated that we on this side are obstructive, that we are merely critical. I myself proposed that the duty on tractors should be removed, but that motion was voted down by the Government. The hon. minister cannot pretend that that would not have been an assistance to greater production in Canada.

We have the Provincial Government using them and we have enterprising farmers doing the same thing for the purpose of working more land and producing better crops. When we have a matter which is really vital, which is important, which is in the interest of greater production, and when we have a proposal of that kind made from this side of the House and every man on this side of the House votes for it, we have the Minister of Finance, who leads the Government, standing up and calling on every man at his side to vote it down. The same thing applies to the removal of the duty on seed beans with regard to which we expect an answer from the Minister of Finance in the near future. Petitions signed by nearly every member of the council of Kent, signed by the warden and leading farmers throughout the county, have been sent to the Minister of Finance. Every section of that part of the country is anxious for it. The farmers are stalled. The unfavourable condition of the weather at the present time means that whoever puts in a crop will have to put it in later in the season than usual and that it will have to be either beans or corn because it will be too late for the farmer to put in oats and barley. It will not be surprising if we find that the same fate meets the resolution embodying that request. Yet we have the statement of the minister to-day that we are not trying to give the Government assistance by suggesting something which might be practical and in the best interests of the country.

I am glad to be able to say a few words on behalf of the resolution which has been introduced by my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte) because I feel satisfied it is not any too soon that a resolution of this kind should be introduced or that some steps should be taken to assist the consumers if at all possible by the Government to at least get food supplies at prices

in keeping with the wages that labouring men are able to earn in the factory.

Mr. COCKSHUTT rose to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the hon. gentleman proceeds, I would remind the House that this motion is under Rule 39 and that the authorities are very explicit that the discussion on such a motion shall be confined strictly to the subject, which is introduced into the House without notice. While it is in the nature of a substantive motion and is subject to the rule governing such, the authorities are very clear that the rule should be applied with the utmost strictness and that argument should be confined closely to the question before the House, which in this instance is:

As to the necessity of taking action to prevent further undue advance in the prices of flour in Canada and to reduce the same to an amount representing the prices of wheat received by the farmer plus the cost of milling and distribution but eliminating the increase due to stock exchange manipulation.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): I am not quite sure, Mr. Speaker, whether the fact that I have risen in order to say a few words on this question is the occasion of your caution. I generally try to stick fairly closely to the text I undertake to speak upon, but I feel that it is a little unfortunate to be confined simply to the question of flour when every hon. gentleman who has spoken has covered a rather wide field. However, I have a very few remarks to make and I shall endeavour as far as possible to stick to the subject at issue. As far back as March 1, 1915, I introduced to this House the following resolution:

That, in the opinion of this House, the circumstances arising out of the present war are such as to justify the Government of Canada in exercising supreme control over the quantity and destiny of our food exports, thereby regulating the prices at which bread, meat and other food products shall be sold for home consumption, while at the same time directing that our surplus food exports should only reach British or friendly countries.

It is upwards of two years since I introduced that resolution, and in January last, in further discussing the subject during the present session, I again drew attention to this proposition of mine submitted as an humble member of this House, for the regulation of prices and the control of food products.

I think the resolution brought forward by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) is a very fitting one and coming as I do from a constituency composed of 25,000 city residents and 8,000 or 10,000 residents in the country, I have to sail fairly close to the wind in order to satisfy both interests and not to offend either. However, I feel it is my duty as a public man not to be afraid to express the opinoin which I hold and have held strongly for the past two years, which is that the country being at war cannot be expected to live up to the ordinary regulations which are sufficient in times of peace. In order that I may be fully understood, I do not think I can do better than to cite from Hansard what I said on the subject two sessions ago:

I said: The resolution standing in my name is one which I deem of great importance at the present time. It has no political significance, so far as I am concerned. It has appeared to me that for some months past it was the duty of those in charge of the Government of the country to keep a very good eye upon the food supply of the Dominion of Canada, and also to assist in every way possible the Mother Country in the tremendous struggle in which she is now engaged. I am aware that the principle contained in the resolution upsets to a certain extent what has been deemed proper economic law, that is, that the law of supply and demand regulates the prices of all commodities.

At the same time this war has upset a great many business axioms, has upset the calculations of many political economists and has brought to our attention the fact that a world-wide war is not dealt with by ordinary means nor controlled by ordinary circumstances. Supply and demand as a rule is a safe criterion for the fixing of prices of commodities. As far as I have been able to judge, Canada is the only country at present at war that has not given more or less consideration to this very important question. Very early in the war the Government of the sister Dominion of Australia, that great Commonwealth, which is also a large producer of food, took possession of all supplies of wheat and arbitrarily fixed the price at $1.25 per bushel. That was done in one of the leanest years that Australia has seen in a long time. Their wheat crop was comparatively a failure. The supplies for home consumption were away below the requirements of that great country. New Zealand is in very much the same position and has been obliged to appeal to Canada for its supplies.

It is only consistent on my part that I should now again advocate the principle of the motion which I placed on the Order Paper then. The 7,000 workmen of the city of Brantford look upon this as the leading question of all the questions that are before this House or the country at the present time. We are not asking this Government, nor are we asking this House, to do anything that has not been already done by every one of the warring countries ex-

cept Canada. We take up the paper to-night and in regard to the United States which has only been about a month in the war we read in the Evening Journal this despatch from New York:

United Press Despatch.

New York, May 3.—"Submarine destruction has been steadily increasing for six weeks. The situation is one of extreme gravity, make sure of that."

With this warning Herbert C. Hoover, who is to be America's food dictator, arrived to-day from Britain. He left immediately for Washington.

Declaring that deaths in the industrial districts of Belgium had been "multiplied by three" on account of submarine operations during March and April, Hoover said the U-boats were the one big menace which must be eliminated in order to win the war.

"The European food situation as well as the general food situation there requires every possible effort we can make," he said. "What Europe needs most is wheat and what it must have is wheat, but it must also have beef and pork products. As for Belgium, the relief system is struggling to its feet after having been practically knocked out by the submarines. Five of our ships have been lost since March 1."

This further statement from one of our agricultural authorities, Mr. W. J. Black, appears in the same paper:

All over Canada the situation is grave. The prospects are far from bright, and the people may as well know it now. The seeding has been lamentably delayed by the weather this spring, and in the western states even less land is ploughed than has been heretofore the case. In Saskatchewan alone there were 1,500,000 acres less land ploughed last fall than the year previous.

This was due to the fact that the harvest was taken off the fields so late there was not time to get the land ploughed before winter set in.

I think those quotations prove conclusively that we are at an acute crisis in the food situation. I have no political axe to grind and no particular desire to please either the farmer or the workingman beyond that desire which every citizen should have, to help humanity whereever he can help it. I speak on behalf of the workingmen of Canada, and especially of those who reside in my native city of Brantford, and I feel it is my duty to impress on the House the desirability of more control of food supplies. That applies not alone to flour but to all other food products. The day is near at hand when we must have a food dictator in Canada. I think we might with advantage have had one long ago. I do not mean by a food dictator a tyrant, a despot, or a czar, but one who would make kindly suggestions to the people, appeal to them in the way of humanity, and ask them if they are not willing in time of war to sacrifice a little. It is all very well for you, someone may say to me, living at a first-class hotel, to propound a proposition like this. I should be only too glad if the Government would tell the hotel keepers of this city and of all Canada that they must limit their menus to the barest fare, as they have done in Great Britain, in France and in practically all European countries. Why should we be served with twice as much on our plates as any reasonable man should eat? Often it would be much better for a man's stomach if he did not eat so much, but he must eat it all or waste it, and in my judgment the time for waste has passed. If this war continues, we shall need a food dictator or a man who will come to us with propositions with regard to flour, meat, potatoes and all those necessities of life, and tell us that we should not have more of them than is good for us, and should save all the food we can on behalf of those not so fortunately situated as we are. It may be said that the workingman has his increased wages. So he has. But I want to tell you, as one who represents a working class community, that the wages have not advanced in nearly the same proportion as have the prices of foods. That is in the knowledge of every man who gives the slightest thought to it. We know that food prices have increased enormously. Wheat, which was 80 cents to 90 cents before the war, is $3 to-day. Flour, which sold at about $3 to $3.50 per hundred weight, is now $6 or $7 per hundred pounds. And the increase does not apply to food only. Take coal, woollen goods, almost any textile goods and the same thing applies all through. And what has the workman got? He has got a very small wage increase over what he was obtaining before the war to pay for all these advances that have been placed upon the necessities of life.

May I make a few suggestions that I think, if followed up, would be of advantage. I have always appealed to the farmer in the same way as to the workingman. I am not saying anything here that I would not say before an audience of farmers or workingmen, and if I cannot be re-elected in my constituency I am quite willing to stay at home. I want to speak what I believe to be right and true and I declare that, in war times such as these, to say

that the law of supply and demand must continue to regulate the prices of all articles of commerce is to my mind to beg the question. I say that it wants something more drastic and these kid gloved methods that have been in vogue for so long will not do if this war continues. I say that with regard to recruiting as well as with regard to the food supply. We want to wake up and give a lead to the people of Canada, who, I believe are ready for a lead right now. They want somebody to suggest something practical that they can do to help the situation. They are anxious to have suggestions made as to ways in which they can assist, and if they can assist by cutting down the cost of living, I am sure that they will be ready to do so. Where is there a man who, knowing the suffering that exists to-day in Belgium, in Serbia, in Poland, in almost all the countries of Europe, where is there a man who is going to spend $3 or $4 on a high-class dinner, and leave two-thirds of it on his plate, when he knows that his brethren of almost all the civilized nations of the earth are dying day by day for the necessaries of life? We say here every day, give us this day our daily bread. How many of us are thinking of the other chap who is not getting his daily bread? How many of us are ready to surrender any of the things that we have been squandering on ourselves in war times? When I read that lecture I apply it to myself as well as to anyone else. I know that I have spent money that I should not have spent. I know that I have not given as much as I should. I have tried to give and to do, but I know that I have not done half of what I should, and I know that if every member in his heart will only examine his ability to sacrifice and to do for others he will find that he, too, could do more.

We have before us to-day a proposition with regard to flour, but it applies to almost every article of food that goes on the workingman's table, and I say we have to remember those who work behind the benches as well as those who till the soil. I am not here to speak on behalf of one or the other, but to say a word for the honest working men of Canada. According to the census of 1911 there were 900,000 workers besides those on the farm who were dependent upon their daily wages for their daily bread, and while you may say that the farmer's lot is the hardest, I have tried a little of the farmer's life and a little of the workingman's, not a great deal of either, and I declare that the workingmen of the Dominion of Canada to-day put as much honest labour on their daily task as any other class of the community, and that is not said with any disrespect to anybody. They have to work winter and summer, day in and day out, from seven in the morning until six at night, with one hour off, with a taskmaster often over them to see that they are on the job, and if they are two or five minutes late they are docked for it. That is the way the workingman of this country has to put in his time; he has a watch-clock on the job and has to be there on the moment and he must not knock off a moment before the time is up.

Now, what about these workingmen? Are they exercised about the prices of food? I think they are. I say they are very much exercised about the prices of food, and I believe that in the very near future this Government, or some other Government, must take in hand the prices of foodstuffs in the Dominion of Canada. I say that believing it to be true. It has been done in all other countries, and it can, and, I think, will have to be done here if this war continues. It is a practical necessity of the situation, absolutely. We have been living in a kind of fool's paradise here, it appears to me, for quite a while. We think we are in the war, but, barring the men we have sent across and the occasional thoughts we give to the casualty lists, I fear our efforts on behalf of the war are mighty small, our self-denial mighty little, and, I think, it is time that we all realized that the sufferings of humanity are our sufferings, and that we must bear our share of this white man's burden in the way a white man should.

These prices, which can be and ultimately must be controlled, can be controlled in ten minutes under the operation of some such resolution as I have proposed. There is no doubt about that; prices have been controlled in every other country in the world, and they can be controlled here. The United States, only a month at war, is talking of controlling prices immediately; why not Canada? Great Britain has done it, Australia, and India have done it, France has done it, Germany and Austria have done it. Belgium, Poland, and Serbia, unfortunately, have not any food to control, but every other war country that professes to have a Government at the head of affairs is controlling its food to-day and securing a fair distribution of it among the people. That is one of the duties of a Government; if necessary, we should even be put on rations. Owing to the high cost of living, I think that that is a practical suggestion.

Mr. MARCIL: What about controlling exports?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: That is exactly what we have here; it is plainly set forth in the resolution. I say that the control of exports will result in the control of the price of food, immediately and absolutely—and not only food, but manufactured articles as well, if you wish. I do not want to be left out of this; let nobody make a mistake about that. I am prepared to submit to the very same regulation that I ask every citizen in Canada to submit to. I do not propose any class legislation, but I say that the control of all food exports would provide that after a certain maximum price has been reached—fix it where you will, but fix it where it is fair and just—no more goods shall go out until the price goes down. That will fix it, and fix it quickly. We may beat about the bush; we may have investigations; we may curse the middleman and every one who deals in food and every individual citizen who is not our own self; we may say that the other fellow is responsible, but when it comes to the final analysis the responsibility lies at the door of every citizen. We all have to do our share; we all have to give; we all have to practise self-denial, if need be, in order that all may live.

The workingmen have suffered much on account of the high cost of living. I do not say that there is any acute suffering at present, but they have been obliged to deny themselves many things that they would like to have upon their tables and that we, perhaps, have upon our tables. Their wages cannot pay for these luxuries that others are, perhaps, provided with. You say that the farmer will cease to produce if you begin to limit his prices. I do not think that that will happen. I am sympathetic with the farmer. In my own county I have many farmer friends of a lifetime whom I esteem as highly as I do any class in the community. I know that they are rational; I know that they are human. I know that if a woman or child knocks at the door of a farm house in the county of Brant or any other county in the province of Ontario, the farmer or the farmer's wife will say: you shall not go hungry from this door. It is the instinct of humanity to help the suffering. If in ordinary times $1.50 or $2 is a fair price for wheat; if $1.50 or $2 is a fair price for a bag of potatoes, 35 or 40 cents a fair price for a pound of butter and 25 cents for a pound of cheese, it is no hardship on this or any other Government to say that owing to the exigencies of war, those prices should not be exceeded. Britain has a food dictator. He has not gone about with a big stick, but he has made suggestions with a view to the limitation of the cost of all the necessities of life. Every hotel and restaurant in the great cities of Great Britain have a menu beyond which they cannot go. They are obliged to serve so many ounces of bread, so many ounces of meat, so much potato, and so on, and their meals are confined to two or three courses, according to the necessities of the case. We are asked to deal with a question such as this. I hear an hon. gentleman say: "How would he reduce ploughs," if I am not mistaken. I am quite ready for my hon. friend to fix ploughs at his own price. The day has gone by when I can be held up with a threat about ploughs. I have explained in this House time and again that I have had absolutely nothing to do with the manufacture or control of ploughs for twenty years and if anybody in this House thinks that he can hold me up by shaking a big stick over me and talking about ploughs, I would like him to get up and try it. I have had that shot at me from both sides of the House and I tell you that it does not count with me worth a cent. I did not think that my hon. friend should have whispered that quite so loudly. The suggestion of ploughs is supposed to answer all arguments, and it has been made to me whenever I have attempted to say anything about the necessities of life. It has nothing to do with the question so far as I am discussing it, and, besides, I am propounding nothing now, as I have already said, that I am not prepared to submit to myself. I am trying to make valuable suggestions that will help to secure the control of food prices, and I am doing it in a serious way, because I think that is absolutely necessary.

It gives me a good deal of pain to have to dissent from my fellow-members. I would not do it unless a strong sense of duty led me to the conclusion that, representing a constituency such as I do, in a time of war such as this, as a citizen of Canada I should say what I think upon this great question. The time is near at hand, if this war continues, when some such suggestions as I have made will have to be put into operation. And if they are put into operation as I have suggested them, I guarantee that they will be effectual. What every other country has done

Canada can do. We want something of the heroism in our acts at home that will, even if only in a very feeble way, compare with the acts of our heroic sons across the water. If our heroism at home was half or quarter as great as that of our dear boys over the water, we would not have to speak as we do on this occasion. We should be ready to make sacrifices; we should be ready to deny ourselves in time of war. The ordinary influences of supply and demand are set aside by the unusual conditions. In the face of a world-wide war, millions of tons of food have gone to the bottom of the seas and we shall be months or years overtaking the loss that is being occasioned by the submarines. If in the face of these conditions we continue our wasteful methods, a sudden call of halt will come to us, the food supply will be gone and we will have only ourselves to blame, simply because we have thrown away the lavish gifts of nature that are scattered broadcast over the Dominion. I trust that the resolution that my hon. friend has introduced will be the means of causing the powers that be to think seriously about the regulation and control of all food prices and of all the necessities of our daily life, and particularly of the life of the workingman. That is a practical suggestion; it is one that will come in the near future; and in all kindness, but with full sincerity, I make these suggestions from one of the back benches, and I trust that my remarks will not be thrown away but that in the early future, we shall have, if not a dictator, some one who will come out with a lead and ask the people of Canada to live and let live, to sacrifice and to give, to help those who are in need, and to try to lighten the white man's burden, as represented by the workingmen of this country, for whom I say we cannot appeal too strongly. They are worthy of the utmost sacrifice on the part of every one of us, and we should endeavour to lighten their load which, I am sure, they find very onerous at the present time. Let the heroism shown by our boys at the front be shown in some measure by those of us who remain at home, and all these questions will be duly solved.

Mr. F. N. McCREA (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, I think the Government are, to a large extent, responsible for the high price of flour and the high cost of living in general. They are having a large amount of munition work done in this country and they are paying such prices to the manufacturers of munitions that the latter are making immense profits and are paying very high wages to their employees. I can understand that, at the start, it was necessary to pay extreme prices for munitions in order to get the business started, because the manufacturers were not equipped for making munitions and were unwilling to engage in a new business unless there was good remuneration in sight for them; but once the business was started and once the munition manufacturers throughout the country were clamouring for business, the Government should have adopted a little more business-like method and should have said to the manufacturers, when they wanted one or two million shells: Give us a bid; how many can you make, and at what price? Instead of doing that, the Government have fixed a price for munitions so high that the manufacturers have made huge profits and have been able to pay their employees—not all skilled labourers, but some of them men who were common day labourers—ten dollars, fifteen dollars and even more than that a day. The call to arms has come to every man in this country, the farmer as well as every one else, is supposed to send his sons to the front, and they have gone. Consequently, the farmer must have some one to cultivate his farm and I ask: Where is he to get the help to do his chores from five o'clock in the morning until nine o'clock at night at ordinary wages, if a man can make ten to fifteen dollars a day in a shell factory? Had the Government adopted more reasonable and intelligent methods of dealing with this matter, they would not to-day have to ask the munition manufacturers to cough up 75 per cent of their profits, because they would not have made those profits and it therefore would not be necessary to ask the manufacturers to give them back. Unfortunately, all of the labouring men of this country are not in the shell business. Employers engaged in ordinary lines of manufacture cannot afford to pay excessive wages to their employees, although they are probably paying wages from thirty to forty per cent higher than they were a year ago, and as the cost of living has increased more than thirty or forty per cent, the man who is working for the ordinary employer is up against a hard proposition to support his family, whereas the man who is employed on government work and is making five or six times the wages of his less fortunate brother is not to be pitied. It is the Government,

however, who are responsible for the high cost of living by having this Government work done at higher wages than the ordinary business man or farmer can afford to pay. It may be late in the day to remedy this matter, but it is said: "Better late than never." I understand the Minister of Finance made the statement this afternoon that the law of supply and demand was the governing factor. I wish he had thought so when he was dealing with the newsprint proposition. He did not appear to think of the law of supply and demand then because he fixed the price of newsprint at least at one per cent per pound less than it can be made for.

The high cost of living is going to be a serious problem for the man in the ordinary walk of life or working in the ordinary factories, and the farmer also is up against a very serious proposition. The farmer is asked to produce more. Most of his sons have gone to the front and he has to go into the labour market for help and he cannot get any. The Government ought to consider this question, even at this late hour, and see that the men working on Government orders are paid about the same wages as the men working in the ordinary factories. If the Government do so, they will be going a long way towards remedying the cost of living.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, the course that the debate has taken this afternoon and evening must satisfy the Government that this question is one of the greatest importance, and that it is not, as the Minister of Finance has stated, a matter of party politics. The Minister of Finance is usually fair, but I think to-day he was absolutely unfair to the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) who introduced this resolution, and to other members on this side of the House who spoke on it, when he characterized it as being largely political. I am sure nobody in the House will accuse the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) of making a political speech, and I think he has shown to the Government and to the House that it is not a matter of politics but a matter of absolute necessity that something should be done if conditions are going to continue at all reasonable in this Canada of ours. I congratulate the hon. member for Brantford on having foreseen this two years ago, long before any of us on this side of the House or on the other side of the House saw it in the same light. What is our position in this country? Canada is a food producing country, and to-day is overflowing with food. Why, then, should there be such high prices as are asked to-day? It is only a few days ago that the Minister of Agriculture told the House that we had a surplus of 1,500,000 bushels of potatoes over and above the food and seed requirements of this country. If that is the case, how comes it that the price of potatoes is $4 a bag? Who is to blame for it? My hon. friend the Minister of Finance says it is a question of supply and demand. I do not for one moment think it is the law of supply and demand that has raised prices up to their present level. I want to be absolutely fair; I do not want to blame the Government for more than they are responsible for, but it does seem to me that if the Government had used foresight or even common sense, we should not be in the position we are to-day. If it is the law of supply and demand that is forcing prices up, how is it that the price of wheat at Liverpool has not gone up $1 a bushel in the last few days? Liverpool, as we all know, sets the price of wheat for the world, but there has been no such advance there in the past few days. What I blame this Government for is that they have simply let matters drift until they have got into their present position. It is only a short time ago that wheat was at a reasonable price in this country. Within the last six weeks the Minister of Trade and Commerce had representatives of the farmers' organizations in the West come to Ottawa, and he wanted them to sell the whole western crop of No. 1 Northern delivered at Fort William at $1.20 a bushel.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who wanted to buy it?

Mr. TURRIFF: Sir George Foster.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all. You have been told that several times.

Mr. TURRIFF: He was acting, as the Minister of Finance has told us this afternoon, as agent for the Imperial Government.

Mr. LALOR: Did he try to buy the wheat, or simply submit the offer of the British Government to the farmers?

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend can put it any way he likes. The fact remains that the Minister of Trade and Commerce made that offer, and spoke in a very truculent manner when the farmers would not accept it. He said they had made a great

mistake and were very foolish to reject the offer. The price was $1.30 a bushel at Fort William, and that was only six weeks ago. The Minister of Finance told us this afternoon that one of the reasons for the high price of foodstuffs was that 25,000,000 men had been taken from their vocations and were now slaughtering each other. The Government knew that six weeks ago, and they also knew, as the Finance Minister told us this afternoon, that the consumption of foodstuffs in war time is greater than in times of peace. Knowing that, why did not the Government come forward with some plan like that suggested by my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), with the object of keeping the cost of living within reason, and enabling the working man to have a loaf of bread on his table for his wife and family at every meal? But the Government did nothing. The charge I make against them is that they have deliberately avoided doing anything. If my hon. friend the Minister of Finance wants anything done along this line, I urge him to do it himself. I would have some hope of results if he took this question up; I think he would do something, and I would suggest that he invite the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Labour to take a holiday and take over those two departments in addition to his own. I am satisfied that if he did that, something would be done.

What has my genial and smiling friend the Minister of Labour done? For two years he has been puttering around, but he has not reduced the cost of a single article that goes on the workingman's table by five cents since the war started. This afternoon he gave us a great dose of figures about Russia and other foreign countries, but does he think that will satisfy the stomachs of the people of Canada? Only this afternoon he sent a man from his department down to Montreal to find out the price of wheat and flour there.

As I said a moment ago, the Minister of Trade and Commerce tried to buy the crop of No. 1 Northern at $1.30 delivered at Fort William. What did the representatives of the farmers say to that offer?

9 p.m. They offered to dispose of the western wheat crop of 1917 in two different ways. They said, we will agree to a minimum price of $1.50 and a maximum price of $1.90, or, if you prefer, we will agree to a flat rate of $1.70, delivered at Fort William. That price was for No. 1 Northern; it would work out to $1.55 about for the whole crop delivered at Fort William, and that would mean about $1.35 to the farmer. That was a fair proposition to make to the Government and I should like to know why it was not accepted. The Minister of Finance had then all the information he has given the House this afternoon, so why did he not come to an agreement with the farmers? If the Government did not want to buy the wheat, why did they not do as the hon. member for Brantford has suggested, appoint a dictator to regulate the price of foodstuffs in this country? It has been left in the hands of the Minister of Labour, and he has done absolutely nothing. And as long as the present occupancy of that position continues, I have a good deal of confidence in telling the leader of the House (Sir Thomas White) that nothing will be done in this matter to help out the people. You have heard what my hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) said about what the ordinary workman outside of munition manufacturing is getting. I ask the members of the Government how they expect that any man earning $2 a day, or $2.50, or even $3, can feed a family of children? With flour at $13 a barrel, not only will they be denied the luxuries of life, but they will not get enough of its necessaries, and at times they will even have to go hungry. Go into the large cities to-day, and, I venture to say, you will find thousands of working people who do not know how they are to provide food for their families. And the members of the Government sit smiling here and doing absolutely nothing, except sending an official down to Montreal in a Pullman car to ask what is the price of flour and what is the price of wheat. I say that the Government is to blame, and I tell the Minister of Finance that, as the most prominent man in the Government, bar none, he is more to blame than any other. He should take this matter out of the hands of his colleagues who have had it in charge and who have done nothing. For this is a serious matter, Mr. Speaker. I hope the Minister of Finance—I think he was not in his place when I made this remark before—will not accuse us on this side of trying to play party politics with this question. He did make that accusation this afternoon, and then he himself went on to deliver a speech of the most partisan kind. I really thought that a general election was right upon us, so suddenly had he been converted

to looking after the interests of the farmer. Or I thought that, at the very least, he had decided to run for an agricultural constituency. But what we want him to do is not for the farmer, but for the consumer.

The hon. minister said that some gentlemen on this side of the House had dared to suggest that the farmers' wheat ought to be commandeered. I represent a constituency that is almost altogether a wheat-growing constituency, and I say that, when the farmers offered their wheat at $1.70 for No. 1 Northern, delivered at Fort William, if the Government thought it in the interests of the consumers of Canada they should have gone ahead and commandeered that wheat. If they decide to do so, they will hear no word against it from us. The farmers are willing to be fair, they offered to sell their wheat at a fair price. I believe that if the Minister of Finance had been in charge of that question, and not the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell), that he, being a good business head, would have seen the advantage of acting upon that offer, especially in view of the fact that, as he told us this afternoon, he had all the information as to the conditions that have led to the high price of flour.

I say the Government is to blame, very much to blame, for not having taken action. It has been pointed out a number of times in this debate that every country engaged in this war has taken action along the lines suggested by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). Why, then, cannot Canada do something? The Minister of Finance told us that we had 100,000,000 bushels of wheat in Canada. Now, the people of this Dominion could not eat, between now and the threshing of the next crop, more flour than would be produced from 25,000,000 bushels of wheat—not if they sat up nights to do it. So, according to the Minister of Finance, we have 75,000,000 bushels of wheat in Canada more than we want. Yet we have wheat jumping in price twenty or thirty cents a day. Caused by the demand in Britain? No, but caused by speculation. And the Government has sat idle all these weeks and has allowed things to drift into their present condition, and now they are afraid to do anything—except to send a man to Montreal to ask the price of flour and wheat.

Mr. LALOR: The Minister of Finance said that the wheat in warehouses in Canada was largely owned by the British Government. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) must have heard him say that.

Mr. TURRIFF: What about it?

Mr. LALOR: The hon. member says that we have 75,000,000 bushels of wheat above our requirements. But the Minister of Finance told us that that was largely owned by the British Government.

Mr. TURRIFF: I imagine that my hon. friend must have an option on a good bunch of wheat, by the way he talks.

Mr. LALOR: I may tell the hon. gentleman I do not own a bushel of Canadian wheat.

Mr. TURRIFF: Then, I congratulate the hon. gentleman on having sold out his option and pocketed his profits.

Mr. LALOR: Let me tell the hon. gentleman I have not, nor have I had, a bushel of Canadian wheat.

Mr. TURRIFF: Of course, I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. The Government reports show that, of the wheat in the West, twenty-one per cent is still in the farmers' hands. This means that 21,000,000 bushels of wheat at all events is not owned by the British Government. But even of that in warehouses, a good part is owned by millers, grain dealers and speculators. No doubt, the British Government owns a good share of wheat, too. Why could not the Government have appointed somebody to declare that the price of wheat should not be higher than a certain figure? The British Government and the French Government have taken similar action. All the governments that are at war have fixed the prices of food supplies. While we were paying 55 cents and 58 cents a pound for butter, the British Government refused to allow it to be sold at more than 50 cents a pound in that country.

What are the United States doing? They have introduced a resolution that munition manufacturers shall not be allowed to make more than 3½ per cent profit, and that the dealers in foodstuffs shall not be allowed to make more than 6 per cent profit. How does that compare with what has been going on in Canada, where they have been making, not 6 per cent, but in some cases close to 600 per cent on some of food products? Again, the Government have refused to take any measures whatsoever to protect the consumers or anybody in Canada, and they have allowed the speculators,

the manipulators and middlemen to so manipulate prices that the price of food is almost out of the reach of the average working man in Canada. The Government are to blame and are greatly to blame. It is time that they were waking up, and time that they were realizing the position that the country is in. It has been stated to-day, and I want to emphasize it, that we do not know exactly where we are in this war. With German submarines sinking vessels at the rate of fifty to sixty a week, as reported, and it is very probable we are not getting the worst of the reports, the condition is most serious. I add my voice to the voice of my hon. friend from Brantford, and I call on the Government to take action at once along the line of appointing some man in charge of the food of the Dominion and see that the price is not put out of reach. It is just as likely to-day that flour could be put up another $5 a barrel, as it was two weeks ago, that it would be put up to the price it is to-day. If it has gone up $5 in the last week or two, what is to hinder them from putting it up another $5? I would be afraid to contemplate the condition of the people of Canada with flour at $20 a barrel. In a country that has much more food than it can use, with flour at $14.50 a barrel, potatoes at $4 a bag, and lots of other things not quite in proportion, but also very high, surely the Government will realize their position at last and come forward and do something in the interest of the people of Canada. If they do not—and I want to say this as moderately as I know how—take some action the people will hold the Government responsible, and absolutely responsible, not for the total advance in the prices of foodstuffs, but for not taking any action to regulate prices. There is no question at all that the great big advance that has been made in the last few days is not due to supply and demand, but is nothing more or less than speculation and allowing these manipulators of food, for their own profit, to put prices away up in order that they may make millions. Every working man will have to pay his share of the millions of profits that are being made to-day out of the huge advances in the prices of wheat and flour and other foodstuffs throughout Canada.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, it is with some hesitation that I rise to offer a few remarks on this motion, for the reason that I have not been able to be present during this debate, and have only had the privilege of hearing the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Turriff) and the hon. member who preceded him (Mr. McCrea). However, I feel that I can with fair safety assume that the character of the discussion, at all events the character of the attack, has been throughout much of the same nature as that to which I have just listened from the hon. member for Assiniboia. If the level of the discussion prior to that had been such as would accord with the dignity of Parliament and the seriousness of this time, I could not believe that the hon. member for Assiniboia would allow himself to descend to the plane that he occupied for so long.

Now, we are asked, in the first place, to believe that there is "something" that should have been done. I have heard that word "something" so often, in these two speeches, and indeed during many years, as the peculiar name of what ought to be done, that I have begun to long to have that "something" defined. What is this miraculous, mysterious "something" that should have been done, or ought now to be done, or has not been done, and so on? The hon. member for Assiniboia says that we have lain back and done nothing. While dealers in food supplies have made millions, while other countries have done so much, and while things were in such an excellent condition the world over, all but here, it is said we have lain back and rested on our oars. We have all listened to very considerable in the way of general criticism of that sort, but we have heard very little in the way of comparison with other countries. About the last remark the hon. gentleman made was this, and it is a remark I have heard from him times without number: These middlemen, he says, and these people of a general character that he feels safe in attacking, are making millions piled upon millions, while in other countries they will not permit such thing at all. In good old England they never permit anything like that, he says, and they have a dictator to see that nothing of that kind takes place. What are the only figures available to compare all the millions that are being permitted to be made in this country and all the millions that are permitted to be made in other countries? Fortunately, we are in a position to make a comparison, that I do not claim is final, but that at all events is useful, on this very subject. We have now information as to the excess profits war tax, which I think has been very fully collected—collected with wonderful success for the first year, much beyond in amount the expectations of hon.

gentlemen on this side of the House, and far beyond the expressed expectations of hon. gentlemen on the other side. The collections for the first year of 25 per cent of the excess profits tax over 7 per cent on corporations in Canada gave $12,500,000, and are expected to reach $15,000,000 when all are in for the first year. For the second year it is expected that they will reach $20,000,000. Let us take that first year and compare it with the amounts got by Great Britain, and we will learn a lesson that will be very useful if we just let it sink down far enough. If 25 per cent of excess profits over 7 per cent amount to $15,000,000, the whole excess over 7 per cent will reach $60,000,000. That is for this country with a population of about 8,000,000. In Great Britain they collected for the same purpose 50 per cent of the profits in excess of what was for each business the average for three years prior to the war. Now our average for three years prior to the war would be over 7 per cent. However, our total profits over 7 per cent were approximately $60,000,000.

In Great Britain they took their 50 per cent of what was over and above a higher amount than 7 per cent—namely, the average profit for three pre-war years.

In this way they collected £139,800,000, so that their total profits (excess over the average for three years before the war), would be twice that sum, or about £280,000,000. This is roughly $1,400,000,000, or 24 times the excess profits in this country. Their population is approximately five times ours. So that, man for man, in that country they had in the first year of the war excess profits in Great Britain of nearly five times the excess profits in Canada.

Before I pass to another phase of the discussion I want to make clear once more to the House—I know it long ago was clear to the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) if he would do himself and the House the justice of stating it, instead of misstating it—the relations of the Government to the recent offer of the British Government to purchase the surplus export wheat of this country. The British Government have what they call a Wheat Commission, which deals through agents in this country and the United States with the necessary wheat purchases for themselves and their Allies. They are the purchasers for themselves and in the main their Allies the world over. It is they who want the wheat for this purpose, and not the Government of Canada. That Wheat Commission met the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) when he was over in London, and they made a proposition to purchase the surplus wheat of this country, as they had made similar propositions to purchase the surplus of Australia, New Zealand and the other overseas dominions. At that time the United States was not our ally, but was a neutral nation. They had already consummated their negotiations with the other dominions and they made their offer to purchase our wheat on such a footing, having regard to the ocean rates between the other dominions and Great Britain and us and Great Britain, they controlling that, to a large extent, as would make our wheat cost in Great Britain what the wheat purchased in the other dominions would cost there. However, after some discussion, Sir George Foster was able to show them that it would be fair to pay a little more for the Canadian wheat, and consequently he was able to get them to raise the offer a little; but it was their offer from the beginning, throughout and to the end. They advanced certain reasons to him why, in their judgment, keeping in mind the higher interests of this war and of this Empire and doing justice at the same time, as they felt, to the farmers of Canada, that offer should be accepted. Having arrived in Canada, Sir George Foster felt it his duty—and the Government felt he was only pursuing his duty—to lay the subject before such organized body in this country as best represented the producers. Consequently an invitation was sent to the Canadian Council of Agriculture to come to Ottawa and to discuss with the Minister of Trade and Commerce the offer that had so been made, and to ascertain whether or not they would recommend its acceptance on behalf of those whom they represented. That offer was made in that way, and the reasons adduced by the British Government through their wheat commission why in their judgment the offer should be accepted were passed on by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, as it was his duty to do, to the representatives of agriculture in Canada. They refused to give an opinion. They went back and consulted their associations in a body, and then refused the offer and made a counter proposal. The counter proposal was as stated by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), and it was at once communicated to the British Wheat Commission, who did not act upon it. Now those are very plain facts. I am not bringing them forward in order to erect the Government of Canada

into any great position of credit. We simply did a simple and a plain duty. But on such simple elementary facts, why does an hon. member stand in this House and seek to attack this Government alleging as he does, that we tried to persuade the farmers of Canada to sell at $1.30 and refused afterwards to pay $1.70 when, as a matter of fact, we as purchasers were never negotiating with the farmers of Canada at all? These men speaking for the producers of Canada refused the offer made by the British Wheat Commission and the British Wheat Commission has not acted upon their counter proposition. So if any attack is to be made in this House, it is to be made on the British Government and the British Wheat Commission. But I do not stand in this House and attack them, nor do I stand in this House and praise them. They know the situation better than we do and in the light as they saw it they refused, or have not so far accepted the offer. There the matter stands.

One who has listened to the hon. member for Assiniboia for eight years in this House as I have, who had listened to his diatribes against the Government for their animosity to the farming community, who had listened also to his pleas for the poor workingman to be allowed to buy his flour cheaper by the removal of duty, would not have thought that, two weeks after the duty on flour was removed, the hon. member would stand in this House and attack the Government for doing nothing to bring down the price of the breakfast of the workingman. He wants a dictator too. He wants a dictator to dictate not what the farmer should get for his wheat, but what the workingman is to pay for his flour. Could humbug go farther? I do not know whether he wants the same kind of a dictator as we heard proposed by an hon. gentleman behind me, a dictator who does not dictate. We were asked solemnly by an hon. gentleman behind me to appoint a dictator who would assume his duties and prosecute his duties by making "kindly suggestions" to the people of Canada. I want to say that we have just a little less than 7,000,000 of this kind of dictators already. We have "kindly suggestions" being made until we need an embargo on suggestions in this country. We welcome the man who will say specifically what can be done and help to do it. Suggestions, "kindly suggestions"—we have had them from the beginning of the war. Talk about giving a lead. There is not a man in this House who has not given a lead, if that is giving a lead. Most of us have spoken on platform after platform, gentlemen on the other side of the House as well as on this side; there is scarcely one who has not given that kind of a lead ever since the war began, asking that we exercise thrift, asking that we produce more, asking that we help the boys at the front and behave ourselves in Canada something in the way that they have behaved themselves on the battle fields of Flanders. That is what thousands are doing. There has been leadership in abundance of that kind. We do not want a czar, we do not want anything in the way of an imperator, according to the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). We want a dictator who will make something in the way of suggestions as to what may be done to keep down individual expenditure in Canada, and the waste of our food and our resources. Why, everybody knows what to do to keep down waste in this country—do not waste. Everybody in the country knows that already. It may be, and I am not going to say the time has not come or is not soon coming, when we will need to go further than make "kindly suggestions." It may be that the time will come when something will be done by way of compulsion. But if we are to have compulsion, let us call it by its proper name, and not endeavour to introduce it under all these dead phrases about doing "something," and all the rest of it. There is one step beyond the suggestion step, and that is compulsion, and if any one thinks we must have compulsion let him stand up like a man and say it, and not pursue these soft glove evasions all the time.

We have been listening to-night to much in the way of encomium of the United States. Well, I am not going to offer any criticism of the United States, of what they have done or of what they have failed to do, but I do not think the time has quite come for passing encomiums on a country, or deprecations of our own country by way of comparison, merely on the basis of the introduction of a Bill into the United States House of Representatives. We, too, have had a few Bills "introduced" into this House. We had a few "resolutions" last night. For example, we had one resolution not only introduced, but actually going through—or failing to go through—with the imprimatur on it of the Liberal party in Canada, which, if it had become law, would have taken out of the pockets of people who happened to have saved money

and had left it in the banks for five years, all the money that they had there, giving them not a dollar and no indemnity whatever in return. We have had all kinds of "resolutions" and "introductions," too. But it is time enough to pass encomiums and eulogies when the United States gets something done towards winning this war and towards prosecuting it the way we are prosecuting it. The other day a magazine in United States sent a message to Great Britain to Lord Northcliffe, perhaps the severest critic of British policy that has arisen since the war began, or that ever arose, and asked him if he had any suggestion to make to the United States as to how they could best address themselves to the duty of prosecuting the war. What was the suggestion that he sent? He said: "If you enter the war, you will find that waging a great war under democracy is a new and vast experiment" (If he had stood in this House of Commons and listened to this debate, he would surely have thought it was indeed a vast and perilous experiment. He said, further: "If you come in, I have one thing to say to you, and it is this: you can learn a great deal from the example of Canada." Those words are printed on the pages of Everybody's Magazine, where all the world can read them. Theodore Roosevelt wrote an article in a United States publication. He, perhaps, has been the severest critic of American policies since the war began. His name stands out in this country as unexcelled among his fellow-citizens. He said: "I am not an adherent of the principle of the voluntary system. But the voluntary system has achieved much, and Canada has shown to the world the utmost that can be done by the voluntary system." That is what the world's biggest men looking on Canada impartially from without thinks of what this country has achieved. Now if hon. gentlemen opposite want compulsion introduced in the military forces of this country or in the civil forces in the matter of food dictatorships and prices, let them say specifically that they will back up compulsion and they will gain their wishes at least much faster than they will by this infinite amount of aimless and pointless talk.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): Mr. Speaker, I always listen with interest to the very eloquent speeches of the Solicitor General. He has made a reputation for himself of steering away from the real subject at issue, and I can assure him that in the art of keeping away from the subject and of not touching the issue at all he never did himself better justice than he has done on this occasion. It is sad to watch the tactics of the generals of the Government and the dope which they deal out to their followers around them when a question of this kind is brought up. The first thing they do is to get their supporters good and mad against the Opposition so that they will take a plunge into anything and vote for the Government whatever the question may be. That dope has been meted out by the Solicitor General and it has been dosed all over the members on the other side by the great leader of doping, the Minister of Finance. Hon. gentlemen, I think, have been sufficiently doped and dosed by this time to accept almost anything that may be submitted to them. But the hon. generals of the Government on that side of the House must not forget that the electors of Canada, supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, the men who sent them here, are not partaking of this dope which the Solicitor General is spraying around. Sitting in their houses or going about their business, they have opportunity of deliberately considering the question from a proper point of view and outside the baneful influence of this dope that is being cast around.

I think that the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. G. W. Kyte) is entitled to much credit and commendation from both sides of the House for bringing before the House the very important matter that he drew to our attention this afternoon. If the discussion had been participated in only by members on this side of the House, it might be said that the subject was a partisan one and had in it no value or virtue besides that of partisanship. But we find the Minister of Finance, who is leading the Government, the Minister of Labour and the Solicitor General, and such able and eloquent men as the member for Brantford (Mr. W. F. Cockshutt) taking part in this discussion; therefore we feel that it must be a question of grave import and should be dealt with in that spirit.

I must apologize to the Solicitor General on behalf of some of us on this side who suggested that the Government might be doing something. The member for Assiniboia (Mr. J. G. Turriff) suggested that the Government might have taken steps to procure a large quantity of wheat at a certain price subject to their control in order to meet present necessities. The hon. Solicitor General said that the Government would

not do such a thing; he became indignant at the idea that the Government should be doing anything on behalf of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and who may not have an opportunity of speaking again. I must apologize to every member of the Government for supposing for one moment that they would do anything of a practical character.

We are told that so far as the subject matter of the resolution is concerned we in Canada are in a better position than the people of other parts of the world. The hon. member for Richmond, in speaking the other night, made it plain from reliable facts and figures that cannot be controverted that the cost of living in this country has gone up 44½ per cent, while in the Commonwealth of Australia—a sister dominion inhabited largely by the same class of people, having the same kind of industries, being more like Canada than any other part of the Empire—the cost of living has increased only 9½ per cent. Does the Solicitor General think that our country compares favourably with our sister colony in the matter of the cost of living? I submit that it does not. The cost of living has been kept down to an increase of only 9½ per cent in Australia by reason of governmental action, and there is no reason why the same governmental action should not take place in Canada and produce similar results.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman not realize that Australia is not surrounded by a country with ten times its population, and that there is no method of export save by the transports provided by the British Government, whereas we are 4,000 miles along the American border, and our prices are naturally controlled by theirs?

Mr. McKENZIE: The argument of the hon. gentleman would be cogent and to the point if it were found that we had not in abundance in this country the commodity with which we are dealing, and if by reason of the exportation of that article and by reason of the large demand for it elsewhere, it had gone out of the country, but we have the articles here in superabundance.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman say for example that we should put an embargo on wheat.

Mr. KYTE: The embargo is on now.

Mr. McKENZIE: I care not what the thing is called—embargo or protection or prohibition or injunction or whatever the hon. gentleman may call it—I say, we have a population to feed; we have responsibility to our country and to our people, and we should do whatever is necessary to feed them in the cheapest and best possible way. That is why I say all those prohibitions, or extraordinary remedies as we would call them in law, are necessary. Let the Government apply those extraordinary remedies. That is what we are discussing; that is what we want.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would the hon. member actually prevent wheat going out of Canada into the United States now?

Mr. McKENZIE: I would prevent flour or fish or potatoes going out of Canada if their going out was making the cost of living beyond the reach of the people of this country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is it beyond their reach?

Mr. McKENZIE: I would say so to-day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You would prevent wheat going out?

Mr. McKENZIE: I would prevent anything going out if that was raising the price to the point where our own people could not make a living.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Would the hon. member prevent wheat going out of Canada if our soldiers were starving in the trenches in France?

Mr. McKENZIE: There is no need of putting an extraordinary and absurd situation. If our soldiers in France were starving, we would divide our last bite with them. I would go on one meal a day and send the other two meals to the soldiers in France; I would do anything to help them; but the situation is not pressing nor present, and we should deal with facts and circumstances and situations as they are, and not take impossible ones that are not yet in sight and ask how we should deal with those things. This Government refuses to deal with conditions that are impelling, conditions that cry for remedy, conditions that are in the acutest possible stage. Therefore what is the good of asking me to tell what should be done in an extraordinary condition which has not yet arisen? We are trying to stir the Government up to take some steps in regard to the situation as it is, and then after we get them agoing, perhaps they will do something if such an extraordinary circumstance as the hon. gentleman has mentioned should arise.

I wish, for a moment, to refer to the manner in which the motion of my hon. friend from Richmond was received by the Government. I always sympathize with a man who keeps within his limits and who does not try to fly beyond the atmosphere and heights to which God and Nature intended him to soar. I, for that reason, sympathize with my good, congenial friend the Minister of Labour when he quietly and complacently accepts the situation, knows that he did nothing and smiles when he is told of it. I am sure that he must have enjoyed and quietly laughed to himself at the comedy that he has put on this afternoon. He told us about the heaps of wheat and straw, and particularly chaff that there were in Russia. It is a great consolation to the child down in the county of Cape Breton, where I come from, who may be crying for bread, to be told that there is abundance of it in Austria, Russia and other places. What I want to deal with, what the resolution deals with and what we want to stir this Government on, is the actual question that is now before Parliament. The Minister of Labour was honest enough to say that he did nothing at all except, forsooth, to send a man down to Montreal. That mission to Montreal has about the same effect as if one's house in the city of Ottawa were burning and the fire brigade arrived on the scene and they all stood back, and when a man would ask them: Why do you not put out the fire? they said, we have sent to Montreal for a bucket; when the bucket arrives from Montreal we will try to put out your fire. The one reason is just as effective as the other. Seven million people, we are told by the Solicitor General, are deeply interested in this question of the price of flour, and yet the only step the Government can take is to send a learned gentleman of my own profession to the city of Montreal to make slight inquiries as to whether the price of flour has gone up or down. I cannot for the life of me see what possible effect that will have. I was speaking about the way in which this proposition was received, and I was delighted to find the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) speaking on this question, not as a new one, because he has given us largely the same views that he presented to this House two years ago. He cannot be accused of being favourable, from a partisan standpoint, to any ideas we put forward on this side of the House. He has spoken more strongly than anyone on this side along the line of some action being taken by the Government. I think the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. W. H. Bennett) stated that this was all political buncombe. That is strong language, and I venture to say that he will not take the responsibility of telling the hon. member for Brantford that he, as a good, strong, straightforward party man, always a party man, came into this House this evening for the purpose of embarrassing this Government and talking political buncombe. Therefore, I think we must all reach the conclusion that the language used by the hon. member for East Simcoe was ill-advised and ill-considered, and that when in the quiet of his chamber he will think over it and think of the great question that is at stake, he will revise his opinion, and that if he had to speak again he would not use that very strong language. He was, however, to some extent, justified in his attitude by the speech of the Minister of Finance, who was very irritable. I was just thinking to myself what was the most distressing circumstance that I could put him in from a physical standpoint, that would put him in the irritable position he was in, and I was thinking that if I could get a lobster dragging a Scotch thistle down his spine that would be about the sensation that would put him in the nasty position he was in. It would be well for a man in the high sphere that the minister is in not to appear as if the lobster and the Scotch thistle were going down his back when he deals with questions of this kind. When men take high and responsible positions they must know that with the position goes the responsibility of receiving criticism and sometimes criticism that will not be just. The hon. member for Richmond approached this question this afternoon in a most reasonable and rational frame of mind, and there was no justification for getting into this apparent fury into which the Minister of Finance worked himself unless it was for the sole and only purpose of spraying around this dope in order to get his men behind him into that frame of mind where their party spirit would be up and they would be determined to vote for him, regardless of every other consideration, because he represented the Government. I could understand the Government's reception of this subject to-day if it was a new question, but it is not a new thing for a Government to deal with matters of private concern in this country. It is not a new thing, for instance, for this Parliament to establish a railway commission, whose duty it is to deal with private business, to

regulate prices, not the price of food, but prices of commodities in this country are nevertheless regulated to some degree by the rulings of that commission. I venture to say that every province in this Dominion has its utilities board. In the province of Nova Scotia we have one, and I think there is also one in New Brunswick, and I am pretty sure there is one in Ontario, and in the other provinces of the Dominion. There are some cities and towns in this Dominion that do not own their own water supply; in some cases it is owned by corporations, and if the water supply is not properly furnished or if too much is being charged for it, the utilities commission of the province has the right to regulate the supply and control the price of the water. In like manner the price of lighting, telephones, and other public utilities are subject by legislation to the control of independent men appointed by the Government. The principle is therefore admitted. This Government not only admits the principle, but they have acted upon it in regulating the price of news print. Having acted upon the principle, having thus put themselves in the position of dealing with cases of this kind because too high prices are said to be charged, why do they not deal with flour or wheat or any other commodity just as readily as they deal with the raw material that goes into the making of a newspaper? I submit that a newspaper, while an excellent thing to have, is a luxury to a great many people, and we can do without luxuries. We can do without newspapers, although perhaps life may be very dull without them, but it is much more important that a workingman should be able to buy butter, bread and cheese for his wife and family than that he should open up the newspaper to them. The Minister acted quite properly, I presume, in helping out the newspaper people, but he gets into a passion and says that we are unrighteously and unfairly attacking the citadel of the Government when we suggest to him that the price of flour and other foodstuffs in the country should be brought down to that level where the purchasing power of the poor man could buy them. The principle, therefore, has been adopted in local politics, and has been acted upon by this Government. For that reason the Government have no ground for looking upon this as a new thing, or for taking umbrage at myself or the hon. member for Richmond or any other member who has spoken in support of the idea presented in this motion.

The Minister of Finance pointed out to us this afternoon that we have 100,000,000 bushels of wheat in this country. If there is any country in the world where flour should be cheap, that country is Canada. Canada, the United States, the Argentine Republic and other countries producing wheat in large quantities—these are the countries in which flour should be cheap. I cannot conceive of any good reason why the Government will permit the price of flour to soar beyond what is reasonable. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) told us that a fair price to the farmer, and one that he was willing to accept, was $1.70 a bushel. This is a fair basis to start with, and if the Government can secure to the people of Canada wheat at $1.70 a bushel, what justification is there for them allowing it to go up to something like $3 a bushel as it is now. I submit to the minister and to the Government that if it is true that flour is selling in the neighbourhood of $13 a barrel here, the miner at Glace Bay or Sydney will be paying at least $16 a barrel. My hon. friend from South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll) says it was selling down there at $15 a barrel last week. Since then the price has gone up $1.20 a barrel, so the miner down there must be paying $16 or more. I should like to point out to the minister that a miner with a family of seven or eight children would consume about two barrels of flour a month. A barrel of flour does not last in a house of that size more than two weeks, perhaps not that long. I venture to say that the earnings of the miner are not more than $48 or $50 a month. When you take $32 out of that for two barrels of flour, it leaves him only $16 to pay his rent and buy coal, groceries, clothing and so forth for his family. With flour at this price he cannot live at all, and the hon. member for Richmond and all of us come here and plead in the only place where we can seek for a remedy for this condition. The Government might well find fault if we had any other way open to us of trying to cut down the price. They might well say then, "Leave us alone, we are running the war; go somewhere else for a remedy." But we have no other place to go, and that being so, we are justified in coming here to the only power that can deal with questions of this kind.

10 p.m.

According to the Minister of Finance we have 100,000,000 bushels of wheat in this country. That means 22,222,222 barrels of flour, allowing, as the minister said, four and one-half bushels of wheat to the bar-

rel. I presume we have in this country about 100,000,000 barrels of flour, besides the wheat that is not ground. That is an enormous quantity of flour, more than we could expect to consume in this country for some time. But supposing we had nothing in the shape of ground flour in this country to-day, this 100,000,000 bushels of wheat that the Finance Minister speaks of would mean three and one-quarter barrels of flour to every man, woman and child in this country, and we are told we must pay something like $16 a barrel for every barrel of this flour. Surely there is no necessity for one moment for us to pay such an exhorbitant price, and we come to the Minister of Finance and ask him to take this matter in hand. These speculators occupy the front seats in the commercial synagogues and temples of this country. I submit to the minister that they pollute and contaminate the blessed streams of fair and righteous merchandising, and we are now asking the Minister of Finance, the Zaccheus of the Government, to take the knotted cords in his strong right arm and drive from the temples and synagogues, as was done of old, these men who are polluting the temple and contaminating the trade of this country. He may not have any precedent in his Government for this, but if he will look to sacred history he will find the One of old took the cords and drove those rascals out of the temple that were trying to rob and destroy the people and contaminate the trade of the country. We appeal to the Minister of Finance now to do the same thing to those men who are polluting our trade, and I am sure he will have the people of Canada behind him.

Of course, it may be a new departure for the Government to do something; but I would remind the hon. minister that before they came into office the people were accustomed to a Government that did things and saw to it that the people were protected. And if those now in power wish to gain the confidence of the people in the same degree that their predecessors did, they must come down, as Zaccheus of old came down from the tree, and do something to remedy public grievances. This subject is one of such vast importance to the people that I, representing here, as I do, a large body of working men, even though I could not bring anything new to the discussion I deemed it my duty to make myself heard in support of this motion. It has been said that we are attacking the farmers, and we are told that this is the day of the farmer. We are not attacking anybody, and I submit that this is not anybody's day to make undue profits. The dire distress of the country in this awful war is not anybody's opportunity to make undue profit or charge exorbitant prices. Every one of us owes a great deal to his profession or line in life, but none of us must take advantage of present circumstances to profit unduly by what we produce. The lawyer, or the doctor, has no business to charge more because there is a war, and the farmer owes a duty to the public to which he looks for the purchase of his goods. No man should take advantage of the fact that the war is on to demand prices that he could not possibly get at other times.

I trust the Minister of Finance and his colleagues will consider this matter carefully, and above all that they will disabuse their minds of the idea that there is any politics in the motion under discussion. Speaking for myself, nothing could be further from my mind. Nor do I see how political capital could be made out of this matter. It is our simple duty to the people to make Canada a good country to live in; and if prices of foodstuffs are soaring, making it impossible for men with small wages to enjoy reasonable conditions of life, it is the duty of this Government to try to remedy that evil, and it is my duty as a member of the House to point out what seems to me the way in which the Government can be of service to the people.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): The times in which we are living are such as we have never before experienced. The liberty of the nation and of the individual is at stake. We are asked by the resolution now before the House to adopt very radical measures indeed with regard to one of the staple articles of food, and we have heard a good deal of criticism from hon. gentlemen opposite of the lack of action on the part of the Government with regard to this and other questions. I know that the tendency under ordinary conditions is to seek to make as much political capital as possible out of any question that comes up in Parliament. But at such a time as this I believe anything of that nature should be foreign to our minds, but that we should look on these questions honestly, and wholly in the interest of the country and of the cause for which we are contending. The slogan for the last few months has been "greater production." We have heard from practically every urban centre in Ontario, and we might almost say throughout

the whole Dominion—men and women, everybody, urging upon the farmers the need of greater production in view of the danger confronting the people of the whole world. I believe it is wise that this should be done. The danger thus far is only one that is apprehended, but it may become a very real danger indeed. But I do not believe that the present situation has come about altogether as a result of this war. I believe we were leading up to this condition for a number of years before the war. There was an exodus from the rural districts to the urban centres for many years prior to 1914. I have viewed that movement with a good deal of concern, and have satisfied myself—and have so expressed myself on many occasions within the last fifteen years —that the time would come when the folly of the course pursued would become apparent to the people. It is unfortunate that a critical period should intervene at a time when we are called upon to put forth every exertion in the struggle in which we are engaged. I view with a good deal of concern the statement in the press that flour advanced by $1.20 a barrel yesterday. The statement has been made by a number of hon. gentlemen opposite that we should commandeer the wheat in the hands of present owners. The Minister of Finance has told us that a good deal of that wheat is owned by the Government of Great Britain, and is to be made available for the men who are contending in the struggle at the front. We also know that if you wish to promote production of food you must not hamper, but must encourage those who are engaged in that work. The argument has been advanced by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) that the British Government, having made an offer of $1.30 a bushel for wheat, we should have appointed a dictator and should have purchased wheat at the same price. He suggested the price fixed by the Farmers' Association of Western Canada. I do not know that there is any other profession under the sun that is more of a gamble than farming. The farmer of Western Canada have no certainty as to what the result of his harvest is going to be. Seeding has just started now in a great deal of Canada and as to what the result will be nobody can tell. It may be that a great injustice would have been done to many farmers in Canada if the price of wheat had been fixed at even $1.70 a bushel because such a price is of very little use to the farmer if he has little to sell. It is the same in many of the older sections of Canada. You find that people are continuously referring to the enormous profits that the farmers are making I know tenant farmers who have the greatest struggle of their lives to make both ends meet. High prices are absolutely useless to the farmer if he has nothing to sell and he has much to purchase. That is the very condition that is confronting a great many people to-day. To commandeer the wheat crop of Canada is a very serious matter but it has been glibly suggested by a number of speakers that it should be done with regard to wheat and a great many other commodities as well. Potatoes have been referred to as another commodity which the Government should take control of. It is a remarkable thing that this scarcity of certain products has practically taken place in almost all parts of the world at the same time. It is something unique in the experience of the world that a shortage such as we experienced last year in the potato crop should have been so general in other countries. The same thing applies to wheat. With a thousand million bushels of wheat short last year, is it any wonder that the price of wheat has risen? Yet some hon. gentleman opposite say that the law of supply and demand should have nothing to do with this. Why should it not have anything to do with it? What other law should apply but the law of supply and demand? I believe that is the law that is regulating prices to-day. I believe the prices that are being fixed in the great markets of the world are a result of this condition. I wish that the law of supply and demand was the only law in fixing all prices. One of the reasons given for the high cost of living has been the large wages paid to the workmen engaged in the manufacture of munitions. I do not think that has had so much to do with it as some other things. This is a condition that has not arisen since the war but it is one up to which we have been gradually approaching for many years past. In Ontario, during the last twenty years, 125,000 people who were producers have moved to the towns and cities or to some of the other provinces. If this condition is general throughout the country what else could you expect but a food shortage? That is the very thing that we are confronted with to-day and the fixing of prices is not going to increase the quantity of foodstuffs but production will be increased only by the people who will get out and work on the land. Then, let the law of supply and demand govern. We have reached a stage to-day

where agriculture is coming into its own. its own.

We have a country extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, almost 4,000 miles, in extent one of the grandest stretches of agricultural land in the world, and instead of finding about fifty per cent of the people living in cities and towns, we should find a larger proportion out cultivating these broad acres and endeavouring to do something to meet the conditions with which we are confronted to-day. It is all very well to get up here, on the very next day after this unusual increase in the cost of wheat and flour, and advance the arguments that have been advanced. It would have been much better if we had realized that we have been approaching these conditions for a number of years past. I believe one of the chief reasons for the condition that confronts us to-day is the organization that has taken place in almost all other classes except those engaged in agriculture. The labour unions, we know, have organized themselves and the pay of the wage earner has been increased. I do not say it has been unduly increased but it has been increased to such an extent that the farmer has been unable to pay the price being paid by the manufacturers; consequently the labourers have drifted into the towns and cities and that is one of the things that has brought about the present scarcity. But it does not apply to Canada only. It is general throughout the whole world. In the United States, in the early days of the war, it was necessary to pass a war tax. Conditions became as acute there as in Canada. The removal of the duty on wheat and flour by the Government a few days ago, I believe, was a wise measure. It was something I was opposed to in years gone by but under the abnormal conditions with which we are now faced I think it was a wise measure on the part of the Government. I could not help thinking, as I listened to the hon. member for Assiniboia and other members opposite who have been condemning the Government to-night, what an outcry they would have raised if the Government had not taken the action they did in regard to this question.

I do not intend to say anything more in regard to that but I do feel that we must not lose sight of the fact that the people who have been endeavouring to keep the flag flying on the farms of Canada are entitled to some consideration at this time and that the future welfare of the country is bound up in these men who have been working long hours, who have been struggling under a mighty and heavy handicap in order to keep themselves going. We have practically reached the breaking point but I do not think for one moment that it is possible for the Government nor should we expect them to rescue us from the results of our own action. It will take time and the men of this country and other countries must realize that they have to till the soil in order to get food products. You cannot live on manufactured articles but you must live as a result of the fruits of the soil. No one regrets the suffering, which undoubtedly is in existence to-day in many places as a result of the high cost of living, more than the farmers of this country. I say further that the farmers have done their best. There is no class of people in Canada, the United States, or, I believe, any other country, that have laboured more diligently and with less reward for their services than have those who have been and are engaged in agriculture.

Mr. GEORGE W. KYTE (Richmond, N.S.): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the very interesting debate we have had this afternoon justifies me for making the motion which I presented at the opening this afternoon. While we have not received any assurance from the Finance Minister, who spoke more particularly on behalf of the Government, that the very fair and reasonable request which I made will be taken seriously into his consideration, we have the satisfaction of knowing that the Liberal opposition does not stand alone in the desire to improve the conditions as outlined by me in this motion. We had a very interesting and illuminating address from the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) this afternoon, and his address ought to be a complete and effective reply to the allegation made by the Finance Minister that we on this side are actuated by motives of partisanship in the resolution which is now before the House, and which has been debated. The Finance Minister endeavoured to argue that it would be quite impossible for the Government to take any such action as suggested by me, and that in face of the fact that similar action was taken on a very important commodity to which I referred in my opening observations. I have a little more fully looked into that question since I addressed the House this afternoon, and I desire to communicate that information to the House. The proposal to fix the price of news print that was made to the Min-

ister of Finance some weeks ago was accepted by him as a fair and reasonable proposition. What did he do? Officers of his department were sent to the manufacturers of pulp, and these officers proposed to the paper manufacturers that they must dispose of their paper at a price $10 in excess of that which they received a year ago. That price was not acceptable to the manufacturers of paper, and a subsequent offer was made by the officials of the Finance Department, which was to the effect that the manufacturers of paper must accept the sum of $2.50 per hundred pounds, or $50 a ton, for 20 per cent of the produce of their mills, which was estimated to be the quantity required for consumption in Canada. As to the balance of that production, they were free to sell it in whatever market they could and at whatever price they could obtain. With regard to the question of the price of flour and wheat referred to in my resolution, my proposition is solely that we eliminate the influence of the stock speculators in increasing the price of these commodities to the consumer. The total consumption of wheat in Canada for many years has been about 50,000,000 bushels. It was pointed out by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) that the total population of Canada could not consume more than 25,000,000 bushels before the next crop is harvested and garnered. It is not then a matter of commandeering the whole wheat product of this country, because we have in Canada, according to the statement of the Minister of Finance, 100,000,000 bushels of wheat. It resolves itself down to a question to be disposed of in a manner similar to the manner in which the Finance Minister disposed of the question of news print at the request of the newspaper publishers.

The Solicitor General asked many times: What is it that the members of the Opposition ask the Government to do? He reiterated time and again that the doing something was entirely too indefinite, and that it was up to the Opposition to make some concrete suggestion as to what ought to be done under the circumstances. He was not present during the debate when other hon. members on this side of the House addressed themselves to the subject, and so had no opportunity of knowing what suggestions came from this side of the House. For his benefit I would repeat once more what my suggestion has been. It is to take over all the wheat outside of that which is in the actual possession of the farmers at present—and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) is willing that even the wheat at present in possession of farmers should be taken over—that that wheat be controlled by the Government; that the Government should go to the millers and ask them to mill that wheat at a reasonable price and distribute it to the consumers in Canada. If the millers should be unwilling to do that, the Government should then take control of the mills, should themselves mill the wheat at a reasonable compensation to the millers, and distribute it to the consumers. That is a concrete proposition, and I think the suggestion of the Solicitor General that we have not offered any proposal looking towards the solution of the difficulty is not justified in the light of speeches from this side of the House. The Solicitor General, while sidestepping the real question under consideration, went into some figures to show that Great Britain obtained a very much larger amount of money out of its war taxes, relatively, than did the Dominion of Canada. I do not know why the Solicitor General offered that argument to the House except to show that the manufacturers in Great Britain were making very much larger profits, relatively, than the manufacturers in Canada. Of course, the Solicitor General did not point out to the House that the basis of taxation in England differs vastly from that which is applied in Canada at the present time. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, a few days ago, brought down his Budget proposals, which include taxation of war profits up to 80 per cent. The total taxation to be exacted by the Finance Minister in Canada under the new war taxes does not amount to more than 30 per cent at the very outside, so that if a larger proportion of taxation is derived from the taxation of war profits in England than in Canada it is due to the larger proportion which is exacted by the Government, and not to larger profits by the manufacturers.

Mr. LALOR: Is it not a fact that the British Government took over a certain percentage of the excess profits over and above the average profits for a certain number of years?

Mr. KYTE: The statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer two days ago was that they were taking 80 per cent of the total profits for the present year.

Mr. LALOR: I think the hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. The British Govern-

ment, according to the new regulation, takes 80 per cent of the excess profits over and above the average profits of a number of years.

Mr. KYTE: That is true, 80 per cent of the total profits over and above a reasonable interest upon their investment.

Mr. LALOR: No, that is not it at all, over and above the average profits they were making for a number of years.

Mr. KYTE: But not including the profits since the war broke out—over and above the average profits for a number of years previous to the outbreak of the war.

Mr. LALOR: That is absolutely correct.

Mr. KYTE: The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) would like to convey the impression that it was 80 per cent over the average profits for the last three years, which is not the case.

Mr. LALOR: I do not think the hon. gentleman wants to be unfair. I did not want to lead anyone to suppose that it was the average profits for the last three years; it was the average profits for the three years previous to the war, and over and above that a percentage was taken.

Mr. KYTE: That was my understanding, so that there is no difference of opinion between us. Now, with regard to the conditions existing in Australia. The Government of Australia exacts 50 per cent of the profits upon all manufactures during the first year and 75 per cent during the second year.

The case made out by members representing the Opposition in the House this afternoon is absolutely unanswerable. The reply of the Finance Minister is to the effect that nothing can be done; that a disruption of trade would result if any action were taken. At the same time he intimated that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is in Washington for the purpose of looking into this question. He further intimated that it would be impossible for us to do anything here unless some action were taken in the United States. I read in the New York Herald to-day a statement made by Mr. John Dillon, trade expert before the Senate Committee now considering the legislation proposed to fix the price of food products in the United States. Mr. Dillon said:

> I think it is a crime that men should have produced such a large volume of wheat last year and then the speculators should have obtained such high prices. The Government should take away their stocks of foods. If I knew to-day the speculators bought wheat at $1 and were selling it at $3 I would not hesitate to recommend the Government to take over the wheat and adjudicate prices.

That is just what we desire this Government to do at the present time. In the New York Times of May 2, I find the following:

> Wholesale grocers and food dealers who submitted bids on the big navy orders of April 19 have received notice from the Navy Department that they are to fill them at once at prices to be fixed later by the President of the United States. The notice was received while the dealers were anxiously awaiting news as to whether the department had accepted their bids, based on the prevailing high market prices. The action of the Navy Department was taken under a provision of the Naval Appropriation Bill adopted last March, giving the President the power to purchase war supplies "at reasonable prices." This is the form of the notice received by New York firms:
>
> In accordance with the authority conferred on the President by the Act of Congress March 5, 1917, I am directed to place with you the attached order. You will deliver the goods specified therein as directed, and the price to be paid therefor will be determined by the President in due course.
>
> Any representations you desire to make as to the price you claim for these goods should be submitted to this office with your bill on delivery. The attached order is based on proposals submitted by you to this office on April 19. Please acknowledge the receipt and acceptance of this order under the conditions of the same.
>
> C. T. Williams,
> Paymaster United States Navy.

Mr. MORPHY: May I ask the hon. gentleman to repeat the items that he mentioned?

Mr. KYTE: Perhaps it is further on. (Reading):

> This is the first time local jobbers have ever been called upon to deliver goods to the Government without knowing what prices were to be paid. The general opinion was that the Government had adopted the system for the purpose of making sure that it got the goods and at the same time preventing the advance in market prices, which was made about the time the Government asked for bids on the navy orders. One jobber ventured the opinion that in the future dealers might be rather slow to submit to the Government estimates of what they could furnish if they got a certain price, to be used as a basis for virtual commandeering of supplies, but the general sentiment was willingness to trust the President to see that prices were fair.

Mr. MORPHY: The hon. gentleman read them in the first part of the quotation.

Mr. KYTE: Yes; I assume that "wholesale grocers and food dealers' would cover such products as wheat and flour. Hon. gentlemen will observe, therefore, that

practical action was taken by the Government of the United States a few weeks after they declared war. Canada has been a belligerent country for three years, and up to the present time no effective action in that direction has been taken by the Government. The arraignment of the Government on account of this dilatoriness and want of activity which was presented to the House by the hon. member for Brantford this evening was well deserved and absolutely justified. The Government having heard this discussion and having received intimation from one of its followers that he is dissatisfied with their lack of action in regard to this matter, I do trust that the consumers of Canada may reasonably hope that something will be done in the near future.

Motion of Mr. Kyte to adjourn the House negatived.

THE BUDGET.

DEBATE ON ANNUAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.

The consideration of the proposed motion of Hon. Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance) for the Committee of Ways and Means, and the amendment of Mr. Turriff thereto, was resumed from Tuesday, May 1.

Mr. H. BOULAY (Rimouski) (translation): Mr. Speaker, from the remarks by the eloquent orators who have hereto taken part in the debate on the Budget, I took it that the main question was that of free wheat. The subect is not wanting in interest. It may be considered from two viewpoints, as to-day's discussion shows.

The enhanced price of wheat in the western provinces must necessarily produce an increase in the cost of flour, and so the people in the East must pay a much higher price for this staple commodity. Mr. Speaker, I heard the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) censuring strongly the Government. At every session he was heard in condemnation of the Government because the latter would not grant to the western provinces a greater measure of reciprocity. Yet the gentleman hails from an eastern constituency, having been born, as myself, in the county of Rimouski, where he has still important interests and many relatives.

I think he must remember—having been brought up in that section of my province—that the province of Quebec has some interests it seeks to protect, and he cannot but admit that the western part of Canada should not monopolize all our attention and efforts.

In support of my claim, I shall quote from a speech I delivered last year in this House. I shall read the English version, so as to be understood by the hon. members who do not understand French. My remarks were as follows:—

All the points of the question have been sifted again and again and all its aspects scrutinized, and from all the twaddle what stands out clear to me is that the western members are using the question as an electoral war-horse. They take it up as a good means of boosting their case and ensuring their re-election.

A while ago one of the western members attacked the Government for not giving the farmers all the help they were entitled to. Yet, if any people should grumble against want of solicitude on the part of the Government, surely not those farmers. Every time they are the victims of some slight mishap, a drought or a frost, they appeal to the Government and immediately millions of dollars are put at their disposal to enable them to tide over the crisis. Our eastern farmers have not the same recourse. If the harvest is bad, or they suffer from frost, they have to shift for themselves without any one coming to their aid. Of all farmers who have no reason to grumble, those of the prairies are first, for the Government is lavish in its favours to them.

The same orator complains that agricultural implements were not allowed to be imported free of duty from the United States, he claims the tariff in that respect is detrimental to them, and in support of his contention he maintains that the higher price paid for the same machinery in Canada than obtains across the border is disadvantageous to the farmer, that it is in fact money taken from the purse of the farmer and given to the manufacturer. So be it, but, in my opinion, when the hon. member further stated that only the manufacturers reap the benefit of the tariff, he is clearly mistaken. The workmen also find it be to their benefit. It must not be forgotten that in those manufactories are to be found workmen to whom the tariff is a benefit in the form of employment. Granted even that an article be something higher in price in Canada than it is in the United States, it seems to me that if the western people were good patriots, they would not begrudge this slight sacrifice to allow Canadian workmen to find his sustenance in this, our common country. After all we are not an agglomeration of two or three Canadas, but we form an entity destined to live as a whole in this country, and no section ought to be indifferent to the necessities of another section.

There is another subject I would call to the attention of my hon. friend from the West. We have, out of the public treasury, built for their use, at fabulous cost, three railways, designed to move their harvest and bring their produce to the Canadian harbours to be thence shipped overseas.

We are now building also, at their request, a request made to the late administration and repeatedly pressed upon the present Govern-

ment,—a burdensome railway, the Hudson Bay railway, to afford them a shorter route to the European markets. I would like to know the bottom reason for those railroad constructions. Why are we wasting so much money on the Hudson Bay road—built only for the benefit of our western countrymen, since neither Ontario nor Quebec nor the Maritime provinces can utilize it; why waste so many millions for those western farmers, if those gentlemen are bent on dealing on the American market? Is that fair? Let them insist with the Government that a stop be put to that useless expenditure on the Hudson Bay railway. It might be after all to the country's advantage to abandon those undertakings and allow the western people freedom of trade with the United States. One of the previous orators stated that in the West the farmer made no money. It appears to me there is not much patriotism in coming here to make such a declaration. If in the West the farmers do not make money, why then ask so much for colonization, why all this propaganda to draw settlers to a region where results are so deceptive?

I, however, have it in my mind that the farmers of the West coin money much more freely than in the East. Had I spoken in the stead of the hon. member I should certainly not have delivered myself of such a remark, because it is not in the interest of his province. We all know that for the most part the western agriculturists are well-to-do and that many of them become rich with much less pains than our eastern farmers.

Such are the few remarks I wished to make. I make them without acrimony and in the best possible intention, so that our friends from the West may realize that they should not be parties to these unhealthy agitations, that they are not the only inhabitants of this country, but that on the contrary, they have to live in close community with the other parts of Canada, and that their first thought should be the general interests of the country, and not those of a particular section.

These remarks, which I have just quoted from my speech of last year, are very fair and very just, and I still believe that the giving of such advantages to our friends of the West is contrary to the interests of the East. We in the East are ready to support the measure that has been put into force lately by this Government in order to afford an opportunity to our western friends to sell their wheat at a high price; we are ready to make the sacrifice, but on one condition, and it is that these gentlemen immediately cease thinking that Canada exists only for themselves, and that they should remember that there are other parts of the country that want to be protected. With regard to the continual cry for free trade with the United States, while I admit that this will be a benefit for the West, at the same time it is contrary to our interest in the East, and we are solidly against it, and as a patriot I would ask my friends from the West to advise their supporters that they are not

alone in this country, and that they must bear their share of the burdens of nationhood, sharing in the disadvantages as well as the advantages that may result from tariff reform. In the East we are patriots from an economic standpoint as well as from a fighting standpoint. I am sorry to see published in the western papers attacks against the East, and principally against the province of Quebec, for not doing its duty in this great war. Let me tell the House that the county of Rimouski alone has furnished no less than 800 soldiers for overseas, and the neighbouring counties of Bonaventure and Gaspe have, to a large extent, furnished their share. As the representative of the county of Rimouski, which has furnished such a large number of volunteers to our Canadian army, I say that such attacks should not be made. When, the other day, I heard the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Best) quote from a paper a letter from an officer who passed through the province of Quebec, charging our people with insulting the soldiers when they were passing through that province, I was really sorry to hear such an unjust accusation. I do not say that my hon. friend made that statement in order to insult us, for, perhaps, he thought that it might be true, but I may assure the House and the people of Canada that in my county and the adjoining counties of Bonaventure and Gaspe, which have furnished so many soldiers, the people are in entire sympathy with the valiant Canadians who go overseas to defend us.

Whether they come from British Columbia, Manitoba, Ontario, or any other province we are delighted to see the soldiers going overseas to defend our liberty and fight in the cause of humanity. If there have been any such instances as alleged, I should like to see the facts established, and the responsibility placed where it belongs. It may be that soldiers, just like private citizens, have made mistakes occasionally at some of the railway stations in Quebec, and if they insult the people they must expect to be insulted in return. I know that if the soldiers were insulted at Rivière du Loup and Mont Joli, it would be because of the behaviour of the soldiers themselves, not all of them, but a few. The people had no thought of insulting them until they were provoked. I know of one instance where soldiers have insulted women. In Campbellton, which is not in the province of Quebec, some of them took the liberty of seizing a horse and wagon, shoving the proprietor aside, and taking a ride around

the town. Other soldiers burst into a liquor store in the same town, and took the whole contents. They must naturally expect to be insulted when they do things like that. But these are merely isolated cases, and bad-will must not be imputed to our people, because we are just as patriotic as any of our fellow Canadians and just as eager to win the war. I trust that steps will be taken by the Government or militia authorities to ascertain whether the allegations made by this officer are true, and if an investigation is held I am sure it will be found that his charges are baseless.

I would take this opportunity of asking the newspapers of the West to cease their attacks upon us. Soldiers from the West, who have read these articles in the western newspapers, must be prejudiced against the province of Quebec, and in passing through our province on their way overseas, they are apt to take offence at little things which otherwise would pass unnoticed. As soon as this depreciation of the province of Quebec in our western newspapers ceases, the better it will be for all the people of this country.

In listening to the speeches on the motion by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte), I heard hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House one after the other criticise the Government for not doing so and so. The Government was not doing its duty in trying to meet present conditions, they said. In my opinion these charges are a disgrace to those who preferred them. When we think of the terrible crisis with which the Government is confronted, and of the courage displayed not only by the Government as a whole, but by the distinguished gentleman who presides over the Finance Department, instead of trying to deprecate him and accuse him of not doing his duty, hon. gentlemen opposite should get up and praise him for the ability he has shown in conducting the financial affairs of this country since the beginning of the war. Instead of indulging in criticism of that sort hon. gentlemen should get together and help the Government, regardless of party, to pull through the hard times with which we are confronted. One hon. gentleman opposite asks, "What has the Government done since the beginning of the war to meet the situation?" It should not be necessary to ask such a question. We had to raise, equip and send overseas in a very short time 400,000 soldiers. The money had to be raised to pay these men, and to meet our obligations in connection with the war. Besides that, the Government had to carry on the ordinary public services of this country just as in times of peace. The war made the situation confronting the Government ten times harder than anything a government in this country had ever faced before, and I think when hon. gentlemen opposite think of these things, they should compliment the Government instead of reproaching them.

As a representative of the East, I feel very keenly the hard times through which we are passing. The price of flour we should all be very glad indeed to see come down. Our labourers are confronted with a situation we have never before had in this country, and I am sure that if no other solution of the problem can be found, in order to bring down the price of flour and of meat, our farmers in the East would not grumble if the price of potatoes was cut in half and they received only $1 per bushel. I know, from having talked with several of them, that they would be glad to sell their potatoes at $1 a bushel, provided that the prices of flour and meat were reduced proportionately. I have enough confidence in the Government to believe that if this conclusion can be brought about they will take means to that end. That being so, there is no need for the opposition to criticize and to try to embarrass the situation. For my part, I think the best thing we can do is to act as patriots, to act unanimously, and, if we have suggestions, to make them to the Government, in order that we may be united in carrying on and bringing to a successful conclusion the present terrible war.

On motion of Mr. McKenzie the debate was adjourned.

On the motion of Sir Thomas White, the House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

Friday, May 4, 1917.

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

THE POTATO SUPPLY.

On the Orders of the day:

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) who had to leave the House, I beg to read a telegram which he has just received from Sherbrooke. It is as follows:

Sherbrooke, P.Q., May 3.

F. N. McCrea, M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

The provision merchants of the City of Sherbrooke, at a public meeting held on the third day of May, 1917, unanimously adopted the following resolution: Whereas, according to the Gazette, in reply to a question, the Hon. Mr. Burrell has informed the House that there is at this date a million bushels of potatoes in Canada, generally held by the farmers of Alberta, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick. Whereas, by messages and letters addressed to dealers of potatoes in the Maritime Provinces, the reply is that there is no stock to offer, and in most cases there is no reply at all; furthermore, that the ruling price in Montreal being prohibitive, there are no potatoes obtainable in our section; we therefore respectfully ask our deputy, Mr. F. N. McCrea, to inquire again from the hon. minister if he maintains his figures as being correct at this moment, and, if so, to give sufficient information so that a part of that surplus may be imported to this section without further delay.

This is signed by Mr. N. Lacroix and about twenty others, grocers, I presume, of Sherbrooke. I am requested to ascertain from the Minister of Agriculture if there is any information which he can give in connection with this matter.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I have very much to add to the statement I made the other afternoon, namely that on the date mentioned, the end of February, we did ascertain not only from the various ministers of agriculture but also from such trade sources and official sources as were available, the situation throughout Canada. As I mentioned the other day, the surpluses in the Maritime Provinces were as follows: In New Brunswick, 750,000 bushels was the lowest estimate and 1,250,000 the highest; in Prince Edward Island, the lowest estimate was 500,000 bushels; and in Alberta the lowest estimate of surplus was 800,000 bushels. So we estimated that there was about one and one-half million bushels of surplus, and up to the middle of April, watching the exports, there would be left probably about one million bushels surplus. We made use of every possible source of information.

In regard to the telegram which my hon. friend has read, I may repeat the action that we took: we communicated all these facts to the ministers of agriculture for the respective provinces. We also suggested that as in some of their districts there appeared to be a surplus and in others a shortage, if the provincial minister of agriculture thought there was a shortage in the whole province it would be desirable, having placed all this information at his disposal, for him and for other ministers, as far as possible, to look after the shortages and requirements in their own provinces. That, it seems to me, was the proper action to take, and short of taking very drastic action indeed, that is of embargoing or fixing a price, which would carry a great many complications with it and would raise a great many protests, I do not know that we could go any further. I will look into the matter again and corroborate the statement to date, and shall again find out what the exports have been; and if I can give further information to the House within the next day or so, I shall be glad to give it.

THE HIGH PRICE OF FLOUR.

STATEMENT BY SIR THOMAS WHITE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I should like to give the House certain information which I think will be of interest in view of the discussion yesterday with reference to the recent sensational rise in the price of wheat on the Winnipeg Exchange. In confirmation of the statement which I made yesterday in my speech upon the subject, I have learned this morning, from what I regard as dependable financial and commercial sources, that the corner which has occurred on the Winnipeg wheat market has been brought about by the unusually large buying of the British Wheat Commission. That commission has been purchasing contract grades of wheat, and I understand that elevators and other vendors in the ordinary and, I believe, legitimate course of business, have been selling for May delivery, and that many of them have found themselves unable to fill their contracts with the contract grades of wheat. The result has been that the price of wheat has been driven up by the endeavours of those vendors to obtain wheat of contract grades for May delivery. It has been suggested that the British Wheat Commission should accept from these vendors, to the extent that they are unable to deliver contract grades of wheat, wheat of a lower grade to an equivalent amount, having regard to its proportionate value for milling purposes. The information which I desire to give to the House is that, understanding that that was the situation, I yesterday morning cabled Sir George Perley to take up the question with the British Wheat Commission, and I have

to-day cabled him further in the matter; and if, as a result of those cables, relief is not afforded to the situation, the Government will have to consider such further action as we may deem expedient in the public interest.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is there any restriction against the mixing of wheat for the making of flour in Canada?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Not that I am aware of.

Mr. MARCIL: Has there been any large increase in the sale of wheat in the United States since the Order in Council concerning free wheat was passed?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have not looked up the statistics.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Has it occurred to my hon. friend that so long as it is known that the British Wheat Commission is buying there may always be expected to be a corner to hold them up, and that occasion may be taken to advise against that?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In answer to my right hon. friend, I may say that it has long been known that the British Commission are the principal buyers for export.

THE BUDGET.

DEBATE ON ANNUAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.

The consideration of the proposed motion of Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance) for the Committee of Ways and Means, and the amendment of Mr. Turriff thereto, was resumed from Thursday, May 3.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of attention to the speech delivered last night by the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Boulay). As the hon. gentleman took advantage of the ease and facility with which he can change from one language to another, his speech was of a somewhat broken character, and while I could follow him fairly well when he spoke in English, I am sorry to say that he can very effectively draw a cloud between myself and his speech when he plunges into French. I have learned, however, from that speech, to know that he loves the Government in spots. A few evenings ago he took the Minister of Railways and Canals by the back of the neck, threw him out of the window and tore to tatters everything pertaining to his department. But last night I noticed that the Minister of Finance was the chiefest among ten thousand, and altogether lovely. It was further observable from his speech that while he is no doubt a very patriotic son of the province of Quebec, his Toryism is nevertheless stronger than his patriotism. He was quite willing to treat very tenderly, indeed, what was regarded as a strong affront offered to his province by the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Best), whom he let down very easily, with the touch of a velvet glove, saying, like one of old: Lord, forgive him, for he knew not what he did. With these observations it is not my purpose to follow any further the speech of the hon. member for Rimouski. I do congratulate him, however, upon his excellent command of the English language. We shall no longer pardon him when he insists upon putting himself forward as a man who does not understand English, because he disclosed to us yesterday the fact that he is well equipped in that respect, and that the needs of his constituency can well be set forth by him in the House through the medium of that very excellent vehicle of thought.

There are two occasions in particular upon which the representatives of the people in any House of Commons under the British flag have a wide sway in dealing with matters of a general character. One of these is in the debate on the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne, and the other is when the King comes before the Commons and asks for money to run the business of the country, as that is what the Budget is for. On these occasions it is particularly fitting that the voice of the people, as represented in this House, should be presented to the Government, and particularly to the minister in charge of the country's finances.

Last night the hon. member for Rimouski rather chastised gentlemen on this side, because, forsooth, we sometimes criticise the Government. In all British countries in which government of the people and for the people prevails and in which a system of government by majority is carried out, it is the function of the Opposition to criticise and to give their judgment squarely and honestly upon any question that comes up in the House. If the Opposition did not squarely and honestly voice its opinions, party government would necessarily become a failure. I submit, Sir, that it is our duty to follow that course, and, availing myself of that constitutional right, I purpose, in my own humble way, presenting some criticisms of this Government.

As has already been brought to the notice of the House, the regime of the present Administration can be divided into two parts. One of these dates from the inception of the Government in October, 1911, and continues to August 4, 1914. The other runs a somewhat double course, between the war obligations and duties of the Government, and such time as the Government have been able to devote to ordinary business. I submit that this Government have not lived up to the high standard set for them by the outgoing Government of my right hon. friend who now leads the Opposition, either in the matter of progressive measures in the interest of the people or in the matter of handling the finances which were left in their charge. They have fallen into errors which could have been avoided, and these errors, which have been going on from day to day, are going on now. The Government have not handled the war well and the finances of the country have not been husbanded in the best interests of that great undertaking upon which our country so loyally and patriotically launched. It was a grave mistake on the part of the Government, on the part of the ex-Minister of Militia and of the present Minister of Militia, to handle the money used in connection with the war on strictly party lines. The cause of the Government being everybody's cause, and the energy of everybody in the land being devoted to one great purpose, any moneys to be expended should be expended equally among all the people, and party lines should have entirely vanished. Such was not the case at any time since the war began, and such is not the case to-day. I arraign the Government before the bar of public opinion in that they have fallen short of the broad and big duty that devolved upon them in that connection. I point them to the Mother Country, from which we are proud to take our pattern in many matters, and direct the attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact that in that country party differences, party patronage and party advantage have been entirely dispelled; the great statesmen have joined hands in doing what was considered to be in the best interests of their great united effort. Here we do no such thing, and we have in Canada by reason of that fact great drawbacks, great heart-burnings and much dissatisfaction.

I purpose submitting to this House evidence which goes to show that there did not exist amongst the Government themselves that harmony and that unity of effort that should exist under such conditions as we have been up against since the declaration of war on the 4th day of August, 1914, and I purpose giving a few pieces of testimony from one who at least was in a position to know what was going on in the sanctum sanctorum of the Government. Whether that person whom I am going to quote is giving the facts or not it is for the Government to judge; but we on the outside have a right to suppose that when a man has been elevated to the high position of an adviser to His Majesty, a Minister of the Crown, then, and while he is dealing with matters appertaining to his high office and after he leaves that office, he is gentleman enough to tell the truth and that he would scorn to lie about anything that pertains to the discharge of his duties or to what belongs to his expression of them after he leaves office. The speech which was made on the 26th day of April last at Lindsay in this province by the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) discloses a condition of things which, at least to me, appears to be deplorable, and which goes to show that the united effort of this country could not possibly be put forward under the machinery afforded to us by the Government of the day. I am not vouching for the truth of the report of that speech; it is reported in the Toronto Globe of the 30th of April, and that report is available to the whole world, and I have not had brought to my attention any contradiction of the speech made by the ex-minister on that occasion or of the charges that were laid at the door of the present Adminstration. I have read over that speech with care and have picked out of it the various charges that were made against the Government, and I purpose submitting them to the House in their order. They are grave and serious; and if they are not truthful, the ex-Minister of Militia should be called to account for publishing them to this country and giving them the authority of his prestige as a Knight, as a member of this House and as ex-Minister of Militia and Defence. I have tabulated those charges running in order from (a) to (m). They are:

(a) That more than a year ago the Government interfered to stop recruiting, particularly the Prime Minister.

(b) That there was Governmental interference in the sending of the First Contingent, the interference being by the now overseas Minister of Militia, Sir George

Perley, and Sir Thomas White, Minister of Finance.

(c) That there was useless and wasteful expenditure of public moneys, because the advice of the then Minister of Militia was overruled by the Government.

(d) That the High Commissioner and the Minister of Finance have tried to create trouble for the Minister of Militia in England, and as he puts it himself, to create an unwholesome atmosphere for him in that country, and that this was going on from the very commencement of the war.

(e) That those gentlemen bribed or attempted to bribe and purchase the influence of the Canadian press, both in Canada and Great Britain, for the purpose of thwarting and defeating the plans of the Minister of Militia.

(f) That newspapers, friendly to Sir Thomas White, Minister of Finance, made vicious attacks on the Minister of Militia of that day.

(g) That an envenomed poisonous conspiracy was entered into by the members of the Government to assassinate the Prime Minister—that is, of course, politically—and as a preliminary to slay the Minister of Miliita.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I presume you still mean politically.

Mr. McKENZIE: Further:

(h) That the Prime Minister was informed that his colleagues and subordinates in the Cabinet were conspiring and thirsting for his political life.

(i) That the branch of the Finance Department which had to do with the paying of troops and other expenses in England had been rotten, that is plain Anglo-Saxon.

(j) That the medical service and organization in connection therewith was no better.

(k) That attempts were made by enemies of the minister in the Cabinet to "sweeten the press"—"Sweeten the press" are the exact words of the minister—and to influence bankers and brokers of Canada, all of which was done at the cost of the poor people of this country—meaning, of course, that the moneys of the Finance Department were used for bribery and corruption in order to render abortive the efforts of the Minister of Militia to place an efficient and effective Canadian army in the field.

(l) That the then Minister of Militia advised in 1914 that there should be a general election and was over-ruled. And this last charge is possibly the most serious of all.

(m) That the Ross Rifle was discarded by the Government and its agencies, not because there was anything wrong with the rifle but because of the malign influences of "German gold,"—thus insinuating that his colleagues and others in authority accepted bribes from the enemy.

Mr. BURNHAM: Would not that mean that the objectors to the Ross rifle had been influenced by German gold? They would be the Opposition.

Mr. McKENZIE: The ex-Minister of Militia, as any one can see by his speech, was arraigning and criticising his former colleagues in the Government; he was saying nothing about the Opposition and it was not in the power of the Opposition to discard the rifle. He was speaking about the people who discarded the rifle and who brought about the conditions which made it impossible to use that rifle further, and he said that those conditions were successful, not because there was anything the matter with the rifle, but because German gold was too influential. That is what he said, and it is for the Government and hon. gentlemen who are in touch with the ex-Minister of Militia to find out what he said. To the ordinary person who understands the English language, his words mean that somebody or a number of persons who brought about the discarding of the Ross rifle, did so, not because there was anything wrong with the rifle, but because German gold was too influential. That is the way I understand his language, and that is the way it has been expressed in the loyal city of Lindsay in the loyal province of Ontario, by a super-loyal ex-Minister of the Crown. That is an arraignment of the Government by a former colleague which we on the outside, until the contrary is shown, must accepted as being correct. If correct, it shows the condition of things in connection with handling of the war to have been absolutely deplorable. According to the minister himself, while he was doing his best to carry out his plans for putting our armies in the field, he was thwarted by a bad element, and an unwholesome atmosphere was created against him at the War Office and in official circles in England by the High Commissioner, a member of this Government. That is a sad condition of affairs, if true. It may not be true, but the minister says that it is and it is up to him and his friends to prove to this country whether it is so or

not. Why even gold was used against him. The money of this country was taken to sweeten the press. The press was bribed in order to secure their influence in maligning the minister in order to defeat his purposes. No language that I can use is strong enough to characterize a condition of that kind, and I submit that for that reason I am justified in saying on this occasion to the Government and to this country that hon. gentlemen opposite have not handled the war well; nor are they entitled to any credit for their conduct of the war, nor is it in the interests of a successful prosecution of our share in the war that its conduct should be left any longer in their hands. If the people of this country or if we in this House believe that what the ex-Minister of Militia has stated here is correct, then the sooner the carrying forward of military matters in this country is put on a sounder basis, the better it will be for the country and the better for all who are deeply interested in the war.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does the hon. gentleman believe it himself? It would greatly shorten the debate if he would tell us.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not know that I am bound to follow this leading kindly light that is coming to my help, but I said at the opening of my remarks that when a man has attained to the high position of a minister of the Crown, it is incumbent on a humble man like myself to believe what he says until the contrary is proved. I therefore believe that what the minister says is true, and shall believe it until I get some satisfactory evidence to the contrary. Of course, I am open to conviction when it comes in a proper way. Irishman-like, I might ask my hon. friend for Peterborough if he believes it. I will not press him to put his reply on Hansard, if he does not wish to do so, but it is up to him either to believe it or to say that the ex-minister is not telling the truth.

Mr. BURNHAM: Would the hon. gentleman like me to give him an answer?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Speak now.

Mr. BURNHAM: I am ready.

Mr. McKENZIE: This phase of the Government's management of our war operations is thus brought strongly into the full glare of public opinion, and it is the duty of a loyal Opposition that regards itself as having some responsibility to bring these matters to the notice of the public, and then, to some extent, our duty has been performed, and the duty of those in power begins, of clearing up such charges as are laid at their doors.

Coming back to the question of patronage and of party lines being so closely drawn, I submit that abuses have taken place in this country in connection with the expenditure of the public moneys of this Dominion, some of them are in my own province, which show a gross lack of business principles and of business ideas on the part of the Government, and a most reckless expenditure of public moneys, which were worse than thrown away. A few days ago we had the opportunity of seeing a short synopsis of a very lengthy report filed by the Hon. Sir Charles Davidson in connection with an inquiry conducted by him into the sale of horses in the province of Nova Scotia. I am sorry we have not the full report, but presume the reporter who prepared this synopsis has quoted correctly. The two principal buyers, Todd Woodworth and F. B. Keever, are found guilty of being short in their accounting for public moneys which they spent in securing horses for the Militia Department. Sir Charles finds Woodworth short to the amount of $2,224, and Keever to the amount of $2,968. W. P. McKay, a buyer under Keever, is personally exonerated, and so is G. H. Oakes, but regarding the former the commissioner remarks that "as a horse buyer he does not rank high, or at all." That some very old nags were bought is fully established, including the famous steed twenty-three years old, and the one which at a sale some three years previously had been traded for two ducks and a drake. Further on the report says:

> After getting credentials from the Department, Foster proceeded to St. John, N.B.

Now we have always been told in this House that nobody knew how Foster got his appointment and how his toboggan was started, but we have here the report of Sir Charles Davidson, after hearing all the evidence, that Foster got his credentials from the department. There is no doubt any longer as to how he got started or who put him on the road. He got credentials from the department, and it would be interesting to know what the purport of those credentials was. Sir Charles reports that after getting these credentials from the department Foster proceeded to St. John, New Brunswick, where by pre-arrangement he met Gifford H. Oakes, of Kentville, N.S., secretary of the Liberal-Conservative Association of Kings County, and William P.

McKay, son of the late Senator McKay of Truro, then resident of Ottawa, and Keever. The instructions were given, blank cheque books issued, and the buying commenced. All the parties had to do with it. The parties concerned were Foster, the chief, Woodworth, Keever, McKay and Oakes. The commissioner says that Foster's instructions, which would have hampered the committal of fraud, were breached from the outset, because he did not exact the delivery of price tags precedently or even concurrently with handing out cheques for equivalent amounts. Sir Charles says:

> In fairness to Oakes, Mr. Foster himself later on acquiesced in this practice and issued cheques of like character.

That is, cheques were filled in for large amounts and handed over to Keever, Woodworth, McKay and others, without the slightest knowledge of what they were going to do with the money. There were no horses in sight and no vouchers in sight. It was simply a case of filling in cheques for any amount that Keever would say, and then going to the bank for the money and starting out to buy. Sir Charles further finds that there was

> Abandonment in almost entirety of a system of individual checks to individual sellers, carried with it the pressing duty of precise bookkeeping methods; of the securement of vouchers, of accountings and balancings practically day by day; all to the end—apart from the delicate responsibility which attached to Mr. Foster by reason of his position as a member of Parliament—that a final all-sufficient statement might be rendered to the department. Unfortunately methods of performance fell far short of these requirements.

The digest of the report published in the newspaper gives the closing part of Sir Charles' report, as follows:—

> Slipshod financial methods and the disgraceful purchase in a number of cases of horses venerable as to age and decrepit as to quality, have given substantial credence to the belief that inefficiency was the rule and not the exception.

But there is an extraordinary suggestion in Sir Charles' report, which, I am sure, will be as startling to other members of the legal profession as it was to me. He finds that between Keever and Woodworth well over $5,000 was stolen—actually stolen. And he had not the means of knowing all that they stole, for he does not know how many horses they bought—they took good care from the beginning that there should be no evidence, no receipts from the men they paid, and no record of the horses they took over—and the money was dumped out regardless of even the most ordinary business principles. In some mysterious way the commissioner has found out that there were the shortages I have named. But here is the extraordinary thing. He says that, if such a thing should happen as that these men should account for this money, $300 should be allowed them for their travelling expenses. That is a new departure. Suppose that principle were carried out generally. A house-breaker starts from Ottawa and goes to Toronto for the purpose of cracking a safe. Carrying out that operation, he steals $2,000. He is caught and made to account for the money. The judge, acting under the principle laid down here, allows that burglar his travelling expenses. I do not know whether the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) will say whether that is sound or not, nor have I the view of the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) on that subject. One thing is sure, if the Solicitor General will say that it is sound he will get a majority on that side of the House to back him up. If he introduces legislation confirming this report and so allowing travelling expenses to Messrs. Keever and Woodworth, he has only to make one of his usual insinuating speeches to call us down hard and to tell us we are bad Grits and obstructionists, and the Bill will be put through with enthusiasm. But, as I say, this is a new departure. And I need hardly tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in the fair province of Nova Scotia, where we profess to know a little about law, we have not yet heard that it is sound law to offer a premium of this kind to theft, highway robbery, and rascality. But these are the things which have been going on in this country under the eye of our big, solemn-looking, capable, watchdog of the treasury.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McKENZIE: I desire to be absolutely serious about this, for I represent a serious people, many of them poor working people who have no money to pay the travelling expenses of Messrs. Keever and Woodworth. They want a quid pro quo for every dollar they pay into the treasury, and I am here to see to it, so far as I can, that their money shall be used for serious and honest purposes.

Now, what are we going to do about it? The Auditor General is called from time to time to give evidence before committees of this House. The members supporting the

Government seem to look upon him as a fiend incarnate. He is "Belled, booked and candle lighted" every time he appears. If he were not a Scotchman, and determined to do his duty, he would have been driven to the woods long ago. But he stands to his guns; he is doing the best he can. Yet, after all, he is rather helpless. The real power is in the hands of the Minister of Finance, and it is for him to see to it that the people's money is not stolen and squandered in this way any longer.

I began by saying that in my judgment the record of this Administration does not compare favourably with that of their predecessors. When the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who now leads the Opposition, came into power in 1896, he found the finances and the industries of this country at the lowest ebb. All hon. gentlemen opposite who have kept in touch with industrial and monetary matters know that. Even in the year when the Government that preceded his went to the country, and when they would naturally do all that was possible to make a good showing, its Minister of Finance (Sir George Foster) was obliged to admit a very heavy deficit. The credit of the country was low. It was when things were in this condition that the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) took control of the country's affairs. And hon. gentlemen ought to know as well as I that it is not too much to say that on the day when he took power the sun that had risen in adversity set in prosperity. And that prosperity continued for fifteen years throughout his Administration. So great was that prosperity that the slogan of those who opposed him in the election of 1911 was "Let well enough alone." They declared that everything was lovely, magnificent, splendid; that the best of conditions prevailed; and they insisted that no chances be taken on a change.

That was the position in which the right hon. gentleman left the country and it was in striking contrast with the position in which he found it. But, comparing these records, I am bound to point out to the Government that during the regime of my right hon. friend, the immigration policy which was headed from the earliest day of that Government by the Hon. Mr. Sifton, was a great success. For the 18 long years that the Conservatives were in power, instead of a population ruling in the West we had the buffalo and Red Indian in full control. When the policy of Mr. Sifton and the Administration of my right hon. friend came in, the Indians and the buffalo were bound to give way to the tide of a strong, vigorous, and intellectual immigration. The West sprang up into the condition in which it is to-day, the little hamlet gave place to strong settlements, settlements to towns, and towns to thriving and prosperous cities. That is the record that stands to the credit of the right hon. gentleman who now leads the Opposition and who had brought such progress, advancement and prosperity to the country in the fifteen years that he was in power.

He and his Government not only developed the West but they developed the country from one end to the other. No person knows better than the Minister of Finance that the railway policy of the former Government was of the widest and strongest character, that he developed the Northwest Territories by building railways through the direct agency of the Government and by helping other railways financially and otherwise. Arrangements were made with the great system of railways controlled by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company which were highly beneficial to the people of the West and many of the strangleholds which that great corporation had upon the people of that country were removed and a freedom was given to the people which was foreign to them up to that time. Trade and navigation had been developed by the improvement of the canals and great waterways of this country. Improvements had been made along the coast of Nova Scotia and other parts of the Dominion which have been of great assistance to trade and navigation and which are particularly important to the fishermen of this country. I submit to you, Sir, and I submit to the Government and to every leading man in this House that we have been too slow in recognizing the importance of developing our coastal harbours and providing facilities for the fishermen. I submit to you, Sir, that the fishery fields of British Columbit, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island are just as important to the people of the country as are the wheat fields of Ontario and the West. While we are glad to expend money in encouraging the development of the wheat fields, we should also be equally happy, knowing that we are aiding the business of the country equally as well, when we are putting the fishermen in a position

to make the most of the vocation to which they are called. I cannot say much about the coastline of British Columbia, or what the extent of the coastal fisheries of British Columbia are beyond saying that the fisheries are very extensive, but from the boundary line between Maine and Canada around New Brunswick on the Atlantic and down to pretty near Labrador, you have immense coastal fisheries on the eastern shore of this country. You all know what an excellent article of food fish is. If we have plenty of fish, potatoes and flour, there is no danger of hunger invading the home of anybody in Canada. It is therefore highly important that the fishermen should be put in the position that they can go out with their boats from sheltered harbours and that they can return to them because, if this is not done, they are handicapped and put in competition with American fishermen who come with large vessels which our men cannot afford to build, get our fish and sell them back to us again in such cities as Montreal, Winnipeg and Toronto. That is something which is happening because we have not fully appreciated the importance of the fisheries of Canada or provided facilities for our own fishermen.

4 p.m.

It has been my effort, while supporting a Government, as well as during the days in which I have been in Opposition, to press forward as much as possible for the adoption of such a policy as will give railway facilities to every part of Canada. I have, since this Government came into power, moved a resolution in this House stating that the day had arrived when the Intercolonial railway, or its branches, should be extended to every non-railway county in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec. That resolution was accepted by the Government. It was on an occasion when the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) was leading the House —I forget where the Prime Minister was— that the resolution was accepted and it was some time in March, 1915, I think. What more could I do? I moved that resolution, it was accepted by the Government and I had reason to suppose that something would be done. But, from that day to this, nothing has been done except the purchasing of the Quebec and Saguenay railway which was not for commercial purposes but for purpose which are well known to hon. gentlemen opposite. A few months before the former Government went out of office, a railway policy was adopted for the Maritime Provinces which was on the verge of being carried out. I am sorry to say that the Prime Minister dropped every railway that was involved in this scheme except the railway in his own county. I have often, jocularly, and otherwise, thrown this up to the Prime Minister since it was done. We had a railway projected for Cape Breton, one that went to Guysborough, one to Pictou and passing through the counties of Halifax and Guysborough. All were dropped except the road that the minister himself is concerned in. He was hand in glove with myself and others in trying to get the Government committed to the building of these roads, we were all pulling on the one oar and we were glad of the assistance of the then leader of the Opposition. I do not think it was fraternizing on his part when he dropped us after he got into power, built his railway and threw us to the dogs. I do not think it was proper treatment for our former associate in arms in view of the fact that we had been fighting for his road as well as our own. I contend that all the fishing field in Nova Scotia should not only have proper harbour facilities to enable the fishermen to go and catch the fish but that they should be put in touch with some of the branch railways that would enable the people who want the fisherman's product to get it as cheaply as possible. We have all around the Cape Breton coast line the most magnificent fishing fields in the world and I submit to the leader of the Government and hon. gentlemen opposite that we are not properly equipped for the handling of this product until we have proper harbours. Proper harbours and railway facilities must be provided in order that the product when it is caught, can be speedily carried to the great centres where we find a great demand for fish.

I am discussing the question as to what was done and what was expected to be done by the former Government and I am contrasting that with the lack of doing under the present Administration. I do not expect the Government to build railways or to enter into any extravagant expenditure under present circumstances but I do suggest to the minister that there should be care taken in husbanding the money that he has collected from the people of this country. It will not do for the Government, or the minister to blame everything on the war.

It is a great convenience for the Government and for the minister particularly, whenever he is up against a snag to be able to throw out this red signal, the war. But I wish to remind him that we left him a magnificent heritage when he came into power. We left him with all bills paid, with every balance squared up, and we handed him $39,000,000 of cold cash. When the hon. Mr. Fielding went out and our good friend the Finance Minister of to-day came in, he found in the strong box of this country everything squared up and $39,000,000 of money. That, Sir, was a comfortable position for the new manager of a concern to find himself in, and that upon his own evidence in his first Budget speech, is undeniably the position in which he found himself. But what was the condition of the finances of this country before the war broke out? On the last day of July, 1914, before the war broke out, the $39,000,000 were gone; the hundreds of millions of dollars that had been collected in the years since their return to power had been expended, and a deficit stared the minister in the face of $47,000,000, of money. That is the condition that existed three or four days before the war broke out. What has been happening since I do not profess to know, because the amount of money borrowed and the way in which it has been expended are beyond any knowledge that I have of financing. All I can say is that the Government cannot justify itself before the people and has nothing to show what became of those $39,000,000 of money, and over three times that much, perhaps four times that much more, that was collected during the intervening years—and they had a deficit of $47,000,000 in July, 1914. There is no accounting for it excepting in one way: It is accounted for by having been shovelled out in bucketfulls and barrelfulls to people who had no business to get it. If the people of this country wished inquire what has become of the money, they could put the defunct Sir Richard MacBride Government on the stand. There they would find some millions of this money. Let them put the other no less defunct Conservative Government of Manitoba on the stand, and they would find where millions of this money went. Let them come down farther, and they will find $2,000,000 of this money given to the province of Ontario as a post mortem subsidy to the Temiskaming railway. That is where $2,000,000 more went. Let them go down to the Government led by one James Kidd Flemming in New Brunswick, another defunct and disgraced and kicked-out Government, and if that Government are put upon the stand it will be possible to find where some of the money went. That is what has become of the money of this country, and I believe that that was in the paying back of men who threw their bread upon the waters for the support of the Conservative party when they were in opposition in the year 1911. Those provincial Governments were in power then, they were strong concerns, they had money, they came to the assistance of the Tory party, and received a strong promise that these moneys would be returned if they were elected to power. That money was taken out of the pockets of the people of this country, fifty-fold, sixty-fold and sometimes one hundred-fold of the amounts that had been advanced. There is where the money has gone, and that money we can never get back. There is where the Administration is at fault, for not having looked after these matters in a proper way, and carried on the Government of the country in a manner absolutely independent of influences of this kind, seeing that the money of the people was properly expended and that proper value was received for any advances out of the Treasury.

I submit that the people of Canada are getting tired of this method of handling the affairs of this country, and that they are longing for the day when better methods of government will prevail, and when a better system of administration will again be in vogue in this country; and I think, Sir, that I am right in saying, on behalf at least of the Liberal party and the people of Canada, that this great Canadian democracy from the Atlantic to the Pacific, irrespective of nationality, creed or colour, are disgusted, tired and sick of the swine husks of Toryism and have fully determined to arise and go back to the father of peace, progress, plenty and prosperity, the Empire statesman and leader of the people's party, the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Mr. F. R. LALOR (Haldimand): Mr. speaker, I have had great pleasure in listening to the remarks of the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), which, I am sure, were very amusing, although, I regret to say that some of his jokes were a little bit ancient—

Mr. McKENZIE: You will give us better ones

Mr. LALOR:—and some of his references, I fear, were a little bit coa se as well. The

hon. member for North Cape Breton has spoken of the high principles expected of the present Government when they were elected to office, and has spoken in a most admiring way of the high principles of the Government that he supported so long in this House. I wonder if he includes in those principles the purchase of the sawdust wharf and the building of the Disraeli wharf, and such methods of expenditure as have been exposed in this House, including the giving away of the public domain, which became a public scandal during the time his friends held office and he supported them. If the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) were in the House he could enlighten us upon that subject and tell us more than we have been able to find out even by investigation. The hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) speaks of the great prosperity that prevailed in this country during the time the Liberal party were in office. Well, they did come into office at a very fortunate time, and I think it was equally fortunate that they went out of office just about the time they did, considering that we are now engaged in a great war. The hon. gentlemen also spoke of the Intercolonial railway. Let me tell the hon. gentleman—and I do not come from the Maritime Provinces as he does, where all are so interested in the Intercolonial—but still, as a citizen of Canada I feel as all Canadians should, that the people all over Canada have an equal right and interest in the Intercolonial. Let me remind the hon. gentleman that one of the last acts of the Conservative Administration before they went out of power in 1896 was to build eleven miles of the Intercolonial, and during the time that the present Government have been in office they have, I understand, added sixty miles of rails to the Intercolonial railway, But during all the time that the Liberal party were in power and the member for North Cape Breton and other hon. gentlemen opposite from the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were supporting the then Government—only one and three-quarter miles were added to it. Hon. gentlemen are good at promises, as they always have been especially at election times; and the hon. gentleman promises that if his party is returned to power and he is elected to support it, he will try to get something done for the Intercolonial railway. Well, he has made promises along that line in the past, with the results that I have stated.

The hon. gentleman speaks of reckless expenditure, and asserts that the Liberal party left the finances of this country in a magnificent condition. I am not so sure about that, especially when I think of the Transcontinental railway—especially the eastern section—one of the most gigantic evidences that we can find of the folly and bad management of the late Administration. If the hon. gentleman were absolutely conscientious and honest in his expression of opinion, he would agree with me on that point. $258,000,000 was spent upon the Eastern section. A commission was appointed by this Government to investigate that expenditure and they found that out of that amount, $40,000,000 was stolen by contractors and friends of the then Government. The hon. gentleman supported that; and found no fault with it. I suppose he thought that was all right so long as his friends the contractors were able to get the money belonging to the people and pocket it. I say that the whole building of that road was folly. Recently a commission of railway experts inquired into the railway question in Canada and they found that a deplorable condition exists in the matter of railways. The problems of the future will be very great, indeed, as to how we shall manage these roads, or how continue to give them money as we have in the past. We remember that Mr. Blair, who was Minister of Railways, resigned when this project was contemplated, and before doing so he tried to point out to hon. gentlemen opposite the folly of taking such a course. But they would not listen to him, and although he was Minister of Railways in the Administration, he resigned from office rather than assume any responsibility for the construction of the Transcontinental railway. That is the history of the Liberal party so far as railroads are concerned; compare that with the history of the Conservative party under Sir John A. Macdonald, who built the Canadian Pacific railway. One is a monument to the bad management, the bad business judgment and the folly of our friends opposite, and the other is a magnificent monument to good business judgment and the wise expenditure of public money.

I want to compliment the Minister of Finance upon the splendid statement he has presented. It is a most inspiring message, and will, I am sure, be accepted as such by the Canadian people; also upon the successful manner in which he has handled the finances during these trying times. The people of Canada recognize his ability—and we are indeed fortunate in having such

an able and competent minister at the head of affairs at this time. In looking over the financial affairs of Canada during these war times I cannot see where the Minister of Finance has made one error of judgment. No other Minister of Finance since Confederation has had such tremendous problems to deal with, and the minister has handled those problems with great credit to himself and with satisfaction, I believe, to the people. The Budget speech this year was the most concise ever delivered in Parliament, and the facts and figures leave very little room, indeed, for criticism.

The revenue for the past fiscal year was $232,000,000, an amount exceeding the revenue of any other year by $60,000,000. After paying $25,000,000 for interest and for pensions, the Government were able to apply to the credit of war expenditures no less a sum than $60,000,000. We last year saved out of revenue over expenditure $45,000,000, so that during these two years we have been able to apply upwards of $100,000,000 towards our vast war expenses. The war expenses have amounted to $700,000,000, and it is most encouraging to the people to know that the Government have been able to save $100,000,000 and to reduce that war expenditure to $600,000,000. With the continuance of prosperity and the thrift of the people, great as the financial problem is that we have to face, the people will be able to deal with it and to reduce the large expenditure which we are making in these times. No doubt we shall have to assume very heavy obligations, and the longer the war lasts the greater those obligations will be. Our interest account and pensions fund alone will be very large and the taxation for years to come cannot but be heavy, although under the management of the Minister of Finance the people have been very lightly taxed up to the present. In fact, the people, so far as taxation is concerned, hardly realize that there is a war. Taxation will naturally increase and I believe that the Finance Minister has been wise in spreading that taxation and those payments over future years so that those who follow us and the people who come into this country and settle will help to pay our heavy war debt.

In speaking of our expenditure, large as it is, and the splendid manner in which the people have assumed the responsibility of the war and have paid the taxation, I cannot help but mention the voluntary subscriptions to patriotic funds that have been made in Canada. Upwards of $60,000,000, I understand, have been voluntarily contributed by the people towards the Red Cross and Patriotic Funds and on behalf of the work of the Young Men's Christian Association work in the trenches. These are all voluntary subscriptions. It is really inspiring to think of the way people have given. In my little town of 3,000 inhabitants, in two days the voluntary subscriptions towards these funds amounted to upwards of $20,000. In my country I have a little township with a population of about 600 people, all farmers, who have subscribed $6,000 towards the Patriotic Fund. The people of Canada generally, in every city, town and village, have subscribed in the same way. I must mention the work of the Young Men's Christian Association at the front. Not long ago when I was in Chicago, I went to a good Presbyterian church, such as my hon. friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) goes to.

An hon. MEMBER: When he goes.

Mr. LALOR: And a very able minister, during the course of his sermon, explained to the congregation the splendid work the Y.M.C.A. was doing in the trenches in France. The Y.M.C.A., like the Red Cross, have done noble work during this war, and the Red Cross deserves great credit indeed. In every city, town and village throughout the Dominion, there are Red Cross societies, and the work that the women of this country have undertaken in sending to our soldiers in the trenches gifts of food, clothing, etc., to make them comfortable and to relieve their sufferings as much as possible, I am sure, deserves the thanks of the Canadian people. When one considers the splendid work that has been done by the women and the voluntary subscriptions that have been given, one must feel proud to be a Canadian. Canada has set in this war an example that is admired by the world; in fact, it has surprised even our neighbours to the south of us, who point to us with pride and hold up Canada as an example for the United States at the present time.

In the present Government we have an honest Government; I do not think a more honest Government ever held office in Canada. I believe the Government have tried by every possible means to give good value for the money expended, and to see that it is honestly expended, and although some investigations, which have been brought about by hon. gentlemen opposite, have been held in this country, they

have resulted, as everyone knows, in not leaving a stain of any kind upon the Government or upon its administration. We want fair criticism; the Government expects fair criticism from hon. gentlemen opposite, but they do not expect the kind of unfair and unjust criticism that they are getting during this session of Parliament. Hon. gentlemen opposite from day to day and from week to week have indulged in criticism of the very smallest kind; petty, parish politics is the best way in which I can describe it. They have indulged in criticism that is unfair and have made statements that are absolutely misleading. I believe they have an entirely wrong conception of their duties in this House during war time. We should have no politics at all in these critical times; we should be here as one people supporting the Government and doing our very utmost to assist this Government to bring the war to a successful conclusion. Instead of that, the whole object of hon. gentlemen opposite seems to be what point they can make in order to gain a vote in the country, or in order to obtain some political advantage over the Government. I would call their attention to statements which have been made by some of the leading statesmen in the United States. Not long ago Theodore Roosevelt, ex-president of the United States, gave an interview in the papers. A committee had waited upon him and suggested to him a coalition government in the United States, and he said: "No, we do not want any coalition government in this country; we have no politics until the war is over; we are supporters of President Wilson and his Administration." That is the prevailing sentiment in the United States; the same sentiment is expressed by Mr. Hughes, the Republican candidate, and I notice that Mr. Taft has said the same thing. That is the position taken by Senator Root and by other leading politicians in the United States, who are splendid examples for hon. gentlemen opposite to follow. We are not doing our duty in this House; we are delayed here month after month listening to small politics and small political statements to catch votes in the province of Nova Scotia or in the province of New Brunswick, or in the wheat fields out in Saskatchewan, without any object or apparent responsibility as to the great troubles through which we are passing at the present time. It would be a fine thing if I could, from my seat in this House this afternoon, congratulate hon. gentlemen opposite on the manly stand that they were taking in doing their best to assist the Government.

An hon. MEMBER: You would have to stretch a point to do it.

Mr. LALOR: But hon. gentlemen opposite are indulging in criticisms of a petty nature. I am surprised at the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition—and I have no hesitation in saying that I respect him very much—content to let this small crowd from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and one member from Saskatchewan, occupy the time of the House every day while their own friends and supporters sitting around them are compelled to listen to them.

Mr. MACDONALD: Does the hon. gentleman undertake to lay down the principle that this Government is beyond criticism and should not be criticised?

Mr. LALOR: At the opening of my remarks I have said that the Government wants criticism, fair criticism, but not petty parish politics.

Mr. MACDONALD: In other words, my hon. friend wants mild criticism that is not going to displease him and that will not hurt the Government.

Mr. LALOR: I want in this House the kind of criticism that will help to win the war. We do not want political criticism that is meant to win votes and to make the people of this country dissatisfied.

Mr. MACDONALD: Would my hon. friend agree to the proposition that there should be a reciprocity on that basis; that the Government should set out to win the war and should give up playing politics?

Mr. LALOR: This Government are not playing politics; they are trying to win the war.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL: What does Sir Sam Hughes say?

Mr. MACDONALD: What does Sir Sam Hughes say about that and about Sir George Perley?

Mr. LALOR: We are not afraid of our record. In regard to the ex-Minister of Militia, hon. gentlemen opposite are very good friends of his now. How was it before he resigned his office? Who was it that followed the ex-Minister of Militia day and night in this House and out of it with reckless statements? Hon. gentlemen opposite are the men who did that and they know

it. I think that the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence did magnificent work in this country.

The enlistment of 400,000 men, and their equipment with everything necessary, showed the energy of General Sir Sam Hughes. We have raised an army greater than the British army at the time of the South African war, and I admire the young men of Canada who have responded so nobly to the call for volunteers. I have not heard hon. gentlemen opposite have the manliness to criticise the system of voluntary enlistment in the House, but I believe they criticise it outside in some parts of the country. If they do not approve of the voluntary system, why do they not move a resolution that we should have conscription? If such a resolution were moved, I imagine there are a great many hon. gentlemen opposite who would not support it; mighty few of them would be found to support it, in my opinion. But if they believe we should have conscription, we will be very glad to have them move a resolution to that effect, and, speaking for myself, I will support it.

Mr. MARCIL: The Government is running the country. It is for them to move the resolution, and not the Opposition.

Mr. LALOR: The hon. member himself would be a first class man to move it.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is it not a fact that the Prime Minister of this country has declared himself since the war broke out as adverse to any such thing as conscription?

Mr. LALOR: I understand that is the case, but that was early in the war.

Mr. MACDONALD: It was last year, in this House.

Mr. LALOR: I might remind the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) and the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) that their leader made the statement.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is not my hon. friend aware that the Minister of the Interior in his advertisements in the United States stated only a month ago that this Government did not consider conscription as either advisable or necessary in this country?

Mr. LALOR: I say that one of the most admirable things in the whole war has been the success of the voluntary system in Canada. Thousands of our young men have volunteered regardless of politics and regardless of religion. They have answered the call because they were Canadians, and it makes a man proud to think of it. When I told some friends of mine in the United States how our young men were enlisting in such great numbers, they had the idea that it was compulsory, and it was a great surprise to them when I said these young men were all volunteers. Only recently Colonel Roosevelt, though in favour of conscription, pointed to the success of the voluntary system of enlistment in Canada. But perhaps the time is coming when there must be a change. The cream of our young men have been obtained by the voluntary system, and we must have men to replace those who have fallen in the trenches, and it is questionable if the time is not fast approaching when there should be some other system of raising recruits in this country. I invite hon. gentlemen opposite to move a resolution along that line if they want to help win this war. They like moving resolutions, and this would be a first-class resolution for the hon. member for North Cape Breton to move.

Mr. McKENZIE: If I did move a resolution involving the expenditure of money, I presume the Speaker would rule me out of order.

Mr. LALOR: That rule does not apply to resolutions, but only to Bills.

Mr. McKENZIE: It goes further than that.

Mr. LALOR: Perhaps the hon. gentleman would tell me if he would support a resolution of that kind.

Mr. McKENZIE: I will tell the hon. member I would not.

Mr. LALOR: And there are a lot more sitting around him who would not.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am no coward, I say what I think.

Mr. LALOR: I am very glad, Mr. Speaker, that all hon. gentlemen opposite are not all of the same kind. I believe there are men on the other side of the House who would support conscription. I am sure there are men over there who are sick and tired of the tirades we have in this House every day, and who have some sense of their responsibility as members of this Parliament. There is my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark), who is not in the House just now. He has three sons in the trenches. I do not agree with the free trade theories he advocates in this House,

because I am a moderate protectionist, but I think the hon. member for Red Deer is on the wrong side of the House. I think he would be in more congenial company sitting on this side, for more reasons than one. But one reason is that we are a moderate protectionist party on this side, and have been since the days of 1878. We have never changed our policy in that respect from that day to this. The national policy was inaugurated in 1878, when this country was full of soup kitchens under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is free wheat part of your policy?

Mr. LALOR: We have been consistent protectionists from that time down to the present. I think the hon. member for Red Deer should be sitting on this side of the House, rather than with the hon. member for Pictou and his friends, who, though they advocate free trade and a low tariff, practised protection for fifteen years.

Mr. MACDONALD: What does my hon. friend think of wheat?

Mr. LALOR: I will come to that.

Mr. MACDONALD: You will dodge it.

Mr. LALOR: These free traders and low tariff gentlemen opposite were in power fifteen years, and what did they do? They adopted the Conservative tariff that was left them by their predecessors, and they never changed it during their fifteen years of office. On the contrary, they added steel bounties and paid out millions and millions of the people's money to my hon. friend's friends in Nova Scotia and Cape Breton.

Mr. McKENZIE: That comes in well in war time, doesn't it?

Mr. LALOR: It was a steel bounty; I do not know whether there was any "steal" in it or not. As I was saying, I think the hon. member for Red Deer would be in more congenial company on this side of the House. I do not think that such addresses as the House has listened to from the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte), the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) find much sympathy among some hon. gentlemen opposite. I notice the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney) taking his seat. I listened to his speech the other night with great pleasure, and I have had pleasure since in reading it in Hansard. It was a manly, straightforward, non-political speech. It is reported that the hon. gentleman is going to retire from public life.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I hope not.

Mr. LALOR: If it is true hon. gentlemen on this side of the House will regret it very much, because we have great respect for the member for Saskatoon. We also had a speech the other evening from the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles), who wanted the hon. member for Pictou and his friends to declare where they stood on free trade and protection. He said that his constituency wanted to know, that the people out there were getting a little bit tired of both political parties. A free trader himself, he wanted to know where the party he had supported for fifteen years stood. Hon. gentlemen opposite should stick to their principles, or let the public know just where they stand. They should not preach free trade and a low tariff in one place and whisper to the manufacturers and protectionists in other places: Never fear, put us into power, and trust us. I often wonder what these hon. gentlemen opposite would do if they came into power. I would like the hon. member for Cape Breton North (Mr. McKenzie) to tell me that. Would they really change the tariff? I think the hon. member would be ready to assure his friends in Nova Scotia that the tariff will be maintained, while he hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) will be ready to declare that they would introduce free trade. I was speaking to a member on the other side of the House who is engaged in the manufacturing business. I said: "If your side came into power and reduced the tariff, it would be a nice thing for your business, wouldn't it?" His answer was, "Don't worry we were in power for fifteen years and did not lower the tariff, and we would not lower it if we came into power now." Preaching one thing and practising another, in an effort to deceive the people—that is the history of the Liberals. Why, that is what they are doing right now in this House. One day we have a series of speeches from the gentlemen from the manufacturing towns and cities, telling about awful poverty that they say exists in those places—women and babies starving. It is not true, for there never was greater prosperity in this country than there is to-day. The price of farm products is high, it is true. But why should they not be high? The farmers deserve some prosperity. And, let me tell you, wages are pretty good—perhaps not quite equal to the increase in the cost of food, but still

they are good. Some of these hon. gentlemen talk about people starving, but there never was a time in this country when our people bought as good goods or as high-priced goods, or as many of them, as they do to-day. This is especially true of wearing apparel, and this shows that the country is prosperous. And, as I am reminded by a friend near me, the money in the savings banks is greater in amount than ever before in the history of the country.

We are told that the prices of farm products are high. They are pretty high and the farmers are pretty prosperous. But, let me tell you, they deserve a good deal of the prosperity they are getting. And don't forget that it cost a good deal more for the farmer to raise his crops now than it ever did in the past. Everything he has to buy is higher, and the wages he has to pay for help are very much more than formerly. In the province of Ontario to-day, there is an average of about one man for every hundred acres, because the young men have gone to the war. That means that the farmer and his wife and daughters are left to run the farm, and they are doing just as heroic work for the Empire as are the boys who have joined the forces, for we have come to the days when the need for food for the soldiers is fully realized.

We have a Government in power that is very kind to the farmers. We on this side are the farmers' friends, there is no question about that, for we have done more for the farmers than any other government in the history of Canada. A resolution will come before us this session to grant $10,000,000 for the building of good roads. We had a similar resolution before, and had it not been for the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite the farmers of our country would have had good roads. In my county, good roads are almost as necessary as railways, for the roads are not very good naturally. Our county has spent a lot of money on roads, assisted by the provincial Government. If the Bill that we passed in this House and sent to the Senate had been confirmed by the Senate, we would have had good roads through the county of Haldimand. We have got a majority now in the Senate—that is one good thing for this country, and we are going to pass the Bill and give the farmers $10,000,000 to build roads.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If the hon. gentleman will permit me—I made a statement that this Bill was to provide for an expenditure of $10,000,000, but I was informed officially that no such expenditure was contemplated. If I was in error, I am afraid that my hon. friend (Mr. Lalor) is equally in error.

Mr. LALOR: Certainly, the hon. gentleman is misinformed, for the Bill is to provide $10,000,000 for good roads. Of course, it is not all to be spent in one year— he did not expect that, I hope, but it is to be spread over a number of years. One of our great problems is the problem of providing employment for returned soldiers. If we spend $10,000,000 in building good roads for the farmers, that will provide something for the soldiers to do. I have great pride, as a representative of a farming constituency, in pointing to the rural mail system of this Government. The farmers to-day do not have to drive over bad roads for five or ten miles to the nearest post office to get their papers and letters, and then only get them once or twice a week; but a Government mail carrier goes to every farm house every day to deliver to the farmer his daily paper and his letters as well. I could enumerate many other things that this Government has done for the farmers. I am proud to support a government that has given more to the farmers than has ever been given in the past, and has looked to their interests better than any other government in our history. I am sure the farmers will show their gratitude for what has been done for them by supporting the government that has carefully considered their interest.

We have heard a great deal this session about the manufacturers. Hon. gentlemen opposite, for political effect, make the most vicious attacks upon the manufacturing interests of this country, and try and make the people believe that they are being robbed by extortionate high protectionist manufacturers. But I notice that some hon. gentlemen on the other side are themselves engaged in manufacturing. What do they want to do—I ask this question in all seriousness—when they make these statements? Do they propose to close the manufacturing industries of this country? Where are the returned soldiers going to get employment when they come back? In my county, and I am glad to say it is the policy of this Government, the returned soldiers get all the public offices. That is the policy we are supporting. But, they have to get employment as well in the factories and they cannot get employment if this policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is

carried out because probably a good many of the factories would be put out of business.

The manufacturers, I am pleased to say, have shown a good principle during this war. They are the only class of people who are directly taxed by the Government for the war. They have been asked to hand over to this Government 25 per cent of all the profits they make over a certain amount. I am pleased to say, and I think the Minister of Finance told us, that in all Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific, there has never been a grumble from a manufacturer. Although the tax amounts, in some instances, to hundreds of thousands of dollars, they have never grumbled or found fault, but have cheerfully paid over their money to the treasury of this country. Under the present taxation scheme of the Minister of Finance they will have to pay over very much more, in some cases as much as 75 per cent of their profits, and I believe they will cheerfully accept that taxation and pay whatever they are asked to pay.

Hon. gentlemen opposite advocated an income tax. I presume that income tax will fall upon large and small incomes. There is great difficulty in the administration of an income tax, as the Minister of Finance has told us. It is a very difficult matter to go to a farmer who is making a thousand or two thousand dollars a year and ask him to pay an income tax upon what he is making. I am rather inclined to believe in a tax on large incomes. That is a very small problem compared with the effort to raise revenue by means of a tax on small incomes because the people are paying taxes now indirectly if not directly.

I propose, in a moment, to refer to the attack made by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) on the canning business, but in the meantime I will mention another subject. We have heard a good deal in this House about the old reciprocity agreement. Hon. gentlemen opposite regard this as a child of their own and some of them are pleased to tell us about it yet. They cannot give it up although I do not think they really love the baby very much now. The Conservative party opposed reciprocity and the people voted against it. They were opposed to the agreement that was made by Mr. Fielding and the late Mr. Paterson. What was the result? The result of the defeat of reciprocity was that the Republican party went out of office in the States, the Democratic party came in, they gave us more than they would have given us under reciprocity, and we do not have to give anything in return. More than that, we have control of our own tariff

5 p.m. and our own tariff policy. We impose duty where we want to, we take off duty if we want to, and Washington cannot interfere. I have in my hand the Payne tariff, which was in force at the time hon. gentlemen were in power, the reciprocity agreement and the present trade arrangement, which is known as the Underwood tariff. I will just mention a few items, so that hon. gentlemen opposite can understand what a good arrangement the present Government have made by getting the Underwood Bill brought into effect. Under the Payne tariff, if a farmer shipped cattle less than a year old he had to pay $2 duty. If worth not more than $14 he paid $3.75, and if worth over $14 he paid 27½ per cent.

Mr. WILCOX: Is that the reciprocity agreement?

Mr. LALOR: No, that is the Payne tariff. We were told what a great thing it would be if we had reciprocity, because the farmers could ship their cattle to the United States and not pay any duty on them at all, that they would be absolutely free. Well, they are free now under the Underwood tariff. Therefore, there was nothing to be gained by the reciprocity agreement. Horses are a little different. Horses were 25 per cent under the Payne tariff. The reciprocity agreement would have made them free, and now we are charged 10 per cent. Hogs; I remember in my own county that a very good friend, a gentleman whom I admire very much but who is not of the same party as I am myself, told the farmers what an advantage it would be to them if they could ship their hogs over to the United States. The reciprocity agreement made them free, but they are free to-day. You can go down through this whole list and find many instances of this kind. Beef and lambs were free under reciprocity; they are free under the Underwood Bill.

An hon. MEMBER: Are they being shipped in?

Mr. LALOR: I do not know whether they are being shipped in or not. Poultry; the reciprocity agreement made them free; they were taxed under the Payne tariff 5 cents a pound, and they are now 1 cent a pound. Meats fresh; under the reciprocity agreement the farmer, if he wanted to ship his fresh beef to the United States, had to pay 1¼ cents a pound, but under the present

arrangement these articles are free. Bacon and hams were taxed under reciprocity; now they are free. Meats, salted, were taxed under reciprocity 1¼ cents a pound; they are now free. Wheat; you have heard about that before. Wheat used to be taxed 25 cents a bushel; the reciprocity made it free and wheat is free to-day, as you know. There has never been anything done by the Government that has hurt our friends upon the opposite side of the House so much as free wheat. I am sorry that we have not in the House now some of the representatives like the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), who talks free wheat when there is a duty upon it, and, when there is no duty upon it and it is made absolutely free, regrets that it is free. On speeches free wheat has gone into the scrap. They are now of no use to hon. gentlemen opposite. They have to get something new, and the hon. member for Assiniboia the other night tried to make out that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), on behalf of this Government, had endeavoured to persuade the farmers of the West to sell their wheat at $1.30 a bushel. There is nothing in that; it was simply the offer of the British Government that the Minister of Trade and Commerce submitted to the farmers of the West. I believe every member of this House knows it and that the hon. member for Assiniboia knows it as well. You can go down through the whole list of farm products and you will find that they are just as free as they were under reciprocity, and even some of the items that were taxed under reciprocity have been made free by the Underwood tariff.

Let me now take up the duty on flour. It was a good thing that the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) was a member of this Parliament when the Reciprocity agreement was being negotiated, because the hon. member for Huntingdon and his friends arranged that wheat should be free so that he could go over to the United States, if wheat was cheaper there than in Canada, and bring it here and grind it into flour. He also took good care that the Government then in power put a duty of fifty cents a barrel on flour. And we had a resolution the other night charging this Government with blame for the high price of flour, and finding great fault with the Minister of Labour because he did not do something to reduce the price. We were told that if the duty on flour of fifty cents a barrel were removed flour would be cheaper in this country, that the poor people of Canada would be able to buy it cheaper, the artisans, labourers, all who desired to buy flour would be much better off if they could only get free flour from the United States. Here is what the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) said:

> Yet this Government stands in the way and refuses to allow the farmers of Canada to sell their wheat in the United States. They simply refuse to come to the relief of the farmer when the farmer is not asking any favour but only saying: Give us the privilege of selling our wheat where we can sell it to the best advantage. But it is not only the farmer who grows wheat who suffers. What about that great big class of workmen, mechanics and consumers of Canada? Give us free wheat and the farmer who grows wheat will get a better price, and the man who is working for $1.50 or $2.50 a day, with a big family to feed and support, will buy his flour cheaper, so that it works both ways. I say that the workman can buy his flour cheaper.

Well, we have taken the duty off flour to help the poor man out, and there is no one finding greater fault than the right hon. gentleman and his supporters on the other side of the House. They proposed a resolution which occupied the whole time of this House yesterday. In that resolution they charged the Government with responsibility for the high price of flour, said that the Government were responsible, and wanted the Government, as I understood, to go out and buy all the wheat in this country, which is said to be 100,000,000 bushels which, at the present prices, would cost $300,000,000; then they wanted the Government to take over the flour mills of this country in order to produce flour cheaper for the consumer. Well surely you have all the advantage you could have even if such a step were taken when you have the market of the United States absolutely free. The member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) the other night compared prices in this country with the prices in Australia. Was that a fair comparison? Australia is 4,000 miles away from us. If the hon. member for Richmond had wanted to be fair in his comparison of prices he would have compared the prices of the United States and Canada. That would have been a fair comparison, because they are right beside us, and our farmers were told and always have been told that the prices in the United States for farm products were higher than here, while the consumer has been told that they were lower If the hon. member wanted to make a fair comparison, he would have compared the prices in the United States and in Canada. It is the same

old thing today as it was in the time of the reciprocity campaign, an attempt to deceive the people of this country. In my county on the day of the official nomination we always have a big public meeting in order that the candidates may express their views to the electorate. I remember that at the last official nomination during the reciprocity campaign a friend of mine handed me a leading Liberal paper of Toronto. One edition of that paper was issued for the farmers to read and the other for the people in the towns and cities. One told the farmers that if they had reciprocity they would get higher prices, that everything would be worth more, butter, eggs, wheat, stocks of all kinds—everything would go up. The other edition told the people living in the cities and towns that they would buy everything cheaper. Well, it was amusing. Fortunately I got the paper, and I think it amused the people very much to hear the statements of a leading Liberal organ in Toronto. Very largely I think as a result of that nomination meeting, I got three times the majority I had ever received before. I could go over the whole list of articles dealt with in the reciprocity agreement and show that we have gained by defeating reciprocity.

I do not intend to deal any longer with the remarks of the hon. member for Richmond, and his comparisons of prices. I want to say in all seriousness that the one thing we have to fear in this country is a shortage of food. There is no question about that. We talk about the high price of flour and the high price of wheat, but what I fear is that they are going to be very much higher than they are to-day. I think that the greatest trouble that is ahead of us in this country is a shortage of wheat and a shortage of food generally. I read to-day a dispatch which anticipates that the American Government reports which will be issued on Monday will show that 10,000,000 acres of fall wheat have been ploughed up in the United States. That is an alarming statement. The report will also say that the balance of the acreage in the United States will produce only 60 per cent of a crop. The Commissioner of Agriculture for the Dominion of Canada issued a statement yesterday that he had just received a cable from Australia, where they are harvesting their crop, stating that the Australian crop is 36,000,000 bushels short of the crop of last year; and in the same report this commissioner tells us that in the great wheat-growing province of Saskatchewan there is 1,500,000 acres less land ploughed this year than there was last year. I tell you that this is a very serious matter indeed. We talk about appointing a food dictator to tell what we should eat and what we should have on the table. I do not think such a plan would be very practicable in this country; it would be very hard to carry into effect a policy of that kind, although it may be possible to persuade the people to accept the conditions and to live as economically as they possibly can as far as food is concerned. I believe that all the food that we raise will be required by our people in Canada and by our men who are engaged in this war. It is not only the submarine menace that is so dangerous and doing such awful destruction. At the beginning of this war, a man said to me: God Almighty himself will finish this war by famine and by shortage of food. It looks very much as though his prophecy was going to be fulfilled, because we are short of wheat and short of food. I tell you that these conditions as to the wheat supply are very serious. I cannot see anything ahead but very high prices for wheat and flour as well; and if flour will stay at its present price of $14 a barrel and not go any higher, we can congratulate ourselves on the conditions that exist.

I now wish to refer to an attack that was made on an industry in which I am interested, the Dominion Canners Company. The member for Richmond (Mr. G. W. Kyte) made a general attack upon many industrial institutions in Canada, but of the industries that he mentioned there is only one in respect of which I can reply to some of the things that he said. I am not interested in the others and know nothing about them, but if his remarks as to these were no fairer than what he said about the Dominion Canners Company, of which I have been a director since its organization, then my hon. friend's whole statement was unfair and a misrepresentation. I am told that our friends opposite have recently issued some literature—I have not seen it, but I am informed as to this by a gentleman who has seen it—in which the member for East Elgin (Mr. David Marshall) and myself are painted in no very complimentary manner and referred to as having extorted money from the people. I am going to tell a few honest facts in connection with the Dominion Canners Company. It is a very large organization,

with about 75 factories spread from the province of Quebec to the province of British Columbia, employing 10,000 or 12,000 people in their factories in the canning season, contracting with farmers for 10,000 or 15,000 acres of land for vegetables alone. It is a large industry of which I believe the people of Canada may feel proud, because it is the largest institution of its kind in the world. Their methods have been fair and honest and they have never extracted from the people one dollar in the way of extra prices that they were not entitled to.

The hon. gentleman tells us in his statement that the Dominion Canners Company made in the year 1916 $555,777. In that statement he was correct. The Company has a large capitalization, which, I am proud to say, represents good hard cash that has been paid into the company. Let me tell you how they made some of that money in 1916. We know something about the prices of raw material. The Dominion Canners' Company, in 1916, had on hand nearly $1,000,000 worth of tin-plate, and the large increase in the price of tin-plate was responsible for our making $500,000 of the amount mentioned by the member for Richmond. Tin-plate that we used to buy for $3.60 a box is now worth $15 a box, and the same may be said of solder, nails, boxes, labels, and everything that is used in the canning business. The turnover of the company is very large, and I think it is only fair to take the figures for more than one year. That is something that is not quite fair about the Finance Minister's taxation. While the Dominion Canners' Company made a little money in 1916, they lost very heavily in 1915. Of course, the Government got no taxes then—and they did not come to our rescue and help us out. But in 1916, when we had a little better profit, we had to shell out 25 per cent to the Finance Minister to help him out.

In the year 1915 the Dominion Canners' Company lost $407,600. The member for Richmond did mention the loss, but he did not give the figures correctly; this figure is very much larger than that given by the hon. gentleman. In that year we put up a bigger pack of canned goods than ever before, and that in face of the increased cost of labour. These conditions, and the effects of competition, reduced the price of canned goods to such an extent that we lost in one year's operations the amount that I have stated. Let us compare the two years 1915 and 1916. I think it is only fair that we should do so. The total sum made in the two years was $149,000. That is a very small profit, indeed, upon the capitalization of our company and its operations for two years. We paid no dividend on our preferred stock in 1915 or 1916, because we could not do so. As a director of that company I was very sorry, indeed, that widows and other people throughout the country who wanted to get a dividend upon their stock to live upon were not able to get it because we had lost so much money. Recently we paid a dividend of 1¼ per cent on our preferred stock; the common stock gets no dividend. You can buy Dominion Canners common stock to-day at 20 cents on the dollar, and you can buy preferred stock, with all these back dividends due upon them, at 70 or 75. Is it fair to make an attack upon a big organization which is in such a financial position as this, and which is struggling as the Dominion Canners Company has been struggling? I would tell the member for Richmond if he were here that the Dominion Canners Company in two years' operations turned out $15,000,000 worth of goods and they cleared less than one per cent on their turnover. Still hon. gentlemen opposite in their campaign literature say that the Dominion Canners Company are robbing the people and extorting money from them. That is grossly unfair, and would be unfair to any business organization like the Dominion Canners Company, who are mindful of the interests of the farmers as well as the interests of the consumers.

I will give you a little more information about the Dominion Canners Company. It is not always wise for directors to tell all they know about a company in which they are interested, but I want the public to know, and I think the other directors of the Dominion Canners Company want the public to know, all the facts in connection with these unfair and unfounded charges that have been made. In 1916 there was a failure of the vegetable crop in Canada—tomatoes, peas and corn. In selling our goods to the wholesale trade we guaranteed them a delivery of 60 per cent, because their goods are sold before the crop is sown. Every wholesale house that bought canned goods from the Dominion Canners Company was assured of a delivery of 60 per cent. But the crop was so poor that we were able to deliver only 25 per cent of our pack, at prices that were contracted before the crop was grown. I myself went to the United States to buy 100,000 cases of canned goods to help us fill our orders, but could only purchase 60,000 cases. The

wholesale trade knew that we had lost a tremendous amount of money the year before and they were very generous with us; if they had not been generous, I do not know what would have happened to the Dominion Canners Company. They made a compromise with us by taking goods from us and cancelling the original contracts. The wholesale houses got a fair price for the goods last year, because conditions were such that they were entitled to it. You could not buy the goods from anybody else, and they got good profits. When the hon. member for Richmond says that the price of tomatoes was $2.15 a case, I may tell him that that was not the price that the Dominion Canners Company received.

This is the position of the wholesale trade in connection with the distribution of canned goods in Canada. The canners have always sold their goods to the wholesale trade at a profit of ten per cent; that is, the wholesale trade are allowed a profit of 10 per cent for selling the products of the Dominion Canners Company. That profit is not too large. Any business man who has ever sent out travellers to the retail trade knows that it costs about 7 per cent to sell goods, so that the wholesale trade have 3 per cent left for their profit, and to pay overhead expenses. That is the profit the wholesale trade have in the past received. I do not think that profit is excessive. The Dominion Canners Company, from its organization down to the present time has had one aim, one object in view, namely, to give the consumers the best quality of goods, and to charge them as reasonable a price as possible to cover expenses, interest on bonds and dividends on preferred stock. I regret that they have not been able to pay the latter for the last two years. The Dominion Canners Company is a large company, and I do not think any man can place any censure upon it or upon its methods of doing business, which are honest, straightforward and upright. As a member and a stockholder of that company, I am very sorry that a gentleman sitting on the opposite side of the House, not only this session, but session after session has attacked this organization for political purposes solely, to try to make a little bit of capital against some gentlemen who happen to be members of this House and supporters of the Government. That is unfair; further than that, the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) could direct his energies to a great deal better advantage in the House by trying to advise the Government as best he could, honestly, sincerely and non-politically, as to how to win this war.

And after all, there is something higher and nobler in life than mere wrangling over petty politics in this hour of our nation's sorrow, glorious though be the deeds of valour which our sons are achieving. May we not pause to think that in many a once happy home in this land there is mourning to-day. It comes close to all of us when we think of the fine young men who were our every day companions who now sleep their last sleep on the fields of France and Flanders and in Mesopotamia and in eastern Europe. Last week the news came to my own town that four splendid young fellows, well educated boys, had made the supreme sacrifice for liberty and humanity. If you go to the city of Toronto, you will see men with one arm or one leg or maimed in other ways going down the street. Such is the awful condition of things, and in addition to that there is the great problem of food that will face us in the future with the German submarines sinking our ships and sending loads of food to the bottom of the ocean. The conditions in this country to-day are alarming; they are awful, as we all know; and as regards the fighting in France, while we are pleased when we pick up the papers and read the headlines, to think that we are advancing just a little bit, yet, if we look at the papers for a week or ten days previous, we shall find that our forces are pretty nearly in the same position as they were in before. I noticed a despatch to-day stating that in the city of Berlin the Germans have turned their machine guns on their own people and shot down their own women and children, the poor women and children of Germany who are innocent in this war and who are crying for bread. Those are the methods that are used to quiet the people in Germany who are hungry. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite, like Mr. Kyte and Mr. Carvell—I am sorry to mention their names—day after day in this House, for political advantage, for party purposes, for what little impression they can make on the men in one section of the country or in another section, in the interest of the party, are occupying the time of the members of this Parliament who are sent here to devise some real remedies for the great evils and troubles that are facing us at the present time. It is lamentable, and I want now, as a humble member of this House, to appeal to the Right Hon. leader of the

Opposition, for whom I have the greatest respect—and I have never any hesitation in saying that, not only to his face but wherever I am—to set an example to his followers and to tell them to stop all this thing; to say to them: When this war is over, we will fight our political battles to a finish; we will make all the political capital that we can; we will turn the Tories out of office if possible; but for the sake of our nation, for the sake of humanity, let us at the present time help to steer the Government, if we can, to win this war. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that we are going to have an election. I hope not; I hope that neither of the parties of this House will assume that enormous, that grave responsibility. I am quite satisfied that the people of this country do not want politics and do not want an election at the present time. They want us to do our duty here to win this war, and they will respect the Opposition much more than they do to-day and thousands of people in this country, who have never supported the Opposition before will probably vote for them if they will do their duty and assist the Government at this time.

Mr. O. TURGEON (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, it is always with a certain timidity that I arise to address this House, but my timidity to-day is all the greater owing to the admonition of my hon. friend (Mr. Lalor) that no criticism of the Government should be offered by any hon. member on this side of the House. I feel, therefore, that I should perhaps stand aside and not make the remarks that I had intended to make, more especially as I am one of the members from the Maritime Provinces who are, according to my hon. friend, always causing trouble. But fortunately, Sir, so far as you are personally concerned, it may be that your familiarity with the spectre will permit you to keep patient while I address you for a little while.

Later on in my remarks I shall deal with the many arguments presented by my hon. friend. First of all, I wish to discuss something which he has said about the Intercolonial railway and that great enterprise of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, the National Transcontinental. Only a few days ago, we discussed the question of the Intercolonial for a whole afternoon and night, and I thought my hon. friend would have had all the information he could expect from any hon. member at that time without bringing up the subject again,

and displaying ignorance or forgetfulness when he spoke of the Liberal Government having added nothing to the Intercolonial Railway during the years they were in power. Does my hon. friend forget that the Drummond County Railway was taken over by my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Liberal Government in 1898-99 or shortly after they came into power in 1896 and that up to that date the Intercolonial railway from Hailfax was ending in a field at Lèvis with no proper terminals, and that the Liberal Government, as soon as they took office, extended the road to the great metropolis of Canada? Has he forgotten or did he ever know that the road known as the Gibson road connecting Fredericton with Chatham and Newcastle was taken over by hon. friends when they were in power adding 125 miles to the Intercolonial? Has he forgotten or did he ever know that in 1911 when we appealed to the country, a bill was awaiting its second reading for the taking over of the International, the Caraquet, the Kent, and other small branch railways in the southern portion of the province of New Brunswick, to be added to the Intercolonial? I might be pardoned for recalling the telegram sent by the present Prime Minister at the time of the election, pledging to take over all these branches if he was put in power, and I would ask the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat to tell me how many of those railways have been taken over in the six years this Government has been in office. In that time they have taken over only one of these railways, the International. My right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has been most generous to the Government in connection with everything pertaining to the war, and in extending the term of Parliament, yet after such generous treatment as that, when any hon. gentleman on this side of the House gets up and criticises the Government, he is accused of disloyalty. I never accuse any one in Canada of disloyalty, because I believe every man in this country is actuated by a proper sentiment whether he belongs to a Liberal or Conservative family. I think to accuse a person of disloyalty is the most terrible accusation one can make.

I wish to say just a few words about the Transcontinental railway, which hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to make so much political capital out of. That road in a few years, I am sure, will prove its usefulness. It would have proved it already if it had not been for the attitude adopted by this

Government when they took office. It appeared to be their deliberate object to show the people of this country that a great mistake had been made in constructing that road, and they at once set about to get public opinion on their side. Mr. Gutelius, who made the report on the Transcontinental has by his actions on the Intercolonial contradicted his own report. The report showed that he cared nothing for his reputation as an engineer. When he took charge of the Intercolonial he tried to improve the roadbed as much as possible so that trains could haul a greater number of cars between Moncton and Halifax and Sydney, and at a cheaper rate. Since the Government have taken over that portion of the Transcontinental between Winnipeg and Cochrane, the Minister of Railways and Mr. Gutelius have been advertising it as the best road on the American continent. They say that the service and equipment of the trains is unsurpassed. Why do they not boost to the same extent that portion of the road between Cochrane and St. John? My right hon. friend told the country that it would not be a great many years before great industries and populous villages would be settled along that line of railway, and people would go in there by the hundreds and thousands. Why is it that they have not gone? It is simply because this Government have not afforded the facilities which it was intended to give, and which it is able to give them to-day. It is only a few nights ago that the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) threatened to tear up the rails on that portion of the Transcontinental that crosses New Brunswick. This Transcontinental road was expected to cement our provinces closer together, provinces that already were united by industrial and commercial activities, and which had heard the eloquent appeals of Haliburton, Joseph Howe, Tupper, Tilley, Mitchell, mingled with the eloquent appeals of Cartier, Macdonald, Brown, and others. All these men made eloquent appeals to the provinces that were united by the still more noble ties of brotherhood, humanity and charity. Charity, by the way, is a virtue which some hon. gentlemen opposite seem to lack when they talk of the Maritime Provinces. The Maritime Provinces have all played their part. We have given to the West the great harbours with which our shores are so generously endowed, and which are to-day so necessary if Canada is to become the great nation we expect her to be. My hon. friend said that the building of the Transcontinental from Quebec to New Brunswick was opposed by the Hon. Mr. Blair, who resigned because of the construction of that road. Very few men, permit me to say, have been closer to the heart and mind of the people of this Dominion than the late Mr. Blair, and by none is his memory more revered than by me. The Hon. Mr. Blair always treated my county of Gloucester with the greatest justice and consideration. His name is mentioned in every home in the county almost as if it were the name of a father.

I only do him justice when I say that I know that the action he took was inconsiderate and that he regretted it next day. And, perhaps, that was one of the causes that took him so quickly from us, to our great regret. This Transcontinental road across the Maritime Provinces, coming as far as Moncton and bringing down the products of the West to be shipped from the ports of St. John and Halifax, might easily have been made the bearer of a much greater traffic, had the crossing at Quebec been completed. But, through the failure to make this connection and in other ways, the Government have caused this traffic from the West to reach Toronto and Montreal, to be ultimately diverted to American harbours. Some day the Transcontinental across New Brunswick will be one of the best paying roads in Canada. When a government undertakes an enterprise of such consequence as a transcontinental railway it has not in view the returns of the very next day; it looks to the future. This patriotic plan of uniting by another road the Atlantic coast with the Pacific should have had the effect of making the portion of New Brunswick to which I have referred one of the most highly productive parts of Canada. I am surprised that my hon. friends from Ontario are not satisfied with the development which the Transcontinental has given to the trade through that province. The connection from Cochrane to North Bay by the Temiskaming & Northern Ontario railway —itself the conception of a great Liberal statesman, the late Sir George Ross—gives Ontario another means of connection with the West, and that province is thereby greatly benefited, just as central New Brunswick has benefited. The younger generation, when they make up their minds no longer to go to the United States, but to spend their energies in developing the land

in which they were born, will see this middle portion of New Brunswick the scene of many thriving industries, especially the pulp and paper manufactories for which it is so well fitted. And the traffic thus developed must make the magnificent scenery of the Miramichi valley and other portions of that country famous; for, while not so inspiring as the scenery of the Rocky Mountains of British Columbia, its beauties will attract many lovers of nature, and will convince them that Providence has been generous to eastern as well as to western Canada.

On the motion of Mr. Turgeon the debate was adjourned.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

The House in Committee on Private Bills, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

UNITED GRAIN GROWERS, LIMITED.

Further consideration of Bill No. 14 respecting the Grain Growers Grain Company, Limited, and to authorize it to change its name to "United Grain Growers, Limited."—Mr. Bradbury—in Committee.

On section 5—Power to prohibit shareholder voting by proxy:

Mr. BRADBURY: Before we go any further, an arrangement has been come to by which an amendment is to be made to that section. The discussion, the last time the Bill was before the House, was on clause 5 and that was regarding the voting to be permitted. The matter has been thoroughly explained and I am informed that my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) is perfectly satisfied with this amendment which has been placed in my hands. The amendment, which I beg leave to move, seconded by Mr. Schaffner, reads as follows:

That section 5 be amended by adding the following sub-section: "No by-law passed under the provisions of this section shall go into operation until a by-law has been passed under the next following section giving the shareholders representation at annual and other meetings by means of elected delegates as soon as the right of voting by proxy is abolished."

This, I think, clears up the difficulty.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would suggest that the preceding subsection be numbered 1 and this 2.

[Mr. Turgeon.]

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I understand that it is not customary now to number the first subsection. The second is No. 2 but the first is not numbered 1 because it is 1.

Mr. MACLEAN: I think that has become the rule here but I do not think it is considered good drafting all the same.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am disposed to agree with my hon. friend but I know it is customary.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

MOUNT ROYAL TUNNEL AND TERMINAL COMPANY.

Bill No. 37, respecting The Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Company, Limited.—Mr. Rainville—in committee.

Mr. MURPHY: I notice that this Bill has been amended. Would you be good enough, Mr. Chairman, to indicate what the amendment is?

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment is in clause 2: "Section 12 of chapter 74 of the Statutes of 1912 is hereby repealed."

Mr. MURPHY: Can any one tell us what that was?

Mr. BLAIN: This work is pretty well advanced; indeed, a train has passed through the tunnel. The Bill merely provides for an extension of time. There is no opposition from the city of Montreal or from any other source. I regret that I cannot give a proper answer to my hon. friend's question, but I may say that the matter is not contentious. There is but little change from the terms of the original Bill.

Mr. MURPHY: From the reading of the amendment by the chairman, it occurs to me that it may be a verbal change made necessary by this new Bill. Apart from that, however, I desire to point out to the committee that, as the hon. member for Peel has just said, the works referred to in this Act are rapidly approaching completion. A train went through the tunnel a week or ten days ago. The contract for the terminal on Dorchester street was let some time last fall, and the work there is fairly well advanced. The people of Montreal and vicinity are very much interested in the progress of this work; the Montreal newspapers devote a great deal of attention to it. Sir Donald Mann was recently interviewed, and stated that the trains through

the tunnel would be in operation by August next, if I mistake not. I read in one of the Montreal newspapers not very long ago that financial arrangements have been made that necessitate an application of the moneys that have been secured by way of loan for the completion of this work to no other undertaking of the Canadian Northern Company. Under these circumstances it occurs to me that five years is a rather long extension to grant, and that a couple of years at the outside would be sufficient, if the work is really to be completed, and if it is as near completion as persons connected with the Canadian Northern railway and their officers represent it to be. These works have dawdled along for quite a number of years, and possibly if a shorter extension commensurate with the requirements of the company were granted they would be brought to completion much more quickly. I invite an expression of opinion from some gentleman from Montreal who is more familiar with the matter than I am.

Mr. LEMIEUX: While under ordinary circumstances the extension would appear to be rather long, I may point out that of all the enterprises of the Canadian Northern this is, perhaps, the only one which has been brought to a successful issue. Since they started the tunnelling of the mountain at Montreal they have not stopped their work, and I know that in a short time they intend to build a convenient station and terminus on Dorchester street. I think that under the circumstances the committee would do well to give them the extension for which they ask.

Mr. MURPHY: Five years is rather long.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Perhaps so, but even during this war and under the difficult conditions which every railway company has had to go through, the Canadian Northern has been doing excellent work in Montreal. On account of the fact that they have tunnelled the mountain and that they are building the station, as I am told that they have secured the necessary funds to build it, I think we should grant them that extension of time.

Mr. MURPHY: I hope my hon. friend is correct. Could my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) give us any statement as to that?

Mr. BLAIN: That matter was discussed in committee and every one present was quite satisfied with the progress of the work, as my hon. friend from Rouville has pointed out.

Mr. MURPHY: Did any representative of the Canadian Northern railway give to the committee any assurance regarding the completion of the work?

Mr. BLAIN: Yes, that was assured.

Mr. MURPHY: Who was present?

Mr. BLAIN: Mr. Ruel, and he made a statement before the committee that the work was progressing and that a train had been sent through, which would show that the rails had all been laid. The extension of time, as I understand it, is to complete the terminals. The representative of the Canadian Northern railway promised the committee that the work would go forward at once and be completed in a short time. There is something in what my hon. friend says. The time of extension seems to be rather long, particularly as the work is so well advanced, but I do not think there is any cause of complaint in that regard. The work has been pushed forward in a fairly satisfactory manner to all concerned. In answer to the question of my hon. friend in respect to the clause that was repealed, the clause to be repealed is:

> The company shall commence to construct a tunnel on the said line of railway within two years after the passing of this Act—

And so on. That is the general clause. The committee may feel quite safe as to the work being pushed forward as rapidly as possible. The question is a fair one to come up before this committee, and on that point I can assure the committee that it may be perfectly satisfied.

Mr. MURPHY: The Railway Committee acted on the assurance of Mr. Ruel, representing the Canadian Northern railway, that the work would be completed within the time given, and so agreed to the extension?

Mr. BLAIN: Yes.

Bill reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

THIRD READING.

Bill No. 6, respecting the Athabaska Northern Railway Company.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill No. 9, respecting the Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill No. 17, respecting the Westerrn Dominion Railway Company.—Mr. Smyth.

Bill No. 26, respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill No. 28, respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—Mr. Rainville.

Bill No. 30, respecting the Canadian Western Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill No. 16, to confirm certain agreements made between the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company and the Canadian Northern Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 34, respecting the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Northrup.

Bill No. 35, respecting the Kaslo and Slocan Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 36, respecting La Companie de chemin de Fer de Colonisation du Nord —Mr. Northrup.

Bill No. 5, respecting the Guardian Accident and Guarantee Company and to change its name to the Guardian Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Achim.

Bill No. 15, respecting the Saint John Board of Trade.—Mr. Pugsley.

Bill No. 29, to amend the Act Incorporating the Canadian Surety Company.—Mr. Macdonell.

SECOND READING.

Bill No. 44, to incorporate Alliance Nationale.—Mr. Achim.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Department of Labour—Industrial Investigation Act, $25,000.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour) Before taking up this item I desire to make a very brief statement concerning the expenditures of the Department of Labour, chiefly for the purpose of correcting two or three mis-statements that have been made respecting them. Some time ago the hon. member for Rouville, in criticising the expenditures of the various departments, stated that there had been an increase in the total expenditure of the Department of Labour between the years 1911 and 1915 of 50 per cent. On being challenged, he declared that he would prove his statement up to the hilt when we came to the estimates.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Did I make that statement this session or last?

Mr. CROTHERS: Last session. The Public Accounts show that for the first full year after we were in power, namely, from March 31, 1912 to March 31, 1913, the expenditure of the Department of Labour, instead of being 50 per cent more than the expenditure in the last full year of our predecessors, namely 1910-1911, was 17 per cent less, and last year, 1915-16, our expenditure was 15 per cent less than in the last full year of our predecessors. Our expenditure last year, ending on March 31, the figures for which do not appear in the Auditor-General's report, but which I have made up, was about $700 less than the year before, and 15 per cent less than the last year hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. So that instead of the expenditures of the Department of Labour having increased by 50 per cent, there was a decrease of 17 per cent the first year we were in power, and of 15 per cent in the last two years. My hon. friend from Assiniboia, discussing the same subject, though I think he must have got his information from a different source, said that the expenditures of the Department of Labour for the last four years showed an increase over the expenditure when the hon. gentlemen opposite were in power of 32 per cent. The explanation I have just given in answer to the statement of my hon. friend from Rouville covers also the statement of my hon. friend from Assiniboia. If I may repeat, the decrease the first year we were in power was 17 per cent, and last year and the year before there was a decrease of about 15 per cent instead of an increase of 50 per cent or 32 per cent.

Labour — Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, $25,000.

Mr. BURNHAM: Might I suggest that this sum is not nearly large enough, if it includes anything more than simple investigation or incipient preliminary inquiry. Surely, the House ought to have grasped the fact that labour is something of a more extended character than simply the pulling back and forward of interests called labour. It has too long been the fashion to suppose that the time would come when we should arrive at some settled point. That settled point never can be arrived at in labour, I submit, any more than in any other branch of economics. It is precisely like phenomena of meteorology. You never can tell where an eddy of air is going to work out at any one time. The economic equilibrium can never be attained. I would not say that it is a mathematical impossibility, but it is certainly a human impossibility; and, since there

are different people in the world, different dispositions, rivalries, various elements, that go to make up all these different currents, it must follow that there can never be a precise equilibrium. The effect will always manifest itself in continual upheaval. For people to say that we have arrived at the milennium because the minimum wage of labour is so and so, is to state what may be true at this moment; but, having regard to the theory of rent, having regard to the Malthusian doctrine, having regard to the theories of John Stuart Mill, or any other elementary writer on political economy—Thorold Rogers, or anybody else you like—it will be seen at a glance that it is simply one horse pulling against another in the great economic struggle, and you never can tell which is going to be ahead; one appears to be ahead and satisfied, but in a moment it is pulled back and the other is ahead; and so this struggle goes on. To maintain the fair, impartial and true condition of the whole economic world is the duty of the legislators of the nation; that is the duty of the members of this House, and particularly of our expert, the Minister of Labour. That being the case, why cut down to a paltry sum the investigation into one of the very few great elements of the whole economic struggle? I am sure the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) will rise in his place and reassert such a simple principle as that. We are so continually doing things in what we call the law, an ad captandum way—continually plastering up one little hole, or dealing with one little difficulty, never realizing that there is an underlying principle which, if we once ascertain it, gives us the solution of the problem. We must get out of this fashion, or else cease to call ourselves cultivated and scientific. It is just as in the study of zoology, or comparative anatomy, it is a question of life, of living beings, and what is needed is an analysis of experience in order to enable us to understand the elements of the problem we have to face. We shall not reach the solution by considering separately such questions as the price of flour, or the rate of wages. That is absurd. It does not matter what these are, so long as they are in equipose.

Mr. MURPHY: Would the hon. gentleman say how much additional would establish the equilibrium he has advocated?

Mr. BURNHAM: I would reply by saying that I am criticising the disposition to pare down this item. That is all.

Mr. LUCIEN PACAUD (Megantic): I wish to avail myself of this opportunity to bring before this committee the facts disclosed to us by the documents brought down by the Minister of Labour in connection with the strike at Thetford Mines. In doing so, it is not my intention to elaborate at any great length the views I hold, nor is it my intention to indulge in any extensive criticisms which, though they may be, I am sure, quite proper, quite just, quite well-founded, would most likely fall on deaf ears so far as concerns the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers). My one object in rising is this: The miners of Thetford Mines have a just grievance against the Minister of Labour for the most extraordinary attitude which he saw fit to take at the time of our strike last year. As I share that grievance and as I am their representative, I intend to voice our grievance before this committee, and to set forth the facts which gave rise to them. At the beginning of June, 1916, a situation arising out of difficulties between the asbestos companies and the miners became most acute. There seemed at that time no ground for a compromise between the men and the companies. The Department of Labour was officially notified of this situation by a letter which I hold in my hand, written by the Secretary of the Western Federation of Miners on the 20th of June, 1916:

To the Director of Inquiries,
Department of Labour, Ottawa.

Sir,—Would you be kind enough to send me immediately a copy of the Industrial Disputes Act, with all its amendments, the by-laws passed in conformity with this law, and also the blank forms necessary to make a formal request for a board? Does Article 57 of this law require that a notice of thirty days be given by the employees to the employers who desire a raise of salary of fifty cents per day, before making their request for an inquiry?

Believe me,
Yours very truly,
L. J. L. Rousseau.

I received the first surprise of many which the perusal of the documents gave me when I ascertained that this letter was not included among these documents. I waive my right, for the present, to make any comment on this point. But I may add that there was no answer to this letter. So, on June 27—seven days later—Mr. Rousseau wrote a second letter as follows:

To the Director of Inquiries,
Department of Labour,
Ottawa.

Sir,—We have here a thousand of our members who are not satisfied with the condition of labour, and who have decided to strike if they

do not get satisfaction. A request for a raise of salary has been made and the employers have decided of refusing our request. We are actually taking a vote, which will close on the 1st July, and we have reason to believe that the vast majority is in favour of a strike. We, the officers of the Federation, are endeavouring to obtain a compromise between employees and employers. The 20th instant I asked for blank forms necessary to make our request for inquiry, and you did not answer our letter. Please let me know if you still have these forms or better still, to send me them. If there are no special forms I would be very much obliged if you will inform me upon this matter.

L. J. L. Rousseau,
For the Union of Asbestos Miners
W.F.U.

I may say that this letter was also not amongst the documents laid on the table of the House.

Mr. CROTHERS: What is the date of that?

Mr. PACAUD: The 27th of June. The department replied on the 29th June, 1916. I may say immediately that I consider this letter the most important of all those written, or received, by the department in connection with this case. It was not on the file with the documents brought down. Here is the letter:

Deputy Minister of Labour, Canada.
Ottawa, 29th June, 1916.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 27th of June, and in answer I am enclosing you four copies of the forms prepared by this office for a request for a council of conciliation and enquiry. We had not noticed that your letter of the 28th of June contained such a request. I hope that the officers of the Federation will continue to do their best to settle amicably these differences, and if this cannot be done through direct negotiations, that the employees will request a council of conciliation and enquiry. There are no special by-laws on this point, but you will find in the forms which we are addressing you, the printed information touching certain details, and in following closely these institutions, the petitioners would evade all errors.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) F. A. Acland,
Deputy Minister of Labour.

Mr. L. J. L. Rousseau,
Thetford Mines, Que.

I will call the special attention of the minister to this part of the letter. This was a true declaration of policy on the part of the department. The minister was giving in this letter his intention, or the intention of his department, to follow the strict letter of the law as it is laid down in the Industrial Disputes Act 1907:

I hope that the officers of the Federation will continue to do their best to settle amicably their differences, and if this cannot be done through direct negotiations, that the employees will request a council of conciliation and enquiry.

I will refer to this a little later on.

Mr. MURPHY: Who signs that?

Mr. PACAUD: F. A. Acland, Deputy Minister of Labour. I have a letter dated the 30th June and addressed to Mr. Rousseau which is of secondary importance. It informs Mr. Rousseau that:

Mr. Narcisse Arcand, one of the officers of this department, has been charged to go to Thetford Mines and to give you all the assistance to settle amicably the differences arising between the employers and the employees.

Before I go any further I hope the minister will be in a position to tell us exactly what was the work that was performed by Mr. Arcand at Thetford. He was sent there by the department, but I notice in the documents brought down by the minister there is no mention of him at all. I know he was around there for a week or so, and I understand he was dismissed from the service. I do not know if it was in connection with that strike or not. Negotiations went on between the 30th June, the time of the arrival of Mr. Arcand, and the 15th July. Then a petition was sent to the department. This petition requested a board of conciliation. I notice that in this petition there are three special points. First, it was declared that the cause of the dispute was that the present wages were not in proportion to the high cost of living. The petition is in French, and it says:—

The cause and the nature of the difference is that the present wages are not in proportion to the high cost of living.

In the second place, they note that 90 per cent of the men had voted in favour of a strike, but that the officers had decided to ask for a report. In the third place, it was stated that direct negotiations were impossible in view of the fact that the employers had stated that no concessions would be made. I wish to direct attention to this point in the petition that Mr. Sharpe, manager of the Asbestos Corporation of Canada, had declared to the men that he had absolutely no concessions to make. Therefore, to return to the letter of the 29th June from the department, it was stated that if negotiations failed the men would only have to apply for a board and it would be granted. That letter was in reply to the letter of the 27th, which made reference to the possibility of a strike, and, therefore, the letter of the 29th could only have that one meaning. Therefore, on the 15th July, when the

petition was sent to the department, the minister knew that direct negotiations were at an end, because, in order to have direct negotiations, there must be two parties. One of the parties having said that he was not going to make any concessions whatever, the men had an absolute reply to the letter of the 29th of June, and they sent forward their petition. That was on the 15th July. On the 24th July the department sent the following letter to Mr. Rousseau:—

Department of Labour,
Canada.

Ottawa, 24th July, 1916.

Re—law of enquiries in matters of industrial disputes of 1907, concerning the differences between the proprietor of the Asbestos Mines at Thetford Mines, Quebec, and their employees, members of the local Union, No. 143 of the Western Federation of Miners.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge reception of a petition signed by Mr. Joseph Vallée, and by yourself, as President and Secretary of the local Union 143 of the Western Federation of Miners, requesting the establishment by the miners of a commission of conciliation and enquiry by virtue of the law of enquiries in matters of industrial disputes, 1907. The petition does not mention clearly that yourself and Mr. Vallée had informed the employees of the information given out at the time of your conference in the office of the Minister about one or two weeks ago, with the representatives of the principal Asbestos companies.

The questions which the petition claims are in dispute comprise the recognition of the Union, the check of system, etc. The opinion of the Minister is that these questions cannot be properly submitted to a commission of conciliation to be settled, and that it seems understood that the question of the recognition was not to be regarded as vital and was given up. As for the claim for a raise of wages, the conversation held in the office of the Minister established, you will remember, that a raise of salary having been given during the month of April last, and that the representatives of the company and of the employees at that meeting seemed to have come then at the conclusion that no advantage would probably result from a new agitation of this question at the present time.

The opinion of the Minister is, in the first place, that the employees of each company should be informed by Mr. Vallée or by yourself of the general nature and of the results of this discussion in question; and, in the second place, that the pending questions should be discussed with each company separately, through the medium of a committee of employees, and you will remember that the Minister obtained for the Secretary of the Union the privilege of accompanying the committee of employees and to plead their cause. In proceeding along these principles, the employees will act in accordance with the entente which have been arrived at in the office of the Minister.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,

(Sgd) F. A. ACLAND,

Deputy-Minister of Labour, and Clerk of the Commission of Conciliation and Enquiry.

Mr. L. J. L. Rousseau,
Thetford Mines, Que.

I think that before going any further it would be well to summarize the position taken by the minister. On the 27th of June, he received a letter from the men informing him that the situation at Thetford is serious, that on the 1st of July they intended to take a vote as to whether or not they would go on strike. On the 29th, the minister writes acknowledging the receipt of this letter and telling the men: We are pleased that you are trying to negotiate; continue your negotiations and if you are not successful ask for a Board of Conciliation. In the petition of the 15th of July it was clearly established and proved that direct negotiations were impossible, and the petitioners requested, not a favour, but the application of the law. The minister acknowledges the receipt of the petition on the 24th of July and then he says: But there is no more ground for a Board of conciliation; you, Mr. Vallée or Mr. Rousseau, go and see individually every miner, 2,000 of them; and after you have seen them individually and told them what happened in my office in April, that is six months before, go and see every employer and tell him what happened in our office at that time. All of this was in the letter of the 24th of July, although we do not find it in the letter of the 29th of June. This letter was answered by Mr. Rousseau in the name of the union:

Thetford Mines, 28th July, 1916.

The Clerk of the Commission of Conciliation and Enquiry,

Sir:—

In answer to your letter dated the 24th of July I wish to tell you that we do not see why our petition requesting a commission of conciliation and enquiry should contain clearly that we had previously informed our members of the information gathered at our conference at Ottawa, so that it would be accepted. As a matter of fact, we had informed our members of all the details of our interview with you. We take the permission of calling your attention on the fact that the points in dispute are: raising of salary from $2.00 to $2.50, that is to say approximately 25 per cent on the salaries as they are to-day.

During April last, it is true that there was a raise of 25 cents as an average, but taking into consideration the rising cost of living which is constant, our members have decided to claim this new raise of wages of 50 cents per day which is most reasonable and below the salaries paid in other parts of Canada.

We must consider further that our members do not work when the weather is bad, which is not the exception in our locality. You tell us in your letter that the opinion of the Minister is that the miners of each company should submit and discuss with each manager separately the questions in dispute. We differ totally with you. His opinion would perhaps be good, if we were not organized as a labour union, but as such is the case, the moment that

our union by a vote taken at a meeting especially called to discuss such a demand, that decision becomes collective and applies to all the companies indiscriminately where our members are employed. If the opinion of the Minister was followed in the present case, we would have to follow it in cases where a trade union is engaged in about 500 different industries, which would be an impossibility and proves that that opinion is not conformable neither to the spirit nor to the letter of the law on industrial disputes. Nevertheless, we have fulfilled his desire through protesting on the interpretation given by the minister, and here is the result of our interviews. Mr. Hammerick, of the Jacob Asbestos, refused to grant the wish of the Minister in allowing me to accompany the delegation of miners from his mines. His answer was that his company could probably pay the salary that was requested but he did not know what to do under the circumstances. Mr. Johnson was amiable enough to meet the desire of the miners and he said in substance: that the raise of wages was favorable and agreeable to him, but that it would be necessary to come to an understanding with the other miners. Hon. J. R. Smith refused to recognize the advice of the Minister. We tried to meet Messrs Sharp & Bennett, but we were unable to do so due to their numerous occupations. A great many people are enticing our men to strike. The detectives are daily repeating to our men: Hold on, you will win out. We cannot keep our men any longer. We have had to-night a general meeting and it was unanimously resolved that the workmen considered that they should not wait any longer for a Board of Arbitration. If in the 2nd of August it is not granted, we will take a decision. We therefore renew our request for a Board of Arbitration and attract the attention on the fact that it is impossible for us to prevent our members any longer to go on strike if this Board is not nominated in the very near future, and we disclaim any responsibility for the situation which might arise as we have given evidence of patiotism in preventing up to this date a strike at the mine at Thetford Mines and that we have conformed ourselves to the laws which govern this country in making application for a Board of Arbitration.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) L. J. L. Rousseau,
Secretary, W.F.M.

Then we have Mr. Rousseau on the 29th of July again sending a telegram to the clerk of the council of conciliation and inquiry:

Thetford Mines, 29th July, 1916.

To the Clerk of the Council of Conciliation and Enquiry, Department of Labor, Ottawa, Ont.,—

Our interview with the miners of the mines has not had the success which was expected. At a meeting held the same night, we have passed a resolution to inform you that if a Board of Arbitration is not granted on the 2nd of August, we shall no longer wait. I am writing you the details.

(Signed) L. J. L. Rousseau.

The only reply that the men got to that letter was this, on the 31st July, 1916, from the Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour:

Ottawa, 31st July, 1916.

Deputy Minister of Labour,
Canada.

Sir,—I have the honor to acknowledge reception of your telegram concerning the actual differences between the employers and several of their employees at the asbestos mines of the district of Thetford Mines. We are taking measures which we hope will obviate the necessity of establishing a commission of conciliation and enquiry.

Anything but a Board of Conciliation.

In any case this department will not fail to make the greatest efforts in its power in the interest of peace and to assure the rights of the respective parties. We are waiting for the reception of the details promised in your telegram.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) Gerald H. Brown,
Assistant Deputy Minister of Labor.

Mr. L. J. L. Rousseau,
Thetford Mines.

Now we come to the culmination. The men had waited in vain. They informed the department officially on the 20th of June of their intention to take action, but the 3rd of August, 1916, arrived and nothing had been done. Then the minister received this telegram:

A general strike has been declared this morning at 7.30. The men are nearly all out of work.

L. J. L. Rousseau.

And I see on the 3rd of August a telegram to J. L. Rousseau:

Mr. Blanchet will be in Thetford Mines tomorrow to make public investigation. Have men continue work meantime.

(Sgd.) T. W. Crothers.

But the strike had already been declared. Mr. Blanchet came to Thetford. There was a very large meeting at St. Maurice, one of the sections of the town. The people had been informed that the department would send a man, but it was a great disappointment to them as everybody spoke but Mr. Blanchet, so that we did not know what mission he had. After the strike had been on for one week, on the 10th of August, 1916, the men had a letter from the minister as follows:

Ottawa, 10th of August, 1917.

Dear Mr. Rousseau,—

I was very much grieved to learn that the miners of Thetford Mines had left their work a few days ago, a fact which I cannot help but think was not at all wise, especially at a time when negotiations were going on in view of a settlement by agreement.

And this is after all the correspondence I have placed on Hansard to-night.

When the war broke out, I addressed to the employers and to the employees a special de-

mand to evade everywhere where it would be possible all labour difficulties, and I am happy to know that that line of conduct was generally followed by the two parties.

It is of the greatest importance for the workmen that all their efforts which tend to better their condition should be such as to attract the sympathy of the public in general, for if they have not the public opinion behind them, these efforts would not be crowned with any permanent success, and especially during the war, public opinion is decidedly opposed to any cessation of work. The product of the mines at Thetford is of urgent necessity for the pursuance of the war and it is, I believe, the duty of the employees to return immediately to their work, and if it is necessary they could continue negotiations in view of bettering their condition.

I hope that you will be able to use your influence to bring about a just and reasonable settlement of the present difficulty and at all events to persuade the employees to return to work. I understand that the operators are ready to raise the wages by 25 cents per day, and I believe that if this is true it would be to the better interest of the employees to accept this offer. I fervently desire that the employees should everywhere receive fair treatment, but at the same time I am strongly of the opinion that under the circumstances the workmen of the mines at Thetford should accept this offer and return immediately to work.

With kindest regards, I remain,

Yours truly

Mr. J. L. J. Rousseau,
Thetford Mines, P.Q.

The letter was not signed, but I presume it was from the minister. It is addressed to Mr. L. J. L. Rousseau, Thetford Mines, Quebec.

The most important fact brought out by this letter is that the minister did not consider that the strike was a serious matter. He recognizes the importance of the operation of the mines, in view of the war, but he does nothing to prevent the strike. He goes back on what he said in his previous letter. He is notified on July 30 by telegram and letter that on August 2 there would be a strike unless the law were applied. Although he recognizes it as urgent in view of the war that the strike should be prevented, this is the course he took: he passed an Order in Council dated August 3, sending Mr. Blanchet to Thetford to prevent the strike—after the strike had been declared.

But the miners of Thetford Mines were not to be denied consideration. They took to heart the little reproach of the minister and they sent him the following reply:

To the Honourable T. W. Crothers,
Minister of Labour,
Parliament Buildings, Ottawa.

Mr. the Minister,

We have at hand your letter of the 10th instant. In reply I wish to inform you that we have already acted in line with your wishes and that from the 10th of August last, the date on which you wrote us, the labour union of which I am the secretary had already given its assent to a resolution passed by a group of citizens of Thetford Mines, accepted at a meeting in which merchants and business men who are not workmen at the mines, but who have at heart the immediate settlement of these differences. You will see in reading a copy of this resolution, which accompanies my letter, that there is nothing excessively hard nor severe for the employers. It does not seem though that the latter have manifested any desire to accept it. The men belonging to the local catholic union have not as yet replied to the committee of citizens that they were ready to accept. We will add that as you informed us that the product of our men is of urgent necessity for the pursuance of the war, and that it was a patriotic duty for us to make certain sacrifices so as not to diminish this production. The union of which I am the secretary is right to accept an agreement still less severe for the employers and which is as follows:

1. The salary of all the workmen will be of $0.25 per day higher than it was at the month of July last.

2. This scale of wages would remain in force during one year.

I have here a letter from Mr. Deschamps, attorney-at-law of Thetford Mines, who was secretary of the meeting of citizens at Thetford Mines which had been convened by the mayor. The letter is as follows:

Thetford Mines,

August 10th, 1916.

Mr. Joseph Vallée,
President International Miners, P.Q.

Dear Sir,

At a meeting at Thetford Mines specially convened by His Honour the Mayor and held at the City Hall this day at 3.30 p.m., it was resolved unanimously to submit to the proprietors of the mines and also to the Labour Union a project of settlement which was submitted by His Honour the Mayor, of which a copy is herewith enclosed.

You will oblige me by giving me as soon as possible a reply informing me if your union accepts this project, so that I may be able to submit your reply at the next meeting.

I do not feel that it is necessary to read this agreement. It is in absolute conformity with the terms of the letter written by the minister on August 10. The men had agreed to receive 25 cents a day.

I have given all the facts in this matter. The minister had one of two courses to follow: to respect the law or to evade it. He preferred to follow the latter course and to refuse a board of arbitration requested by the men, the law being very clear on this point. As a result of this refusal on his part for reasons which I do not wish to unveil, this body of men received more unfair treatment—I myself was a witness of what happened—than was ever accorded

to anybody in this country at the hands of a minister of the Crown.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, Thetford Mines is in the county that my hon. friend has the honour of representing in this House. He lives and practices law in Thetford Mines, and I am very much surprised that a lawyer should make such a deliverance as he has just made to the committee. He says that he has told us all the facts; I do not think he has. There were six separate corporations mining asbestos at Thetford Mines. There were two labour organizations there, a local one called the Catholic Association and the other the Western Federation of Miners. My hon. friend does not, perhaps, know all the facts, because three or four parties from Thetford Mines came to Ottawa on two occasions, first of their own accord, and the second time at my request. If the hon. gentleman had read the Industrial Disputes Investion Act he would not have made the speech that he has just made. Five minutes examination of that Act would have shown him that it does not lend itself to the establishment of a board of conciliation in the circumstances that existed at Thetford Mines. The first letter that he read from my deputy or myself was written at a time when we did not know anything about there being five other corporations or about the members of these labour organizations working at the six different mines. I am speaking from recollection because I have not any of the papers here. I am surprised that my hon. friend should have brought the matter up at all, it is so perfectly plain that the case was not one in which a board of conciliation could have been properly established. Two thousand five hundred men belonging to these two different organizations were working in the six mines, if I remember rightly, about 1,200 belonging to each organization. I have on many occasions pointed out that where similar circumstances existed, the Act did not permit the establishment of a board of conciliation.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Why not?

Mr. CROTHERS: I am coming to that now. One very prominent case occurred at Cobalt, where the miners were members of the same organization, the Western Federation of Miners. There were forty separate and distinct mines, with forty separate and distinct corporations running them, and we were asked to appoint a board of conciliation to investigate the conditions in those forty different mines, each one of which would have been entitled to name one of the members of that board. When I pointed out the facts and stated that the Act did not lend itself to any such action and suggested that we appoint a commission to inquire into the conditions in the forty mines, our suggestion was accepted; a commission was appointed, the investigation was made, and we have had no trouble since. Another case occurred at Toronto and Hamilton, where about a year ago a large number of machinists working in about half a hundred different factories asked for a board of conciliation. Each one of the fifty odd employers would have been entitled under the Act to name a member of that board, so, of course, I pointed out at once that we could not do anything of that kind, and I appointed another commission of three men, who investigated matters in Toronto and Hamilton, and made a report. I have had to deal with cases where there were only two employers who would not agree upon a man to represent them. If the employers all agree and say: We want one board of investigation and we will agree to have one man represent us on that board, a board will be granted at once. I have had cases of that kind in the smelter mines in western Canada. On one occasion four employers there agreed upon a man who should represent them on a board of conciliation and a board was appointed. There was, however, nothing of that kind here. The mayor of Thetford Mines, the President of this Western Federation of Miners and the secretary, whose letters my hon. friend has read, came to Ottawa at my request. The facts were these. These various corporations had increased the pay of their men by twenty-five cents a day the fall before and twenty-five cents a day again in April of last year, and in June they were willing to advance the men's pay by another twenty-five cents. Even with all these increases the wages would not be very high and, of course, wages were not so high then as they are now. Shortly before that we had had in that district two Boards of Conciliation which gave unanimous findings fixing the wages at $1.75 per day instead of $2.25, the representatives of the employers on those boards respectively agreeing with the representatives of the men, that $1.75 were the wages the men should get. I pointed that out to miners' representatives when they came to Ottawa: These companies will give you an advance of 25 cents a day more, and I think you

had better accept it, because I am afraid if you have a commission to inquire into the conditions, they will not give you as much as that; and I pointed out what those other two boards of conciliation had found, namely, that $1.75 were the correct wages. After their second visit, they left me thoroughly satisfied that they were going back with the intention of accepting the 25 cents advance, and that they would be satisfied with that.

Mr. VERVILLE: Where were these two boards of conciliation the minister speaks of?

Mr. CROTHERS: In Nova Scotia, and the awards were unanimous. The men were doing somewhat similar work.

Mr. DEVLIN: Did the minister advise the men of Thetford Mines that under the Act a board of conciliation could not be granted?

Mr. CROTHERS: I think I did.

Mr. DEVLIN: You did?

Mr. CROTHERS: I think I did. I am not sure; I am speaking only from memory, but I think I would have done so.

Mr. DEVLIN: That does not appear in the correspondence.

Mr. CROTHERS: I am sure, although I do not just remember the matter of telling them, but that is the first thing that would strike me in a case where there were six employers. The six men must agree on a man to represent them or we cannot grant a board of conciliation. I sent Mr. Arcand the fair-wage officer whom we had at that time for the province of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, and he did not succeed in reaching an adjustment or in inducing the parties to adjust the matters in dispute, and I took the course there that I have taken in many similar cases, that is, I appointed a commissioner, in the person of Mr. Blanchet, a barrister of Ottawa, who speaks both English and French fluently. He went down there and in a few days he got a perfectly satisfactory agreement signed up by two men from each of the six mines, or twelve men in all, some of them belonging to the Catholic Association and some belonging to the Western Federation of Miners. That agreement was perfectly satisfactory to everybody, and I was gratified at and fully satisfied with the work Mr. Blanchet had done, and I am much surprised that my hon. friend, who is a lawyer and who very likely possesses a copy of the Industrial Disputes Act, did not advise these men to keep on working and tell them that Mr. Blanchet, a fair and just man, was being appointed as commissioner and that he would make an honest report, as he did.

Mr. PACAUD: Why did the minister wait until a strike was declared?

Mr. CROTHERS: I did not anticipate a strike; I supposed the men were going to carry out my advice. I paid their expenses to come to Ottawa because I thought I could talk the matter over with them better than I could discuss it by correspondence. This matter was brought up by two prominent Liberals from Montreal, more from a party standpoint than anything else, before the Trades and Labour Congress held in Toronto last fall, and the solicitor of that Congress, Mr. J. G. O'Donoghue, who has been their solicitor for a great many years and who is well known to many members of this House, when he learned of the facts, said: "The minister is quite right; he cannot grant a board of conciliation under the circumstances," and any legal gentleman reading over the statute would come to the same conclusion. At any rate, in the end we secured a settlement that was satisfactory to everybody.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Did the men get the increase of twenty-five cents a day?

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes, and they went to work. I am very much afraid, to be frank with my hon. friend (Mr. Pacaud) that he did not make any effort to keep the thing quiet. I was advised at the time that he and another prominent Liberal in the town of Thetford Mines addressed a public meeting of those men and inflamed them to going on strike.

Mr. PACAUD: I deny that absolutely. I am very much pleased that the minister has mentioned the matter. I understood that the Department of Labour had sent to Thetford Mines some Austrians from the confinement camps to work for the Asbestos Corporation. Immediately before I attended the meeting, which was the only one I addressed, I went and saw the manager of the mine and asked if the men had been sent at the request of that company, and I asked the department and they said they were short of labour. They had to get detectives to protect the Austrians and see them safely home at the end of their day's work, but even then one of them got killed.

I did attend the meeting, and I am proud of it.

Mr. CROTHERS. Did you not denounce the Minister of Labour and the Government for not granting a Board?

Mr. PACAUD: I never mentioned a word about anything except the Austrians.

Mr. CROTHERS: But you denounced the Minister of Labour and the Government in connection with that?

Mr. PACAUD: Yes.

Mr. CROTHERS: And inflamed the crowd that was there?

Mr. PACAUD: I had a perfect right to attack the minister.

Mr. MACDONALD: He had a perfect right to attack the minister for sending the Austrians there.

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not know what my hon. friend means about sending them there. These men went there quite properly.

Mr. MACDONALD: If the minister sent them there, my hon. friend had a perfect right to attack him.

Mr. CROTHERS: I did not send them there in the first place, but if I had, the hon. member would not be right in denouncing me under the circumstances. Thousands of these Austrians are interned in different parts of the country. When the war broke out, the men interned were divided into two classes. The first class consisted of those who were suspected of being enemies; these men were interned, and have never been let out so far as I know. The other class consisted of men who had been dismissed from their positions because they were of Austrian or German birth. I am not finding fault with any one for that, but these men could not get work as they were of enemy birth, and many of them came to the Registrar and asked to be sent to the internment camp, where they could get something to eat and have their families taken care of, and this class were sent to the internment camps in large numbers. Subsequently, when there was work to be done, the men of this second class were let out if they were not thought dangerous, and that has been done all over the country. I accept my hon. friend's denial, of course. He admits, however, that he was at the meeting and that he denounced the Government. I submit that I did what was perfectly right in the circumstances, and under similar circumstances I should do it again to-morrow. I have nothing to retract, and nothing to apologize for, and the solicitor of the Trades and Labour Congress approved of my action.

Mr. DEVLIN: Who paid the expenses of these Austrians to go there?

Mr. CROTHERS: The employer pays the fare in the first instance, but recoups himself out of the first money earned by the men. If they remain a reasonable length of time, however, their fares are refunded.

Mr. DEVLIN: Did these Austrians come from the Abitibi district?

Mr. CROTHERS: I think they came from the Spirit Lake district.

Mr. DEVLIN: Surely the Government did not bring men 800 to 1,000 miles to work in the Thetford Mines?

Mr. CROTHERS: I did not say the Government brought them, but the employer.

Mr. DEVLIN: I know, but the original cost must have been paid by the Government.

Mr. CROTHERS: You mean the cost of sending them there?

Mr. DEVLIN: And bringing them back?

Mr. CROTHERS: No, the employer does that.

Mr. DEVLIN: I know a good deal about those Austrians.

Mr. VERVILLE: I am not a lawyer, and I am rather proud I am not in discussing a question like this, but the minister cannot claim ignorance of the law. He said a moment ago that the operators of these six mines should have got together.

Mr. CROTHERS: I did not say they should have; I said they might.

Mr. VERVILLE: The minister blames the men because they did not get the operators together.

Mr. CROTHERS: No, I do not.

Mr. VERVILLE: What was the reason for refusing a board? The minister said that the men would have to get a representative for each of the companies.

Mr. CROTHERS: When I said that it would be necessary to have a representative for each of the operators, I meant that they would be given the opportunity of selecting them.

Mr. VERVILLE: Very well. The minister says that at the outset they did not know how many mines there were in Thetford. That is a poor excuse.

Mr. CROTHERS: That is what you say.

Mr. VERVILLE: Do you mean to say that the Department of Labour or the Deputy Minister does not know how many mines there are in any mining camp in Canada? It is ridiculous to say that, and I am sure the deputy minister would not say it.

Mr. CROTHERS: The number of mines is one thing, but the number of mines involved in the dispute is another, and we did not know the number of mines involved in this dispute.

Mr. VERVILLE: It is all given in the letters that have been read.

Mr. CROTHERS: I am speaking subject to correction, because I have not the correspondence here, but my recollection is that no intimation is given in the first letter of any company but one being involved.

Mr. VERVILLE: I do not want to go over the whole correspondence again. It is all given in the application.

Mr. CROTHERS: Does the application mention more than one employer?

Mr. VERVILLE: I will not detain the House by reading it all, but I will give the names of the companies that are mentioned: Asbestos Corporation, Johnson Mines, Jacob Mining Company, Limited, Bell Asbestos Mines, Limited, Martin Bennett, Limited. That is more than one company, is it not? So the minister was wrong when he said the application concerned only one company.

Mr. CROTHERS: In the letter they do not say anything about these different employers being in the dispute.

Mr. VERVILLE: In the return I received there were three important letters missing, of the following dates, the 26th, 27th and 29th of June. These letters should have been in the return, but I suppose they were omitted through a mistake. I got them elsewhere. I do not mean to say that the minister is personally responsible for that, but the letters should have been in the return. As I have already said, the application was made on the 15th July, and the minister wrote saying the men should have got together so that he could grant a board. According to my understanding of the Lemieux Act, the minister is wrong. There have been cases before this, and I will cite one. The carpenters in Montreal some few years ago asked for a board, and although it was contrary to the law to grant one, as they were not a public utility, a majority of the men asked for a board and it was granted. In this case there was a builders' exchange.

Mr. CROTHERS: It can only be done by consent of both parties. They all agreed upon one man in that case.

Mr. VERVILLE: Surely the minister could have taken similar action in this case, instead of sending Mr. Blanchet down.

Mr. CROTHERS: We sent Mr. Arcand, and he reported that they could not agree.

Mr. VERVILLE: I have here the letter to the department, signed by Mr. Frank, who has been spoken of as their representative. In it he says that he has telephoned to the deputy minister to that effect. I do not wish to go over these letters again—we have agreed not to stay too late to-night. If the representative sent by the Minister of Labour was not sufficiently authorized he should have done the same as has been done in other cases; he should have sent the deputy minister. Does the minister say that on account of the war it would have been impossible even for a competent officer to get the operators of these mines together?

Mr. CROTHERS: We are satisfied with the result.

Mr. VERVILLE: Which result?

Mr. CROTHERS: The one Mr. Blanchet got.

Mr. VERVILLE: Two dollars a day! And this to support a family of five or six children, perhaps. Why, the minister could not buy cigars for that. It is a shame when any one says that men are satisfied with such conditions. Of course, I am not the sufferer, but how can anyone claim that he is satisfied because men are getting two dollars a day? The fact remains that these men have lost three weeks, or thereabouts. They were out on strike for that length of time—from the 3rd to the 23rd August. At $12 a week this would mean $36. Does the minister mean to say that these men will be able to make up that loss? It is his fault, and he knows it. I do not accept his statement that it would have been impossible to get these operators together and

to have a board appointed with a view to preventing a strike. It is true that the Trades and Labour Congress did favour the repeal of this Act. But I would be the first man to vote against that, and I have said so in the Congress.

Mr. CROTHERS: Was the hon. member (Mr. Verville) in the Congress in 1911, when they voted in favour of the repeal of the Act?

Mr. VERVILLE: I was always against the repeal of the Act, and am on record on that point in the Congress. I was man enough to tell them what I thought. The principle of the law is all right; it is the application of it that is bad. It has been poorly handled in many cases, and the hon. minister must know it. I suppose he will not express agreement with me in that. This strike ought to have been avoided, but what I wish to urge is more activity in these matters in the future. If there is the prospect of a strike anywhere the minister ought to use diligence and to appoint a board if necessary, so as to prevent the strike. The hon. minister says that this matter was brought up in Montreal by a Liberal. I am not a member of the Trades Council of Montreal, and so I cannot say whether the minister is correct in that or
10 p.m. not. But if he will tell me who was the man—

Mr. CROTHERS: The hon. gentleman was at the congress.

Mr. VERVILLE: But the minister said that it had been brought up in the Montreal Trades Council.

Mr. CROTHERS: No, I said it had been brought up in the congress by a delegate from Montreal.

Mr. VERVILLE: Who was he?

Mr. CROTHERS: I am not going to tell you that. Look up the record of the congress.

Mr. VERVILLE: The minister says that the man was a Liberal; does he know that to be the case?

Mr. CROTHERS: Yes.

Mr. VERVILLE: We have some men in the labour movement who are neither Liberals nor Conservatives, and if the man referred to is the one I think of, he is one of these—a Radical. I do not accept the information given by the minister that in this case it was not possible under the law to appoint a board. Of course, I must leave the discussion of that point to the lawyers, but at present I firmly believe that it was possible. But if there is impossibility in such cases, then it is time to change the law so as to make it more effective. I am only sorry that the men are satisfied with what they have received. I would not be satisfied with it—far from it. But I am discussing this matter with a view to the future, and I urge the minister to take steps in good time to prevent strikes.

Mr. CROTHERS: I am not surprised that my hon. friend (Mr. Verville) is not satisfied. Such men are never satisfied. They don't want to be satisfied; they want to have a grievance. He expresses the hope that this discussion will cause me to be more active in trying to avoid strikes. It will not have the slightest effect upon me.

Mr. VERVILLE: I did not suppose it would.

Mr. MACDONALD: Can't teach you anything.

Mr. CROTHERS: One moment, please. I have been doing my level best for five years past to prevent strikes. When I hear of trouble brewing I send an officer to try to prevent an outbreak of that trouble. And since I took charge of the department there have been fewer strikes in Canada in proportion to our population than in any other civilized country in the world. We hear a great deal about Australia where they have compulsory arbitration and all that sort of thing. Last year they had 330 strikes and lock-outs, and we had 75. They have a population of five millions and we have a population of eight millions. In the United States last year they had 3,330 strikes and lock-outs. Had they had no greater proportion than we had, they would have had only 800 or 900. While I have nothing to say against my predecessor, nor against the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), there have been fewer labour troubles in Canada within the last five years than there were ever before. I have done everything I could to prevent these troubles. In the case under discussion I thought the difficulty was settled when the men left Ottawa. So, my hon. friend from Maisonneuve need not waste time in expressing the hope that his efforts of to-night will help me in this matter. I have used diligence in these matters for the last five years, and I intend to follow the same course as long as I am in the department.

Mr. VERVILLE: The hon. member says there were fewer strikes in Canada. I believe that. But where was there any room for strikes?

Mr. CROTHERS: There were more strikes before the war than there have been since.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister need not take credit to himself for that. The simple reason is that the Canadian people were more patriotic than the people in other countries, and were therefore anxious to avoid labour troubles during the war. But the relatively small number of labour troubles shows also the advantages of the legislation which was introduced by my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) by which compulsory investigation is made possible with a view to adjusting these matters.

Mr. CROTHERS: I have always recognized that, and have always expressed myself in the strongest terms in favour of this Act. My hon. friend from Rouville knows that.

Mr. MACDONALD: I represent a large labour constituency, and one plea made against me in the last campaign was that I supported this Act, known as the Lemieux Act. In all the labour centres of this country the Conservative party, to the best of their ability, urged the view that this was a nefarious Act intended to cripple the rights of labour and in a great many cases their candidates were pledged to repeal it. The minister is frank enough to say that he recognizes that this is a good Act. I think that everyone will agree that the principle of the compulsory investigation of trouble previous to a strike is a sound one. But the minister promised last year to give us some amendments of this Act and I am sorry that he has not introduced them. There is an imperfection in the Act which prevents the investigation of troubles that arise where an application is made by a body of organized labour on the one hand and employers who are made up of different companies on the other. If the Act does not permit compulsory investigation I would suggest to the minister that it would be wise on his part if he would at this session introduce a Bill by which the provisions of this Act might be made applicable to given situations of that kind. I have no doubt that in the labour difficulties that existed in the West, and which the minister was investigating during the past winter, we had a situation where on the one hand we had a number of men belonging to one particular labour union and on the other hand numerous employers belonging to different companies. There ought not to be any technical difficulty existing by which provisions of this law should be prevented from being put into force in any labour district. If that is the difficulty that the minister speaks about, I would like to ask whether he considers it the part of wisdom to introduce an amendment to deal with that and whether he will not do so.

Mr. CROTHERS: The administration of the Act by my predecessor, Mr. King, and my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), disclosed to them certain difficulties which they would like to have overcome by amendments and the administration of the Act has disclosed to me some more. I am finding no fault with the Act. Like every other Act which is new, you discover in its administration and operation that it is capable of improvement. I anticipated what my hon. friend just suggested, three years ago, and I had a new Bill throughout prepared. I think it included about twenty alterations. Under the Act as it stands now you might have a difficulty arising between employer and employees as to the meaning of an award. In one case I had to appoint a second board to determine what the first board meant. One of the amendments I proposed was that a board might be reconvened for the purpose of reconsidering and determining what the award really did mean. I talked the matter over, the war came on, it was a controversial question, I was satisfied that we would be weeks and weeks discussing the matter, and I did not bring the Bill down because the war was on. I do not propose this session to bring in any amendments. We are getting along pretty well; we would be better with these amendments but I do not feel justified in bringing in a Bill of this very controversial character at the present time. I talked it over with the representative labour men and they did not agree as to what should be done. I do not think we would agree in this House as to what should be done and I therefore do not think it would be wise to introduce the Bill this year.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister does not need to introduce a whole Bill. It is an entirely technical matter. Manifestly the intention of the Act was that there

should be an investigation of these troubles. You might have a labour union on the one hand and different employers on the other and all you need to do is to amend this clause. The minister might do it under the War Measures Act if he does not want to bring down a new Bill.

Mr. CROTHERS: Nobody is suffering because it has not been changed.

Mr. MACDONALD: Yes, you know what happened at Thetford.

Mr. CROTHERS: I have nothing to take back, nothing to apologise for; we would do it again to-morrow. We have the results.

Mr. PACAUD: We had a three weeks' strike.

Mr. CROTHERS: That was not my fault. I am afraid that my hon. friend had more to do with that strike than I had.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It was agreed that the committee should rise at ten o'clock, and I see it is ten minutes past. My hon. friend from Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney) intends to address the committee on this item and before leaving for Toronto he requested me to ask the minister to kindly bring the following information for the next sitting of the committee:

Will the minister indicate all the different strikes with dates of the reports in which the report of the board was not accepted and strikes ensued, stating in which cases the report was not accepted by the employers and by the men?

Mr. CROTHERS: Does it mention the period?

Mr. LEMIEUX: It does not mention the period but I think the statistics could be easily made up from the old reports.

Mr. CROTHERS: Does it state that it should be since the Act became law?

Mr. LEMIEUX: No, I do not say since the beginning but for the last four or five years.

Mr. CROTHERS: We will be very glad to get that. It is in the 9th Report of the Registrar of Boards of Conciliation and Investigation, pp. 26-27.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understand that my hon. friend from Saskatoon did not find that information in the report.

Mr. CROTHERS: We will see that it is provided.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Mr. MACDONALD: I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if, when we go into Supply again, he will bring down the information which he spoke of when we were in Supply on April 23. The minister spoke of having taken up with certain classes of business, prices, with a view to considering the question of the cost of living, such as coal and sugar, and that certain questions had been asked and certain answers had.

Mr. CROTHERS: The report?

Mr. MACDONALD: The information which he got from these different people. The minister will find the statement to which I refer on page 730 of Hansard.

Mr. CROTHERS: My recollection is that I mentioned at that time that reports were being prepared. Does my hon. friend want copies of the questions?

Mr. MACDONALD: I want copies of the questions and the answers.

Mr. CROTHERS: That would be a herculean task. I think my hon. friend had better make a motion in the regular way.

Mr. MACDONALD: If the minister would submit to us the original documents and allow us to inspect them, that would perhaps be all that would be necessary.

Mr. CROTHERS: I think I could do that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When the hon. gentleman takes up his Estimates again I intend to bring up the matter of labour bureaus, in view of the evidence which has been given before the Imperial Dominions Royal Commission.

Mr. CROTHERS: Do you think that that might be discussed on these items?

Mr. LEMIEUX: It comes under the Labour Department. Under what head should I bring up this very important question?

Mr. CROTHERS: I think you made a motion last year.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I made a motion, but this question is still full of life. I shall bring it before the House.

Mr. CROTHERS: I have no objection to my hon. friend discussing it when my Estimates are up again.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Crothers, the House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

INDEX

SEVENTH SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT, 1917

Abbreviations.—1r., 2r., 3r.=first, second, or third reading. Amdt.=Amendment. Com.=Committee. Con.=Consideration. Div.=Division. M.=Motion. Ref.=Reference. Rep.=Report. Res.=Resolution. Sec.=Section.

Abbotsford postmaster, 608

Achim, Mr. Honoré (Labelle)
Military Service Bill, 2873

Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 9, 47, 83, 119, 160, 195, 249

Address to His Majesty the King. *See* Parliament: Extension of term of

Adjournment moved to discuss matter of urgent public importance
Mr. Pardee, returned soldiers, 459
Mr. Lemieux, liquor in military camps, 806
Mr. Kyte, price of flour, 1039
Mr. Devlin, conservation of grain, 1176
Mr. Macdonald, German submarines, 1320
Mr. Oliver, removal of rails, 1820
Mr. Turriff, farm labour, 3504
Mr. Macdonald, munitions, 5517

Adulteration of food. *See* Food

Advertising, government
Department of the Secretary of State, 656
Recruiting, 986, 3136

Aeroplane. *See* Air service *and* Aviation

Aetna Explosives Company, 4508

Agriculture
Animals
Health of, 2271
Loaning of to farmers, 4152
Pure bred, purchase of, 2276
See, under this head, Live stock.
Apples, embargo on export of, 5776
Associations, 2276
Beans for seed, 671, 1473
Bulletins, 2062, 2274
Butter
Imports and exports of, 1573
Purchases by British Government, 899
Cattle. *See, under this head,* Live stock
Cheese
Imports and exports of, 1573
Manufacturing and curing of, 2265
Purchase of by British Government, 1774, 1863, 1971, 2197, 2257, 2265, 2267, 2557
See also Food

Agriculture—*Con.*
Dairy industry, 953, 2075, 2256
Department
Estimates, 654, 2062, 2255, 2924, 3744, 4677
French-speaking employees of, 2262, 2265
Publications 2062, 2274
Staff and salaries, 4924
Development of, 2578
Exhibitions, 2260, 2270
Experimental farms, 2055, 2063, 4682
Hay
Embargo on, 1222
Imports and exports of, 1574
Inspection and grading of, 3402
Purchases of by British Government, 5086
Hogs
Inspection of, 2271
Cholera, 2273
Insect pests, 2066, 2075
Labourers. *See* Labour
Horses, compensation for destruction of, 2056
Live stock
British embargo on, 918, 987, 1535
Pure bred, purchase of, 2276
Shipments, inspection of, 1841
See also Live stock and Produce Bill
Noxious weeds, 2068
Parcel post shipments, 2072
Plant diseases
Rust in wheat, 2063, 2067
Powdery scab in potatoes, 2269, 5991
Potatoes
Accumulation of on railways, 607
Duty, proposed removal, 703, 5274, 5777, 5982
Exports and imports of, 2267, 5982
Powdery scab, 2269, 5991
Prices and supply of, 936, 1087, 1189, 1437, 2095
Seed, 1473
Straw, utilization of, 4683
Veterinary Director General, 987
See also Cold storage, *and* Food

Agricultural Instruction Act
Administration of, 3755
Payments to Prince Edward Island under, 455
Aiken, Mr. G. O., employment of, 4151, 4508
Air Service, 805, 1039, 1127, 1331. *See* Aviation
Alase, Motor boat, 5360
Alberta, enlistments in, 3373, 3375
Alcohol
Distillation of, 3742
Public institutions, for, 5103
Alcoholic liquors
Revenue from sale and manufacture of, 304
Sale of to soldiers. *See* Army: camps
See also Intoxicating liquors, Prohibition *and* Grain
Aldershot camp. *See* Army
Aliens
Armenians and Assyrians, franchise rights of under War-time Elections Act, 5421
Disfranchisement of, 1862, 5416
Enlistment of, 4413, 4415
Homestead rights of, 3808
Naturalization of, 3810
Ames, Sir Herbert B. (Montreal, St Antoine)
Budget, 742
The tariff, 742
Government expenditure, 743
Building of highways, 744
Taxation of business profits, 745
Debt of Canada, 745
Military Service, 2738
Contravention of Act, 3346
Enforcement, 2744
Exemptions, 3220
Petitions for and against, 2738
Recruiting, progress of, 2742
Patriotic Fund
Disbursements, 378, 382
Pensions, 382
Pensions, military, 1615
Soldier Settlement Board, 3785
Soldiers
Assigned pay of, 384
Pay of, 3215
Returned, provision for, 756
Voting of, 4781, 4912
Taxation of incomes, 4084, 4095, 4099, 4641, 4647
Unclaimed bank balances, 1008
War charities, 6064
American Turf Association, 47
Amqui-St. Leonard mail contract, 3903
Anderson, Mr. David, employment of, 1265
Angers, Captain, dismissal of, 758
Anglo-French delegates, visit of to Canada, 669
Apples, embargo on export of, 5776
Appropriation Acts
1. Bill No. 20 (for 1916-17, $9,127,777.42; for 1917-18, $32,195,144). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 584
2. Bill No. 108 (for 1917-18, $24,054,845.38). Res., 1r., 2947; 2r., com., 3r., 3086
3. Bill No. 128 (for 1916-17, $4,821,217.80). Res., 1r., 5242; 2r., com., 3r., 5275
4. Bill No. 135 (for 1917-18, $51,096,767.05). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 6061; 3r., 6062

Archives, Public
Expenses, 5791
Records, 3742
Armstrong, Mr. J. A. M. (North York)
Military service, 2546
Railway mail service, 2244
Armstrong, Mr. Joseph E. (East Lambton)
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4496, 5160
Fuel, 1405
Government Railways Act amendment, 4350
Intoxicating liquor, prohibition of, 4399
Railway Act, the, 3422-3453, 3511-3553, 3592-3609, 3717
Armstrong, S. A., position of, 802
Army
Allowances
Dependents of men joining British Army, to, 385
London offices, to soldiers employed in, 5915
Separation, 336, 382, 383, 387, 1191, 3075, 4001
Subsistence, 4001
Assigned pay, 383
Badges of identification, 5953
Bands, regimental, 4044
Battalions
Forestry
List of, 4509
Recruiting for, 5703
Wages paid in, 3950, 3509
60th, 525
105th. Supply Officer Lieut. R. J. Moffat, 5361
122nd, 5083
156th, 523
167th, 5272
Camps
Aldershot, 3295, 3419
Borden, 96, 100, 101

Army—*Con.*
Intoxicating liquor in, 535, 806, 1226, 1266, 1561, 1567
Petewawa land claims, 5241
Training, in Canada, 899
Canteen system in England, 718
Casualties
June 30, 1916, to June 5, 1917, 2201
June, 1917, 3719
July, 1917, 4151
August 16-31, 1917, 5901
Civil servants, in, pay and allowance to, 663, 713
Classifications, 2185
Commissions, granting of, 203, 207
Conscription. *See* Military service
Demobilization plans, 3118
Dental Service, 31
Officers, 1574, 4009
Desertions, 338, 3111
Discharge
Purchase of, 3111
Regulations governing, 3096, 3098
Table of, 3096
Total to June 30, 1917, 4152
Work pay, on, 457
Divisions, 459, 2186
Enlistment
Aliens, of, 4413, 4415. *See below* Persons of foreign birth
British army, in, 385
Civil Service, from. *See* Civil Service
Different units, in, 29, 245
Farmers, of, 4685
Figures
April 30, 1917, to, 1572
June 30, 1917, to, 4152
July, 1917, 4151
Generally, 2411, 2442, 2446-2451, 2454, 2463-2478, 2573, 2583, 2600, 2624, 2631, 2647, 2855, 2884, 2904
Moosejaw, at, 5122
Non-residents, of, 1476
Persons of foreign birth, 3656, 3759. *See above,* Aliens
Provinces, by, 216, 221
Unfit men, of, 697, 3099, 3107, 4003
Urban and rural, 3135
Western provinces, from, 4685
Equipment, 23. *See also* War supplies
Expeditionary force
Command of, 28, 268
Conditions governing in respect of British Government, 1576
Control of by Canada, 20, 39
Disposition of, 268, 1816, 2356
Holiday for, proposed, 5902, 6065
Status of, 259
Army—*Con.*
Terms respecting enlistment in, 1576
Fifth Canadian Division, command of, 459
Highland Brigade, 458, 552, 556
Hospitals. *See that title*
Irish-Canadian Rangers, 458
Medical service. *See* Canadian Army Medical Service
Non-commisisoned officers, 1608
Officers
Alleged surplus of, 3102
Appointments, charges regarding, 98
Mentioned in despatches, 4062
Pay of, 1628, 1673, 5773
Reversion in ranks, 3997, 5773
Retention of on leave, 5902
Salutes to, 5424
Unemployed, 560, 3102
Wives of, passports for, 3996
For individual officers see their names
Overseas Department
Officers employed by, 6069
See also under this head Expeditionary force
Pay and Records office, staff of, 3104
Pensions. *See that title*
Recruiting
Advertising in connection with, 986, 3136
Civil Service, from. *See that title*
Correspondence between Prime Minister and ex-minister of Militia, 2446, 3086
Expenses, 1959
Folkstone Director of, 1226
Forestry battalions, for, 5703
Generally, 51, 69, 86, 98, 101, 269, 559, 2395, 3371
Irish, Mr. Mark, statements of, 2707
Medical examination of recruits, 3098, 3963, 3967
National service proposals, 360
Officers
Bonaventure county, 1675
Cape Breton, 5361
Quebec, 3135
Rimouski, 456
Orders in Council respecting, 2482
Provinces, by, 2511. *See also under titles of Provinces*
Retarding of, alleged, 3086, 3110
Statement by Prime Minister, 194
System of, 360, 372
United States
British subjects in, 2482
Canadians in, 3758, 3759, 3904, 4466
Regiments
104th, 1570
165th, 1725
Reinforcements. *See* Military Service

Army—*Con.*
Rejected men
Certificates to, 5423
Disposition of, 3099
Rum, issues of, 535, 536
Soldiers
Age of on enlisting, 3577, 3993, 4001
Attendance of at political meetings, 4338, 5231
Deceased, estates of, 3805
See also Soldier Settlement Board
Employment of on farms, 1677
Former occupation of, 4685
Graves of, 1534
Leave of absence, 4005, 4055
Life insurance of, 3557, 3589
Mail matter for, 1263, 3644
Pay
Assigned, 383
Increases in, proposed, 2603, 5223
Promotion, in cases of, 5423, 5773
Working, 457
Personal requests concerning, 4203
Public meetings, attendance of at, 4338, 5231
Returned
Badges for, 5953
Care of, 10, 67, 587, 1586, 1594
Committee on, 459, 524, 756
Employment of, 3846
Camp Kapuskasing at, 5422
Government service in, 491, 1127, 1850, 1858, 1884, 6054
Pensions, scale of, 1594
See also Soldier Settlement Board *and* Pensions
Reversions in rank; pay in such cases, 5423
Voting of, 87, 223, 452, 1383, 2403, 2557, 2651, 2850, 3727, 4406, 4688, 4693, 4740, 4792, 4874, 5195. *See also* Military Voters Bill *and* War-time Elections Bill
Widows of, 3805
Working pay, cessation of, 457
For individual soldiers see their names
Soldier Settlement Board. *See that title*
Substitutes, buying of, 3113
Troops
Alleged stoning of, 803, 2756
Despatch of to the front, 574
Local, supplies for
Pictou, N.S., contracts, 303
Trenton, N.S., contracts, 303
Maintenance of at the front, 536
United States, training of in Canada, 2482

Army—*Con.*
Unfit men
Certificates to, 5423
Utilization of, 3099
Veterans. *See* Army and Navy Veterans Incorporation Bill
Work pay, cessation of, 457
See also Military Service *and* War
Army Act. *See* Military Service Bill
Army and Navy Veterans of Canada Incorporation Bill, 1r., 5421. 2r., 5541. 3r., 5910
Arthurs, Mr. James (Parry Sound)
Army
Officers, surplus of, 3103
Pensions, 3218
Rejected men, 3101
Soldiers, voting of, 4716, 4761, 4777, 4813, 4825, 4895
Immigration from the United States, 1750
Military Service Bill, 2654
Soldiers, attendance of at political meetings, 4338, 5231
Arthurs, Lieut.-Col. James, position and pay of, 5914
Ashcroft-Fort George mail service, 668
Assyrians, franchise rights under War-time Elections Bill, 5421
Astronomical Surveys, 4917
Athletic Associations, incorporation of, 5922
Atholstan, Lord, dynamite plot against, 5360
Atlantic mail service, 452
Atlantic Patrol Service. *See* Naval Service
Auditor General
Office of, 1791
Report of, 1469
Austro-Germans in western provinces, 1265
Aviation
Canadian fund, 5362
Corps, enlistment in, 1886
See Air Service
Babtie, Dr., report of. *See* Canadian Army Medical Service
Baddeck mail contract, 1819
Bags, duty on. *See* Customs
Balfour, Rt. Hon. Arthur J.
Announcement of visit of, 613, 1724
Reception to, 1766
Speech of, 1767
Bank Act Amendment Bills
1. Bill No. 46, Mr. L. A. Lapointe, 1r., 1037
2. Bill No. 56, Sir Thomas White, 1r., 1773; withdrawn, 2008

Bank Act Amendment Bills—*Con.*
3 Bill No. 65, Sir Thomas White,—loans on farmers' live stock. Res., 1960; 1r., 1971; 2r., (referred to Banking and Commerce Committee), 2149

Bank of Commerce, Canadian, 4686

Banks and banking
Savings deposits, 4685
Unclaimed bank balances, 1001

Barnard, Mr. Geo. H. (Victoria, B.C.)
Judges' salaries, 1976
Railway Act, The, 3529

Barrette, Mr. Joseph A. (Berthier)
Gauthier, Mr. L. J., denial of statements of, 2570
Halifax Chronicle, statement in, 3352
Military Service Bill, 2521
Amendment proposed, 2524
Opposition to compulsory service, 2522
Referendum proposals, 2523

Bartlett, Major, position of, 4292, 4416, 5422

Bathurst harbour improvements, 3872

Baugh, Edward Levi
Defalcations of, 1470
Release of, 2481

Baxter, Leslie E., employment of, 3418

Bawdy houses. *See* Criminal Code Amendment Bills

Bay State Fish Company, 2321

Beans. *See* Agriculture.

Bear River, N.S.
Indian agents, 1569
Post office site, 1378, 1569

Béland, Hon. H. S., M.P., detention of in Germany, 311, 341, 524

Belford, Major J. F., position of, 5703

Bell, Mr. Graham, pay of, 1129

Bell, steamer, 1377.

Bell Telephone Company, 3548

Bell Telephone Memorial Association, 5780

Bellemare, Mr. A. (Maskinongé)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 294
Military service, 294, 2823, 3573

Bennett, Mr. R. B. (Calgary)
Bishop of Mackenzie River, 868
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4566, 4627-4638, 5149
Civil Service salaries, 2248
Companies, incorporation of, 5924-5942
Government railways, rolling stock, 4931
Gwatkin, General, 4428

Bennett, Mr. R. B.—*Con.*
Intercolonial railway
Operation of, 786
Reply to Mr. Graham's statement, 805
Intoxicating liquors, prohibition of, 4402
Legislators, free transportation for, 4936
Live stock exchanges, 5506, 5509
McLeod-Tellier Commission, 5252, 5259
Military Service Bill, 4664
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 4669, 4672
Overseas Military Forces, minister of, 4428
Pensions, 6023
Railways
Material for France, 1830
Private cars, 4937
Transportation for legislators, 4936
Soldiers, voting of, 1403, 4902
War-time Elections Bill, 5614
Woman suffrage, 1510

Bennett, Mr. W. H. (East Simcoe)
Flour, price of, 1048
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5499, 5904
Insurance Act amendment, 1037, 1157, 1524, 1568
National Transcontinental Railway—solicitor's fees, 454
War-time Elections Bill, 5681, 5870

Berlinguet, Thomas F. X., employment of, 1381

Bernard, Lieut.-Col. E. S., position of, 5703

Best, Mr. John A. (Dufferin)
Rankin, Captain Ramsay, 987
Troops, alleged stoning of, 803

Bickerdike, Mr. Robert (Montreal, St. Lawrence)
Capital punishment
Abolition of, 46, 325, 617, 1028
Proposed plebiscite, 1016
Russia, in, 1012
Spain case, the, 1018
Women and children, 1017, 1150
Cattle, British embargo on, 920
Dubreuil, Mr., dismissal of, 3635
Prisoners, proposed enlistment of, 1012, 1015
War-time Elections Bill, 5600

Bigamy. *See* Criminal Code Amendment Bills

Bigras, Gedéon, dynamite plot against, 5360

Bills. *See their titles*

Binder twine, 3233.

Blain, Lieut. Roswell, position of, 4245

Blain, Mr. Richard (Peel)
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 824
Recruiting, 3377

Blain, Mr. Richard—*Con.*
Parliament, extension of term of, 3483
Pensions, 1606
Technical education, 1240
Blondin, Hon. P. E. (Postmaster General)
Alleged statements of on conscription, 250, 339
Recruiting by in Montreal, 4415
Board of Grain Supervisors
Appointment of, 2236, 3692
Powers of, 3696, 5206
Boards of Trade Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 3609. 2r., 3657. Com., 3657. 3r., 3905
Boivin, Mr. George H. (Shefford)
Alliance Nationale, 1547
Emigration restrictions, 1726
House of Commons, payment of sessional indemnity to members, 6045
Inland Revenue Department officials, 3819
Intoxicating liquor, trade in, 3818
Military Service Bill, 2833
Extension of the term of Parliament, 2834
Vacancies in Parliament, 2836
Petitions against conscription, 2837
Recruiting in Quebec, 2841
Amendement of Mr. Barrette, 2844
Contraventions of Act, 3349
Parliamentary procedure, amendment of Mr. Barrette, 2844
Renault, Raoul, appointment of, 2374
Soldiers, voting of, 4906
War-time Elections Bill, 5626
Bolduc, Hon. Joseph, address to Mr. Balfour, 1767
Bonaventure county
Breakwater, 988
Mail service, 1126
Recruiting officer, 1675
Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert (Prime Minister)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 25
Appreciation of His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught, 25
The New Governor General, 26
Newfoundland and Canada, 26
Great Britain's part in the war, 26
Progress of the war, 27, 44
Canadian overseas forces, 28
Military Hospitals Commission, 31
Canadian Dental Service, 31
Production of munitions, 31, 36
War Purchasing Commission, 32
Transportation of war supplies, 33, 36
Financial, industrial and trade conditions, 33
Extension of term of Parliament, 37
Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir R.—*Con.*
The fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, 38
The record of the present government, 38
Control of Canadian military forces, 39
Military equipment, 40
Imperial War Conference, 42
Peace proposals, 43
Army
Act, regulations of, 3114
Available men, 2390
Canteens, open, 537
Classifications, 2185
Demobilization plans 3120
Dental Service, 31
Enlistment of persons of foreign birth, 3759
Equipment, 40, 556
Expeditionary force, suggested holiday for, 6065
Highland Brigade, 556
Medical Service, 464, 531, 601, 1864, 3970, 4954
Overseas forces
Control of, 39
Maintenance of, 357
Pay and Records Office, 3105
Pensions, 332, 1613
Rejected men, 3099
Separation allowances, 386
Soldiers
Graves, 1534
Returned, care of, 462, 524, 587
Voting of, 4805, 4819, 4880-4887, 4890
Troops, maintenance of at the front, 356
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J., address to, 1771
Béland, Hon. Dr., M.P., efforts for release of, 311
Bruce, Dr., report of. *See* Medical service
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of 4027, 4216, 4240, 4478, 4867, 4873, 5015, 5112
Canadian Patriotic Fund, 3078
Civil Service, promotions, 4666
Coal
Confiscation of by railways, 195, 334
Western mining of, 341, 523, 2570, 2609
Coalition government. *See under this title,* Union Government
Confederation, fiftieth anniversary of, 38, 524
Conscription. *See* Military Service
Customs duty on Crown's goods, 1981
Defence of Canada, 359
Farm labour, 3506
"Fiddlers, The," forbidden circulation of, 3503, 3654, 3718, 3955, 4059

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir R.—*Con.*
Galt, Mr. Justice, investigation into report of, 2056
Gauthier, Mr. L. J., denial of statements of, 2570
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5903
High Commissioner, Canadian, office of, 4177
Hospitals, military, 464
House of Commons
Business of the House
Morning sittings, 2619, 2775, 2833
Saturday sittings, 324. 2569
Wednesday sittings, 324
Mace, new, 1468
Members, tributes to deceased, 3
Officials
Appointments, 586
Clerk of the House, retirement of, 6069
Sergeant-at-arms, death of, 6069
Imperial Munitions Board, labour, 1986
Imperial War Cabinet and Imperial War Conference
Adjournment of House for, 117, 597, 603
Announcement *re* meeting of, 42
Correspondence respecting, 5, 24
Proceedings, 1525
Cattle embargo, 1535
Dominions overseas, constitutional relations of, 1528, 1531
Development and control of natural resources, 1532
France, visit to, 1536
Imperial preference, 1532
India, representation of, 1534
Minutes of, 2354
Soldiers' graves, 1534
Statements by British Prime Minister, 2354
Judges' salaries, 5955
Labour bureaus, establishment of, 118
Lake of the Woods water level, 2775
Landry, Mr. Justice, finding of, 3110, 3615
Lessard, General, 364
Mace, vote of thanks to donors of, 1468
Members of Parliament, tributes to deceased, 3
Military Service Bill
Introduction, 1542, 2184
Amendment of Mr. Copp, 3078
Appeals, 2191, 3178
Army Act, regulations of, 3114
Available men, 2390
Board of Selection, 5083
Canada's position in the war, 2184
Contraventions of Act, 3342-3351, 3361, 3588
Exemptions, 3208, 3363, 6068
Exceptions, 3559

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir R.—*Con.*
General provisions, 3239, 3259
Militia Act, provisions of, 2187
Necessity for reinforcements, 2187
Persons liable for service, 3116
Registrars, 5900
Senate amendments, 4663
Tribunals, 2190, 3152
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 4174, 4667
National Service Commission, 309, 370
Nationalist Party, 4564
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3745, 3747, 3749
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4196, 4417, 4436
Parliament, extension of term of, 37, 3419, 3504
Parliament, printing of, 5950
Parliamentary procedure
Order of the day, reinstatement of, 2877
Question of privilege, discussion on, 600
Votes and proceedings, correctness of entry in, 2880
Parliamentary Secretaryships, 4196, 4417, 4438
Peace terms, consultation with Dominions on, 300
Pensions, 6018
Pension Commissioners, 4958
Political deadlock, rumoured, 1971
Press censorship, 3654, 3718, 3955, 4059
Racing meets, limitation of, 323
Railway Act, The, 603
Railways
Employees, payment of salaries of, 5956
Material, removal of to France, 310
Traffic, congestion of, 587
Recruiting
Alleged statement regarding, 194
Correspondence with ex-Minister of Militia, 2446, 3086, 3371
Figures for 1916, 379
Retarding of, alleged, 3371
Systems explained, 360-382, 2482
Rogers, Hon. Robert, resignation of, 4736
Ross rifle, 392, 408-434, 477-522
Speaker, election of, 1
Taxation of incomes, 4655
Union Government
Correspondence with Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 2690
Rumoured political deadlock, 1971
Votes and proceedings, correctness of entry in, 2880
War
Expenditure, 354, 476
Requirements. *See* Military Service

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir R.—*Con.*
Supplies—clothing, motor trucks, Oliver equipment, wagons, 556-558
Trophies, exhibit of, 6003
War Purchasing Commission, 32
War-time Elections Bill, 5576, 5648-5702,
War vote ($500,000,000), 354, 586 5706, 5805, 5834, 6071
Woman suffrage, 1504
Yukon price advances, 2199

Boulay, Mr. Herménégilde (Rimouski)
Agriculture Department, French-speaking employes of, 2262, 2265
Army Medical Service, 3989
Bright, the late John, 987
Budget, 1085
Free wheat, 1085
Behaviour of soldiers passing through Quebec, 1086
Necessity for co-operation with the Government, 1087
Civil Service
Employment of men in higher offices, 1256
French-speaking employees, 2262, 2265, 2340, 2759
Salaries, 2239, 2251
Government railways
Accidents, 1376
Operation and management of, 3389
Removal of obstructions, 595
Rolling stock, 594
St. Fabien crossing, 2226, 3389
Government Railways Act amendment, 4373, 4382
Interior Department, French-speaking employees, 2340
Mail service, 3640
McWilliams, Mr., dismissal of, 2167
Military Service Bill
Authority of Parliament, 2761
Classes, 3353
Exceptions, 3571
Exemptions, 3190, 3306
Quebec, position of, 2754
National Transcontinental Railway
Express service, 595
Fitzpatrick yard and engineer's residence, 455, 456
Telegraph line, 456
Ottawa Citizen, statement of, 2776
Parliament buildings, destruction of—indemnities for losses, 4413
Pension Commissioner's staff, 608
Quebec
Recruiting in, 2754
Troops passing through, insults to, 2756
Railway Act, The, 3435, 3511

Boulay, Mr. Hermenegilde—*Con.*
Rimouski
Government employees, 2165
Recruiting officers, 456
St. Lawrence signal and telegraph service, 1471
Scientific and industrial research, 3957
Senate, proposed change in constitution of, 1145
South African war, 2200
Steamship services, 2323
Technical education, 1249
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5384
Troops, alleged insults to, 2756
Veterinary Director General, 987

Bourassa, Mr. J. Boutin (Lévis)
Gravel, Lieut. Gedéon, 1674
Gravelle, Oscar, 1226
Levis railway station, 1129
Military Service Bill, 3069, 3147
St. Romuald public works, 1129

Boy Scouts Association, 2062, 3740

Boyce, Mr. Arthur C. (West Algoma)
Military Service, 3147

Boyce, George H., position of, 1472

Boyer, Mr. Gustave (Vaudreuil)
Butter and cheese purchases, 899
Maple sugar—adulteration, 1958
Military service, 2931

Boys, Mr. W. A. (South Simcoe)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 90
Patriotism of Canadian women, 90
Simcoe county and the war, 90
Loyal Orange Order, 91
The Dorchester election, 92
National service, 93
Recruiting in Quebec, 94

Bradbury, Mr. George H. (Selkirk)
Army canteens, 811
Army and navy veterans, 5910
Capital punishment, 634
Dominion Lands Act amendment, 3799
Military service, 3190
United Grain Growers, Limited, 893
War affairs, Government administration of, 3383

Brampton-Palestine mail route, 590

Bran. *See* Grain

Brantford moulders' strike, 2322

Breadner, Mr. R. W., position of, 3676

Bright, the late John, 987

Brindle, Mr. William, dismissal of, 3758

British Admiralty, recruiting in Canada for, 4159, 4163

British Cattle Supply Company, 1817

British Columbia Indian Commission, 653, 1896

British Government and Canadian Pacific Railway Financial Arrangements Bill, 1r., 1369. 2r., 2059. Com., 2059. Rep., 2061, 3r., 2139

British Government, war supplies, purchases of in Canada, 4953, 5517, 5541

Bromptonville postmaster, 1129.

Brouillard, Mr. Ovide (Drummond and Arthabaska)
- Ætna Explosives Company, 4508
- Military service, 3072

Bruce, Dr., investigations of. *See* Canadian Army Medical Service

Buchanan, Mr. W. A. (Medicine Hat)
- Army allowances, subsistence, 5915
- Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5178
- Coal mining, western, 119, 458, 523, 1266, 1372, 1616, 1723, 1725, 2526, 2570, 2653
- Coutts quarantine reserve, 590
- Economic and Development Commission, 1125
- Farm labour, 3507
- Fuel, 1414
- Grain
  - Commission, 3711
  - Elevators, 986
  - Seed, advances for, 303, 305
- Home guard duty, 336
- Hudson's Bay Company lands, taxation of, 986
- Hyde, Mr. J. W., 301
- Indian reserves, 989, 2389
- Judgments, uniform interest on, 900
- Letter carriers' salaries, 1474
- Medicine Hat military reserve, 301
- Military service, 2600
  - Exemptions, 2607
  - Referendum proposals, 2607
  - Taxation of wealth, 2608
- Mounted Police pensions, 5701
- Oil-boring machinery, 301
- Proportional representation, 913
- School lands, western, 1378
- Shaw, Mr. F. D., dismissal of, 1847
- Soldier Settlement Board, 1163
- Soldiers, former occupations of, 4685
- Taxation
  - Farm implements, 1686
  - Hudson's Bay Co. Lands, 986
  - Income, 1687, 4122
  - Wealth, 2608
- Unclaimed bank balances, 1009
- War-time Elections Bill, 5580
- Woman suffrage, 1515

Budget debate, 718. Amdts. proposed: Mr. Turriff, 750, 845, 870, 937, 1085, 1089, 1194, 1201, 1267; Mr. Robb, 1317, 1319, 1423; Mr. Oliver, 1424. Mr. Loggie, 1424. *See also* Taxation.

Bull, Mr. Perkins, position of, 1130

Bureau, Mr. Jacques (Three Rivers and St. Maurice)
- Berlinguet, Thos. F. X., 1381
- Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5016, 5168
- Industrial requirements, 2696
- Inland Revenue Department estimates, 3835
- Military service, 2693, 5882
- Montreal Gazette, statement of, 2709, 4739
- Public Works Department architect, 5104
- Quebec judges' salaries, 5798, 5800
- St. Maurice river improvements, 1381
- Taxation of incomes, 5886
- Three Rivers
  - Harbour improvements, 3879
  - Public building, 668
- War-time Elections Bill, 5667, 5695, 5712-5771

Burford, recruiting in, 601

Burgess, defalcations of, 1127

Burke, Col. Rev. A. E., position of, 5704

Burnham, Mr. John H. (West Peterborough)
- Aliens, enlistment of, 4415
- Army
  - Camps, sale of liquor in, 817
  - Enlisted men, age of, 3577
  - Pensions, 1594
  - Unfit men, 699
- Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, suspension of, 6911
- Capital punishment, 623
- Civil Service, appointments, 2019
- Government Railways Act amendment, 4355
- Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1179
- Intoxicating liquors, prohibition of, 4403
- Judges' salaries, 1977
- Labour—Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1112
- Military Service Bill, 2555, 3365
- Parliamentary secretaryships, 4204
- Patent medicines, war tax on, 363
- Shipbuilding, 1932
- Soldiers, voting of, 2557
- Soldier Settlement Board, 3630
- Technical education, 1238
- Trent canal wharves, 759
- Venereal diseases, 817, 869

Burrell, Hon. Martin (Minister of Agriculture)
Agriculture Department
Estimates, 654, 2062, 2255, 3744, 4677
French-speaking employees in, 2263
Publications, 2274
Animals
Health of, 2271
Pure bred, purchase of, 2276
Cattle, British embargo on, 921
Cheese
Purchases by British Government, 1971, 2197, 2257, 2267
Regulations regarding manufacture of, 2267
Cold storage plants, 2076, 2256
Exhibitions, 2261, 2270
Experimental farms, 4682
Flax industry, 4683
Food supplies for Great Britain, 2260
Grain
Diseases—rust, 2064
Seed, 1188, 4677
Hogs
Inspection of, 2271
Cholera, 2273
Live Stock and Produce Bill, 4287, 5503
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, claims under, 5970
Potatoes
Powdery scab, 2269
Supply of, 936, 1088, 1189, 2095
Public health, 999
Seed grain purchases, 1188, 4677
Technical education, 1246
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5397
Western farmers, relief for, 3478, 4677
White pine blister rust, 4677
Business Profits War Tax Act, administration of, 3655, 3676, 5290
See also Taxation
Business Profits War Tax Act Amendment Bill. Res., 1436, 1445. 1r., 1774. 2r., 2107. Com., 2107. Rep., 2108. 3r., 2139
See also Taxation
Butter. *See* Agriculture
Cables. *See* Telegraphs
Campbell, Mr. Duncan J., position of, 758
Campbell, Capt. G. H., employment of, 4508
Campbellton-Gaspe steamship service, 1126, 1228, 1959
Canada Evidence Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 4291. 2r., 4463. Com., 4463. 3r., 4466
Canada Gazette, publication of, 3737
Canada Grain Act, expenses under, 5205
Canada Grain Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 386
Canada Temperance Act
Expenses under, 5243
New Brunswick, proposed repeal, 1263, 3739
Canada Year Book, 2337.
Canadian Army Medical Service
Babtie, Dr.
Inquiry and report, 201, 227, 522, 559, 669, 4195
Reply to by Dr. Bruce, 4954
Bruce, Dr.
Report, 201, 227, 527, 559, 601, 669, 1343, 1720, 1864, 3962, 4194.
Publication of, 3845
Reply to Dr. Babtie report, 4954
Carleton-Jones, Surgeon General, report of, 1866
Changes in, 4466
Treatment of soldiers, 3963
See also Hospitals
Canadian Associated Press, 5290
Canadian Association of Returned Soldiers, 4951
Canadian Aviation Fund, 5362
Canadian Bank of Commerce, shareholders and investments of, 4686
Canadian General Council of the Boy Scouts Association, grant to, 3740
Canadian Government Railways
Branch lines, 2223, 2228
Cars
Freight, 2205
Intercolonial, on, 1378, 2226, 3395
Private, 4933
Purchase of, 758, 1376, 1866, 4298
Refrigerator, 4933
Coal for, 3388
Purchase of, 592, 664, 667
Construction and betterment, 3385
Employees
Pay of enlisted, 595
Promotion of, 759
Freight handlers at Pictou, 303
Employees' magazine, 452
Halifax terminals, 2204
Hudson Bay railway, 3396, 5086
Ice, tenders for, 301
Intercolonial
Accidents, 1376
Boisdale, contracts for work at, 4415
Cars, 2226
Shortage of, 1378
Purchases, 3395
Coal, freight rates on, 3511, 4292
Construction and betterment—details of items, 2224
Crossings, 2222
Damage claims, 2707, 3416
Earnings, 2202
Grades, improvement of, 456
Grand Narrows bridge, 2321

Canadian Government Railways—*Con.*
Levis station, 2208
Maritime Express service, 8
Milford ballast pit, 2320
Obstructions, removal of, 1376
Operation of, 759
Passenger service, 2203
Peniac bridge, 2320
Pension fund, 1476
Rails, 1575
Rates, coal, on, 4292
Station accommodation, 2227
Stations, naming of, 3386
Tracadie siding, 2618
See also Government Railways Act Amendment Bill.
Intoxicating liquors, shipment on, 591
Level crossing, Pictou harbour branch, 304
Line improvements, 2204
Military and hospital trains, 2205
National Transcontinental
Earnings, 2203
Engineers' residence at Fitzpatrick, 455, 456
Express service, 595
Fitzpatrick yard, 455
Freight rates, 2210, 3394
Operation, 657, 1573, 3411.
Expenses of, 2203
Portneuf claims, 1571
Rails, removal of to France, 1229, 1266, 2225
St. Malo shops, 1128
Salmon river viaduct, 2212
Solicitor's fees, 454
Telegraph line, 456
Ties, purchases of, 455
Traffic, 2209, 2218
Obstructions, removal of, 595
Officials, 657, 3390
Operation of, 2203, 3386
Passenger service, 2207
Prince Edward Island
Car ferry and terminals, 2205
Widening of, 3902, 3945
Quebec railways, 4948, 5452
Rails, 2224
Rolling stock, 594, 4928. *See, under this title,* Cars
Safety-first inspectors, 337
Ships, building of, for, 4939, 5429
Valley railway, 1380
Working expenses, 3410
See also Government Railways Act Amendment Bill

Canadian Northern Railway.
British Columbia, lines and works aided by province of, 4987

Canadian Northern Railway—*Con.*
Capital stock of affiliated companies held by, 4626
Payments on interest account, 4338
Removal of rails from, 301, 3398

Canadian Northern Railway Company.
Financial statements respecting, 4058
Report of Drayton-Acworth Commission, 4011

Canadian Northern Railway Acquisition Bill.
Res., 4022, 4215, 4217, 4247. 1r., 4293. 2r., 4467, 4512, 4566. Com., 4590, 4622, 4835, 4960, 5015. 3r., 5108, 5123-5194
Amendment proposed: Mr. Graham, 4477; lost on div., 4590
Closure applied, 5002, 5015, 5121, 5123

Canadian Pacific Railway. *See* British Government

Canadian Patriotic Fund, 595, 3078
Allowances from, 203, 207, 383, 3951
See also War Charities

Canadian Press Limited, 3740

Canals, 3402, 3417
For individual canals, see their titles

Canteen. *See* Army

Cape Bold breakwater, 3873

Cape Breton
Recruiting officers, 5361
Senate representation, 89

Cape Cove pier, 3879

Capital Punishment,
Plebiscite proposed, 1016
Russia's abolition of; proposed congratulations, 1012
Spain case, 1018
Women and children, in cases of, 1017, 1150
See Criminal Code Amendment Bills

Caraquet and South Shore Railway, 2223, 3387

Cardin, Mr. P. J. A. (Richelieu)
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5175
Military Service Bill, 3058
St. Lawrence Flour Mills Company, 4509

Carleton beach protection works, 1128

Caron, Mr. Hector, employment of, 4151

Carrier, Emile, allowance to, 581

Carroll, Mr. William F. (South Cape Breton)
Aeroplane service, 1331
Army Recruiting Officers, Cape Breton, 5361
Budget, 1424
Taxation of incomes, 1424
Government expenditure, 1425
So-called prosperity, 1426
Control of food prices, 1427

Carroll, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Reply to statements of Mr. Edwards, 1430
Canada Temperance Act, 5244
Canadian Government Railways, private cars, 4933
Canadian Northern Railway acquisition of, 5140
Censors and decoders, 576
Customs Department, motor boats, 3759
Dental officers, 1574
East Bay wharves, 5315, 5317
Flour, price of, 1044
Food products, prices and control of, 1427
Indians—Sydney reserve, 1888
Insurance, 5203
Macdonald, Miss Jessie, 5361
McNeil, Lt. John D., 5272
Military Service, 2854
Nova Scotia, steamship service, 2291
Shipbuilding, 1331
Submarine situation, 1329
Taxation
Incomes, 1424
Wealth, 2859
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway, 2613
Carroll, Lieut. W. F., M.P., position and pay of, 6066
Carson, Major General, position of, 986
Carvell, Mr. Frank B. (Carleton, N.B.)
Agricultural instruction, 3755
Army, soldiers
Pay of, on promotion, 5423
Voting of, 4795-4834, 4874-4887, 4889-4914
Bear river, N.S.
Indian agents, 1569
Wharfinger, 1378
British preference, 1711
Canada Gazette, 3738
Canada Temperance Act, 1263, 3739, 5243
Canadian Government Railways
Branch lines, 2230
National Transcontinental, Salmon river viaduct, 2212
Promotion of employees, 766
Quebec railways, 5464
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4253, 4266, 5146
Companies, incorporation of, 5928-5942
Criminal Code amendments, jurors, 4301, 4318
Daylight saving, 3682
Desjardins, Lt. Col., 1818
Farm implements, duty on, 1708
Flour, price of, 1051
Georgian Bay Canal Commission, 989
Gordon divorce case, 5903
Carvell, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*
Government Railways Act amendment, 4340, 4356, 4366, 4863
Grain, fixing of price of, 3688
Hollocody, Captain, 897
House of Commons
Members, sessional indemnity of, 5790
Stenographers, 5789
Hudson Bay railway, 2230
Immigration agents, 1737, 1756
Indians,
New Brunswick, 1889
Reserves, cutting timber on, 1889
Insurance, 4388, 5202
Maritime Provinces, military affairs, 5226
McLeod-Tellier Commission, 5247, 5254
McNeil, F. C., payments to, 1380
Military district No. 6, 5226
Military service, 2709
Appeals, 3179
Referendum, 2711
Tribunals, 3152, 3161
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3746, 3753
Parliament, railway transportation for members of, 3519
Potatoes, duty on, 5777
Proposed removal, 5274, 5982
Public works expenditure, 5348
Quarantine service, 3756
Quebec harbourmaster, 897
Railway employees, payment of salaries of, 5957, 5997
Railway Act, The, 3422-3453, 3516-3553, 3593, 3717
Ross rifle, 388, 412-434
Rural mail service, 3647
St. John harbour improvements, 5347
Soldiers, votes for, 1404
Sugar, colouring of, 1957
Surveys, 1346
Tariff revision, 1699
Taxation
Business profits, 1452, 4245
Income, 1452, 1701, 3768, 5884
Telegraph and telephone lines, 3543, 5363-5404, 5410
Unclaimed bank balances, 1007
Victoria breakwater, 1381
Valley railway, 1380
War Purchasing Commission inquiry *re* purchases, 340
War-time Elections Bill, 5660, 5676-5699, 5713
West Edmonton forest rangers and homestead inspectors, 1476
104th Regiment, 1570
Cattle. *See* Agriculture

Censorship, 3503, 3654, 3718, 2881, 3995, 4059, 5492
Censors and decoders, 576, 3718
Louisburg, at, 4008, 4048
See "The Fiddlers"

Census
Male population of Canada, 2283
Western, 2336

C. E. Tanner, steamer, 5362

Chabot, Mr. John L. (Ottawa)
Civil Service
Appointments, 2020
Salaries, 2251
Military service, 2781
Enlistment in Quebec, 2784

Chabot, Lt.-Col. J. L., M.P., position and pay of, 988

Chairman of Committees. *See* Deputy Speaker

Charitable and patriotic enterprises, organization and control of, 378, 462

Charlton, Mr. William A. (Norfolk)
Budget, 1304
Pulp and paper industry, 1304

Chicago drainage canal, 302

Chicoutimi, pure bred animals at, 4152

Chinese Immigration Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 843. 2r., com., 2139. Rep., 2149. 3r., 2285

Chisholm, Mr. A. W. (Inverness)
Economic and Development Commission, 2200
Fish and fisheries
Advisory Board, 2151
Dogfish, 2177
Inverness harbour, improvements, 5326
Margaree harbour improvements, 3867, 5330
National Service, provincial directors of, 2200
Nova Scotia public works, 5319, 5337
Scotch Hill post office, 3649
Steamship service, 2301, 2306
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5371

Cheese. *See* Agriculture: Dairy

Civil Service
Act, administration of, 1791
Appointments
Order in Council, Jan. 1917, under, 3003
Regulations governing, 643
Returned soldiers, 643
See also Army: Soldiers: Returned
Section 21, under, 607, 650, 693, 1023, 1351, 1937
Compulsory retirement from, alleged, 2059

Civil Service—*Con.*
Disfranchisement of civil servants, proposed, 2018
Dismissals, proposed, 3633
Employees, French-speaking, 2262, 2759
Employment of men in higher offices, 1256
Enlistments from, 192, 2014
Pay and separation allowances, 213, 663
Insurance, 3503
Mail carriers. See Post office
Promotions, 2010, 2011, 2238, 4666
Salaries, 1791, 2008, 2238, 2946
Enlisted men, of, 1353, 2014, 2252
Proposed increases, 583
See Civil Service Act Amendment Bill.
For departments see their titles

Civil Service Act Amendment Bill. Res., 2008. 1r., 2024. 2r., 2149. Com., 2238. 3r., 2285

Clark, Mr. Hugh (Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for External Affairs)
Mounted police, 4668

Clark, Mr. Michael (Red Deer)
Army, canteens, 811
Budget, 736
Problems arising from the war, 736
Necessity for economy, 737
Taxation of incomes, 738
Maintenance and extension of our foreign commerce, 739
Free trade, 740
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4867
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1183
Military service, exemptions, 3367
Newspaper articles, correction of, 3617
Parliament, extension of term of, 3492
Political deadlock, rumoured, 1971
Referendum, 2665
Senate, appointments to, 934
Separation allowances, 1191
Soldiers, votes for, 1387
Taxation
Business profits, 737
Income, 738, 4639
Woman suffrage, 1518

Clarke, Mr. W. A. (North Wellington)
Military Service Bill, 2861

Clergy as immigration agents, 5361

Clements, Mr. H. S. (Comox-Atlin)
Wharves, construction of, 5318

Cloakey, George, employment of, 1819

Closure. *See* Speaker, Parliamentary Procedure; Canadian Northern Railway Acquisition Bill

Coal. *See* Mines

Coal miners' strikes. *See* Mines

Coalition government, 2463, 2887, 2901, 3000, 3014, 3023, 3727, 3732
Political deadlock rumoured, 1941
See National government
Correspondence between Sir Robert Borden and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 2692

Cochrane, Hon. Frank (Minister of Railways and Canals)
Canadian Government railways
Cars, purchase of, 4928
Coal purchases, 664, 667
Freight rates, 3394
Hudson Bay railway, 5087
Intercolonial
Cars, 2227
Construction and betterments, 2224
Management and operation, 775
Officials, appointment of, 658
Passenger service, 2203
Line improvements, 2204
Military and hospital trains, 2205
Rails, 2224
National Transcontinental
Freight rates, 2210
Operation, 658
Salmon River viaduct, 2217
Operating expenses, 2203
Prince Edward Island railway terminals and car ferry, 2205
Canals
St. Peter's, 3406
Trent, 2206, 3405
Welland, 2206
Coal
Confiscation of by railways, 584
Shortage, 83
Prices, 666
Government Railways Act Amendment Bill, 3845, 4339, 4365, 4386
Provincial legislators, free transportation for, 684
Quebec railways, 5472
Railway Act, the, 194, 602, 605, 3421, 3511-3553, 3592-3608, 3716
Railway, situation, inquiry into, 3408
Railways—France, removal of materials to, 311, 1825, 3407
Railways and Canals Department estimates, 657, 2202, 3385, 4925, 4928, 5428
St. John and Quebec Railway Act Amendment Bill, 2433, 3401

Cockshutt, Mr. William F. (Brantford)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 100
The war, 100

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Camp Borden, 101
Recruiting, 101
France and the war, 102
President Wilson's peace proposals, 103
Control of foodstuffs, 106
Canada's trade, 108
Army; officers, reversion to ranks of, 4000
Bell Telephone Memorial Association, 5780
Flour, price of, 1065
Military service, 2599, 3233
Labour, 2604
Recruiting, 101
Soldiers' pay, 2603
Taxation
Income, 4077, 4080, 4092

Cold Storage,
Plants
Effect of, upon cost of living, 2027
Government control of, 1628
Proposed nationalization of, 2076
Subsidies for, 2076, 2255, 3744
Lockport Cold Storage Company, 2202

Commerce, Canadian Bank of, 4686

Committees. *See* House of Commons

Companies Act Amendment Bills,
Corporations for other purposes than gain, (No. 129, Sir Thomas White) 1r., 5242
General (No. 132, Sir Thomas White), 1r., 5880; 2r., 5918; com., 5918; 3r., 5953
Uniformity (No. 43, Mr. A. K. Maclean), 1r., 843; 2r., 1151

Compulsory military service,
See Army *and* Military Service Bill

Contract Prices, Bill to prohibit,
See Criminal code amendment

Confederation, fiftieth anniversary celebration, 11, 16, 24, 38, 47, 150, 161, 175, 524
Committee
Apointed 587
Joint action with Senate, 642
Report, made, 1865; adopted, 2283

Connaught, The late Duchess of
Expressions of sympathy on death of, 609

Conscription
Manhood, of, 14, 54, 191, 893, 1586. *See* Military service
Blondin, Hon. P. E., alleged statement of, 339
Wealth. *See* Taxation

Conservation
Commission, salaries, etc., 3744, 5793
Forestry—poplar trees. 3742

Copp, Mr. A. B. (Westmorland)
Address in reply to the Governor General's speech, 160

Copp, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Recruiting among the French Canadians, 160
The fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, 161
National government, 161
Political patronage, 162
Extravagance of present administration, 163
The ex-Minister of Militia, 164
National service, 170
Westmorland county and war profits, 171
Extension of term of Parliament, 172
The Dorchester election, 173
Alleged statement of Mr. Blondin, 173
Budget, 1307
Speech of Sir Sam Hughes, 1307
Winning of the war, 1310
Charges of extravagance against the Government, 1310
High cost of living, 1313
Revenue and expenditure, 1314
Taxation proposals, 1315
Intercolonial railway, operation of, 1316
Canadian Government Railways
Construction and betterment, 3387
Intercolonial
Grand Narrows bridge, 2321
Management and operation, 773
Milford ballast pit, 2320
Peniac bridge, 2320
Government Railways Act Amendment, 4363
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5143
Cape Bald breakwater, 3873
Cost of living, 2005
Customs duties payable by provincial governments, 2135
Dorchester county election, 173
Fisheries officers, 2164
Food products, price and control of, 1313
Government Railways Act Amendment, 4363
Indians, 1892
Inland Revenue Department estimates, 3843
Labour problems, 1173
Migratory birds, 3658
Military Service, 3075
Moncton armoury site, 4787
National service, 170
National Transcontinental Railway, removal of rails, 2225
Patriotic Fund, 3077
Pensions, 6031
Copp, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, 917
Railway Act, The, 3442
Sackville wharves, 3878
Soldiers, votes for, 1401, 4703
Taxation, 1315
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5382
War-time Elections Bill, 5610
Wilfrid C., boat, 4062
Cost of living
See O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., *also* Cold storage
Council of Indian Tribes of Canada Incorporation Bill, 1r., 3902
Courcelette, steamer, 1377
Court, Pte. Harry Ivan, request for discharge of, 3295
Courts, *See* Justice
Coutts quarantine reserve, 590
Cox, John, position of, 1472
Criminal Code Amendment Bills
Alien enemies prohibited from voting (No. 59, Mr. Currie), 1r., 1862
Capital punishment, abolition of, (No. 3, Mr. Bickerdike), 1r., 46; 2r., moved, 325, negatived, 1028-1036
See Capital Punishment
Contract prices, prohibition of, (No. 21, Mr. Knowles), 1r., 386; 2r., moved, 1617; debate adjourned, 1627
Insurance (No. 54, Mr. Doherty), 1r., 1773; 2r., 2104; com., 4388; 3r., 4395
Jurors, (No. 97, Mr. Doherty), 1r., 2567; 2r., 4293; com., 4318; 3r., 4383. Six months' hoist, moved by Mr. Lemieux, negatived, 4307
Non-support; foster parents; bawdy houses; insolvent traders; constables' fees, (No. 124, Mr. Doherty), 1r., 4291; 2r., 4463; com., 4463; 3r., 4466
Racing meets, limitation of, (No. 2, Mr. Wilcox), 1r., 8; 2r., 313-324
Cromwell, Mr. F. R. (Compton)
Live stock purchases, 2279
Railway Act, The, 3604
Cross point wharf, 988, 1228, 1571
Crothers, Hon. T. W. (Minister of Labour)
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 831
Soldiers, voting of, 4702
Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, abolition of office of, 686
Budget, 1267
The extravagant waste of time in the House, 1267

Crothers, Hon. T. W.—*Con.*
Administration of Labour Department, 1269
The labour situation, 1270
The coal situation, 1275
Food prices, 1273
Coal
Questionnaire concerning, 1996
Sale, regulation of, 1275
Western mining of, 159, 614, 1266, 1372, 1616, 2295, 2570, 2653, 2776
Food
Control of sales and prices, 1273, 1989, 2083
Flour, price of, 1043
High cost of living, 695
Industrial Dicputes Investigation Act, 1112, 1168, 1270
Labour Department
Administration of, 1269
Estimates, 686, 1112, 1166, 1989, 3652
Landry, Mr. Justice, findings of, 5248
Le Canada, correction of statement in, 2571
Military Service, 2483
Referendum, 2487
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., inquiry and report by, 3652, 3925
Strikes, prevention of, 1270
Technical education, 1236
Thetford mines labour trouble, 1118
War-time Elections Bill, 5867
Yukon, cost of living in, 2199, 2481, 2525

Cruise, Mr. Robert (Dauphin)
Budget, 1432
Taxation of profits, 1432
Government expenditure, 1434
Free wheat, 1435
Proposed Highways Bill, 1435
Manitoba boundaries extension, 1435
Campbell, Duncan J., 758
Chabot, Lt.-Col., 988
Free wheat, 1435
Glen, Col. Joseph, payments to, 1377
Railway Act, The, 3520, 3550
Railway transportation for members of Parliament, 3520
Smith's Falls postmaster, 1570
Taxation of business profits, 1432

Cunningham, Frances Henry, payments to, 1125

Currie, Mr. John A. (North Simcoe)
Aliens, 3810, 3812
Austro-Germans in western provinces, 1265
Bill to prohibit voting by alien enemies, 1862

Currie, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Army
Recruiting, 3372
Officers, military pay of, 1676
See, under this head, Soldiers
Army and Navy veterans, 5912
Civil Service appointment, 2019
Coal, 2001
Companies, incorporation of, 5926, 5928
Criminal Code amendments, Jurors, 4299
Dominion Lands Act Amendment, 3801, 3805-3817
France, trade relations with, 2310, 2316
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5498, 5905
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company Branch Lines Company, 1375
Imperial Preference, 1584
Loans to farmers, 1965
Martell, Lt. L. A., 5914
Military Service
Classes, 3293, 3356
Exemptions, 3221, 3228, 3279, 3304, 3367
General provisions, 3243, 3252
Great Britain, in, 2908
Regulations, 3316
Reinforcements, need of, 2904, 2915
Selective draft, 2916
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3752
Packages, marking of—inspection and sale,—4069
Parliament, printing of, 5949, 5950
Pensions, 6008
Railway Act, The, 3548
Rifles, importations of, 1125
Rural mail carriers, 3643
Shipbuilding, 1584, 5449
Soldiers,
Parcels for, 3644
Returned, 1586
Votes for, 4775, 4832
Widows of, 3805
Steyner public building, 5412
Taxation, proposals of the Government, 2912
Telegraphs and telephones, 3548
War
Canada's part in the, 2906
Prosecution of, 1576
War-time Elections Bill, 5762, 5845

Currie, Col. J. A., M.P., military position and pay of, 595

Currie, General, despatch from, 4510

Customs
Bonded goods, shipments of, 1854
Department
Appointments of returned soldiers, 1850, 1858, 1884

Customs—*Con.*
Dismissals, 1844
Estimates, 643, 1843, 1881, 5098, 5777
Motor boats in use by, 3759
Motor car of, 1476
North Sydney officials, 1852
Staff and salaries, 643, 1843, 5908, 5777
See also Civil Service
Drawbacks, payments of, 1818
Forms, printing of in French and English, 3133, 3134
Minister of, private car for, 5082
Preventive service, 1881
Revenue cruisers, 1881
Unclaimed goods, disposal of, 3743

Customs Act Amendment Bill
Duties payable on Crown's goods. Res., 1978. 1r., 1985. 2r., 2119. Com., 2121. Rep., 2136. 3r., 2137

Customs Tariff,
Alcohol, proposed free admission for hospital use, 5103
Apples, 1472, 1615
Bags and sacks, 1867
Beans for seed, 671
Bran and middlings, 1867
British preference, proposed increase, 1776
Crown, goods of the, dutiable. *See* Customs Act Amendment Bill
Farm implements, 1686, 1708
Fertilizer, 1709
Food, proposed additions to the free list, 1776-1790
Gasolene, 1675
Hospital supplies, 5103
Imperial Munitions Board imports, 1978
Provincial governments, duties payable by, *See* Customs Act Amendment Bills

Dagneau, John F., position of, 1471

Dairying. *See* Agriculture

Dalhousie, N.B., militia buildings, 454

Danis, Joseph Maximilian, employment of, 2618

Davidson, Mr. Avard L. (Annapolis)
Army, soldiers, voting of, 4709, 4712, 4772
Carroll, Lieut. W. F., M.P., 6066
Douglas, Captain J. M., M.P., 6066
Ellis, Captain J. F., M.P.P., 6066
Neely, Captain D. B., M.P., 6066
Nova Scotia public works, 5320
Ralston, Major J. L., M.P.P., 6067
Schaffner, Mr. L. P., dismissal of, 441
Taxation, income, 4136
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5376
War-time Elections Bill, 5733, 5737

Davidson, Hon. Sir Charles, Kt., Commissioner
Payments to, 898
Report of, 249, 524

Davies Company. *See* Food: Investigation

Dawson post office, 4952, 5313

Daylight Saving Bill. 1r., 2956; 2r., 2945, 3677; com., progress reported, 3687

Dean, Lieutenant R. I., position of, 5703

Decoders. *See* Censors

"Defeat or Victory," book, question as to prohibition of, 1473

Defence of Canada. *See* Militia and Defence

Delisle, Mr. Michel S. (Portneuf)
Chicoutimi, pure bred animals at, 4152
Desertions from army, 338
Dillon, Mr. G. A., 4061
Dorchester County Railway, 5361
Fiset, Theophile, 1959
Gazelle, Noel, enlistment of, 337
Grenier, Mr. Armand, 3757
Lacasse, Mr. Isidore, 5272
Lewis, Mr. J. H., 2944
Military Service Bill, 3064
Transcontinental railway, Portneuf claims, 1571
157th Battalion, 5272

Demers, Mr. M. Joseph (St. John and Iberville)
Auditor General's report, 1469
Canadian Northern Railway acquisition of, 5078
Military Service Bill, 2561
Authority of Parliament, 2561
Motives of the Government, 2563
Referendum proposals, 2567

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees (Mr. J. H. Rainville)
Address to Mr. Viviani, 1361
Election of, 334
Rulings and statements of
Bills—Sections allowed to stand not discussable, 4752
Censored publications, quotations in Parliament from, 5493
Irrelevancy, 2362, 2374, 5235, 5237
Money vote, how amendable, 521
Ways and means, second amendment to motion for, 1319

Descarries, Mr. Joseph A. (Jacques Cartier)
Address in reply to the Governor General's speech, 12
Tributes to deceased members, 13
The Allies' part in the war, 14
Conscription, 14

Descarries, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Imperial War Conference, 15
Expiration of term of Parliament, 15
Progressive policies of present administration, 16
Fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, 16
Military Service Bill, 2982
Appeals, 3184
Burden of proof, 3323
Tribunals, 3172
Railway Act, The, 3441, 3444

Desjardins, Lt.-Col., employment of, 1818

Devlin, Mr. Emmanuel B. (Wright)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 244, 249
National unity and harmony, 244
Recruiting figures, 245
Quebec and the war, 247
Patriotic policy of Liberal party, 248
Statements of Hon. Mr. Blondin, 250
Attitude of the Government, 250
Blondin, Hon. Mr., alleged statements of, 250
Burgess, defalcation of, 1127
Canadian Expeditionary Force, 1576
Canadian Northern railway, 4863
Civil Service
Disfranchisement of civil servants, 2021
Salaries, 1038, 2010
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1176
Judges' salaries, 5797
Military Service Bill, 2731
Authority under Militia Act, 2732
Contraventions of Act, 3332
Persons liable for service, 3129
Quebec province, position of, 2736
Referendum proposals, 2736
Tribunals, 3153
Milsom, Major J. C., 1265
Recruiting, 245
Folkstone director of, 1226
Spittal, Lt.-Col. C. D., 1127
War loan bonds, 2774
War taxation, use of funds obtained from, 4147

DeWolfe, Fred. T., position of, 5703

Digby,
Government lands, 2321
Indian lands, 304

Dillon, Major G. A., appointment of, 1958, 4061

Distilleries. *See* Grain *and* Alcohol

Divorce, Committee to revise rules governing, 4192, 4291
See Gordon Divorce Bill

Dodge, L. B., payments to, 306

Doherty, Hon. C. J. (Minister of Justice)
Béland, Hon. Dr. H. S., M.P., 524
Capital punishment, abolition of
Proposed plebiscite, 1017
Spain case, the, 1021
Coalition government, 3023
Companies Act Amendment, Bills, 1155
Criminal Code amendments
Insurance, 1773, 2104, 4388
Jurors, 2567, 4293, 4307
Non-support, foster parents, bawdy houses, insolvent traders, constables' fees, 4291, 4463
Customs, Crown's goods, 1983, 2119
Davidson Commission report, 524
Exchequer Court expenses, 1811
Government Railways Act amendment, 4368
Interest Act Amendment Bill, 2569, 3401
Judges
Appointment of, 1807
Salaries. *See* Judges Act Amendment Bill
Saskatchewan and Ontario, 1973
Yukon, 5896
Judges Act amendment, 2137, 5954, 6062
Justice Department, estimates, 1805, 5896, 6033
Kelly, Thomas, 1813, 4926, 5794
McLeod-Tellier Commission, 2357, 4291
Military service, 3016
Appeals and appeal tribunals, 3184, 3301
Authority of Parliament, 3031
Burden of proof, 3320
Classes, division into, 3353, 3359
Contraventions of Act, 3326, 3351
Enforcement, 3264
Exceptions and exemptions, 3303, 3307, 3568
Referendum proposals, 3028
Tribunals, 3153, 3168, 3296, 4193, 5881
Military Voters' Bill, 4406, 4688, 4742, 4792, 4874, 4889, 5956
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, claims under, 5977
Penitentiaries
Kelly, Thomas, treatment of, 1813, 4926, 5794
Officials' salaries, 6039
Prisoners, proposed enlistment of, 1013, 1814
Pensions, 6039
Post Office Department, estimates, 2352, 2360, 3634, 6051
Prices, contract fixing of, 1624
Provincial legislatures, powers of, 1808
Provincial prohibitory legislation, Bill in aid of, 4192, 4395, 5514
Woman suffrage, 1491

Doherty, Hon. C. J., payments to, 898

Dominion Canners Company, 1105, 1289

Dominion Day; fiftieth anniversary. *See* Confederation

Dominion Lands Act Amendment Bills
General (No. 107, Mr. Roche), 1r., 2832. 2r., 3793. Com., 3793
Patents (No. 12, Mr. McCraney), 1r., 159. Withdrawn, 1157

Dominion Lands and Parks
Animals in, 1359
Estimates, 1344, 4917
Forest reserves, 1349
Officials, 1675
See Parks

Dominions, overseas, constitutional relations of, 1528, 1531

Dominions Royal Commission, 599, 2338

Donaldson, Mr. Samuel J. (Prince Albert)
Army camps, sale of liquor in, 816

Dorchester county election, 92. 111, 120, 146, 173, 208, 255, 293

Dorchester County Railway, 5361

Dorchester, N.B.
Penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries
Wharf, 3874

Douglas, Mr. James M. (Strathcona)
Apples, duty on, 1472, 1715
Army, forestry battalions, 3950
Dominion Lands Act amendment, 3805
Flour, price of, 5211
Gasolene, duty on, 1675
Grain
Elevators, 3705
Wheat, fixing of price of, 3705
Military Service Bill, 3051
Patriotic Fund allowances, 3952
Tariff revision, 1714
War-time Elections Bill, 5604

Douglas, Captain J. M., position of, 6066

Drake, steamship, duty on cargo of, 4245

Dredging. *See* Public Works

Dropped order. *See* Parliamentary Procedure

Drummond, T. J., steamer, 669, 4925, 4939

Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amendment Bill.
Res., 4455. 1r., 5771. 2r., 5887. Com., 5915. 3r., 5918

Dubreuil, Mr., dismissal of, 3635

Dussault, Mr. Albert, employment of, 457

Dynamite outrages
Arrests in Montreal, 5423
Atholstan, Lord, 5423
Bigras, Gedéon, 5360

East Bay wharves, 5315

Eaton, Ernest, enlistment of, 3419

Economic and Development Commission, 1125, 2200, 5792

Edmonton, enlistments, 336. 3373

Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway, subsidy to, 4925

Edson, Alta., population of, 1816

Edward VII, monument to His late Majesty, 3897

Edwards, Mr. J. W. (Frontenac)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 204
The war, 204
Political patronage in purchase of war supplies, 205
Patriotic Fund separation allowances, 207
Military appointments, 207
Maritime Province elections, 207
The Dorchester compaign, 208
Recruiting in Quebec. 213, 221
Statements of the leader of the Opposition, 218, 220
Naval policy of Liberal party, 219
Extension of term of Parliament—votes for soldiers, 223
National ideals, 224
Bran and shorts, duty on, 1875
Budget, 1209
The record of the Liberal party, 1209
Canada's trade, 1211
Free wheat, 1212
Vessels for carrying flour, 1213
Free trade, 1214
Scarcity of food, 1216
Improvement of highways, 1217
The leader of the Opposition, 1219
Proposed general election, 1220
Cattle, British embargo on, 922
Censorship, 5943
Dorchester county election, 208
Experimental farms, 2055
Food, scarcity of, 712, 1216
Free wheat, 1212
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5500
High cost of living, 712, 1216
Highways, improvement of, 1217
Home defence recruiting officers, 3134
Horses, glandered, 2056
House of Commons stenographers, 5789
Immigration agents, 4914, 5361
Judges' salaries, 5799. *See, under this head,* Supreme Court
Lavergne, Mr. Armand, 2619
Mail clerks, French-speaking, 5272
Military districts Nos. 3 and 10, 455
Military service, 2715, 3221
National service cards, 667, 713

Edwards, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
Parcel post service, 3634
Parliamentary secretaryships, 4211, 4214
Party records, 2373
Patriotic Fund, 207, 595, 3951
Penitentiaries
Portsmouth, 3418
Report of inspector of, 3419
Salaries of officials, 6033
Pensions, 6012
Post office signs—language in which written, 5999
Potatoes, 5987
Pugsley, Lieut. J. A., 4895
Quebec and military service, 2719-2728
Recruiting, 213, 221, 569
Rural mail routes, 1959
Shipbuilding, 1213, 1670
Soldiers
Pay and pensions of, 3216, 6012
Voting of, 223, 4807, 4895
Storage elevators, 2099
Supreme Court—allowance to Chief Justice, 6049
Taxation of wealth, 2728
Unclaimed bank balances, 1010
Votes for soldiers, 223, 4807
War-time Elections Bill. 5570, 5678, 5742, 5873

Eggs, imports and exports of, 1573

Elaine, steamer, 1379

Elevators. *See* Grain.

Ellis, Captain J. F., position and pay of, 6066

Elrose, Sask., mail service, 899.

Elliot, Mr. George A. (North Middlesex)
Soldiers, votes for, 1387

Emigration
Restrictions on Canadians of military age, 1726, 1775
United States, to, 987, 3285
See also Immigration

Esquimalt dock yards, 5915

Estevan, Canadian Government Steamship, purchase of provisions for, 4923

Estimates. *See titles of Departments and subjects*

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C. (Two Mountains)
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5019, 5112
Food requirements, 2869
Military service, 2863
Labour, attitude of, 2871
St. Jerome post office, 899
War-time Elections Bill, 5826

Exchequer Court. *See* Supreme Court, etc., Bill

Exchequer Court Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 1422.

Excise. *See* Inland Revenue

Expeditionary force. *See* Army

Experimental farms. *See* Agriculture.

Faguy, Gaudiose. dismissal of, 2284

False Creek dredging, 900, 1126

Farm labour. *See* Labour

Farmers
Employment of soldiers by, 1677
Loans to. *See* Bank Act Amendment Bill
Western, relief for. *See* Grain

Farmers Bank
Depositors, proposed reimbursement of, 4508
Shareholders of, 301

Farming industry, development of, 1776, 1786. *See also* Agriculture

Fiddlers *See* "The Fiddlers"

Finance
Debt of Canada, 347
Department
Estimates, 578, 1790, 6289
Staff and salaries, 1796, 5289
Gold, handling of, 1796
Income and expenditure of Canada, 274, 718, 723, 745, 846
Interest. *See* Interest Act Amendment Bill
Loans
Dominion, $100,000,000
Cost of issue, 342, 435, 4957
Proceeds from, 4416, 4621. *See* Public Service Loan Bill
Farmers, to. *See* Bank Act Amendment Bills
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, 5292
Quebec harbour. *See that title*

Fiset, Theophile, payments to, 1959

Fish and fisheries
Advisory Board, 2151
Bait, 2036
Bounties to fishermen, 457
Canneries
Licenses for operation of, 3399
See Meat and Canned Foods Act Amendment Bill *and* Fisheries Act Amendment Bill
Committee on supply of, 3400
Department
Appointments, 2149
Estimates, 2149
Development of industry, 2037
Dogfish, 2176
Exhibit at Toronto, 2033
Export of, 454
Herring, 2036

Fish and Fisheries—*Con.*
Inspection, 2035
Inspector Fisher, 2170
Investigation of problems, 5288
Laws, violation of, 2389
Licenses, 2051, 2182
Lobsters, 2049, 2117, 2154, 4171, 5425
Marketing, 2037, 2042
Ministry of, proposed, 2026
Officers, 2151, 2157, 2161
Oysters, 2174
Patrol service, 2183
Protection service, 4163, 4166, 4170
Salt for curing purposes, 1027, 1319, 1373, 2044, 2290, 3556
Sardine fisheries, 4168
Telephone method of fishing, 2176
Transportation, 2031, 2042, 3392, 3556, 4933
Trawlers, steam, 300
Whitefish, 2159

Fisheries Act Amendment Bill. Res, 2116. 1r., 2118. 2r., 2149. Ref, to Com., 2149. Com., 3399. 3r., 3400

Fisher, Mr. John H. (Brant)
Recruiting in Paris and Burford, 601
Soldiers, votes for, 1386

Flags on public buildings, 4146

Flavelle, Sir Joseph, letter from, 2956, 4010
See O'Connor *and* Food

Flax industry, 4683

Flour. *See* Grain

Food
Adulteration of, 2387
Bacon and lard, 3915, 5274
Beef, exports and imports of, 1574
Butter. *See* Agriculture
Cheese. *See* Agriculture
Control of, 108, 695, 1304, 1313, 1427, 1989, 2076, 2471, 2509, 2580, 3045, 3744
Australia, in, 963
Prices, 3918
Sugar, 1992
Controller
Appointment, 2433
Office and assistants, 3502, 4413, 4414, 4244
Powers of, 3943
See also Food Products
Eggs, exports and imports of, 1573
Fish, committee on supply of, 3400
Flour, 700, 1868, 5207
Prices and profits, 1039, 1088, 5085
Yukon, in, 2237
See also Grain.
Imports and exports of, 1573
Inspectors, 607

Food—*Con.*
Investigations of Mr O'Connor:
Report of, 3652, 3914; inquiry into, 3914, 3744, 4243
Maple sugar and syrup, 1958
Order in Council *re* sale of, 1273
Packages and containers of, 4065, 4070
Potatoes, 702, 2095. *See* Agriculture
Prices and supply of
Flour, 700
Sugar, 695
See, under this title, Control *and* Controller
Scarcity of, 1216
Sugar, 695, 1957
Supply of, arrangements with British Government, 2260
See also Meat and Canned Foods Act Amendment Bill; Grain; Inspection and Sale Act Amendment Bill

Forestry
Poplar, conservation of, 3742
Timber, protection of, 1349
White pine, blister rust, 4677

Fortier, Mr. Edmond (Lotbinière)
Burke, Col. Rev. A. E., 5704
Customs, private car for Minister of, 5082
McLeod-Tellier Commission, 3418
Military service, 3067
Public Works Department,—automobile purchase, 2480

Foster, Mr. A. De Witt, government employ of, 303

Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir George E. (Minister of Trade and Commerce)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J., visit to Canada and to House of Commons, 613
Board of Grain Supervisors for Canada, 2236, 3692
Boards of Trade Act, 3657
Canada Temperance Act, 1263
Canada Year Book, 2337
Civil Service—employment of men in higher offices, 1260
Coal, supply of, 4064, 4788
Confederation, fiftieth anniversary of, 1865
Connaught, the late Duchess of, 609
Daylight saving, 2356, 2945, 3677
Dominions Royal Commission, 599, 2338
France, trade relations with, 597, 2309
Fuel controller, appointment of, 2235
Grain
Breweries and distilleries, for, 1185
Congestion in the West, 340
Elevators, 2334, 3707, 3710, 3689
Prices, fixing of, 3689, 4564
Hay, inspection and grading of, 3402
Industrial and scientific research, 5276
Joffre, General—visit to Canada, 613

Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir G. E.—*Con.*
Military service, 2404
Oil bounties, 2329
Packages, marking of,—inspection and sale, 4065
Parliament
Extension of term of, 3461
Sessions of, expenses of, 1262
Pay and Records Office, 1355
Pensions, 6007
Railway Act, 3717
Referendum on military service, 2410
Research Council Bill, 2357, 3905, 3957
Salt for fish curing, 2290
Scientific and industrial research, 3905, 3957
Secretary of State Department estimates, 3737
Shipbuilding, 1337, 5436
Soldiers, returned, care of, 1590
Steamship service, 2285, 2323
Submarine situation, 1335
Technical education, 1244
Trade and Commerce
Commissioners and agents, 2326
Department estimates, 1835, 2285, 2323, 3687, 5205, 5275
United States
Declaration of war by, 610
Tariff, changes in, 1264
Viviani, M., address to, 1366
War
Charities, 5489
Prosecution of, 1588
Supplies—munitions contracts, 5529
War-time Elections Bill, 5853
Wealth, conscription of, 3462
Zinc bounties, 2330

Foster parents
See Criminal Code Amendment Bills

Fotheringham, Surgeon General J. T., report of, 4059

France
Exhibitions project with Canada, 2260
Food supplies for, 2310
Railway material for, 310, 335, 1229, 1266, 1372, 1473, 1474, 1615, 1628, 1690, 1820, 3407, 3409, 5293
Trade relations with, 597, 2307, 2309
Visit of Prime Minister to, 1536

Franchise
See War-time Elections Bill; Military Voters' Bill; Woman suffrage

Frank, Alta., moving of residences at, 4919

Fraser river channel improvements, 1126

Free wheat *See* Grain

Freight rates *See* Transportation

French Army manœuvres, attendance of Canadian officers at, 5219

French-Canadians
Enlistment of. *See* Quebec *and* Army
United States, in, 4914

French language
Bills, printing of in, 5550, 5559
Government officials speaking, 2262, 2265, 2340, 2759, 5272

Fripp, Mr. Alfred E. (Ottawa)
Civil Service
Disfranchisement of Civil servants, 2018
Promotions, 2018
Salaries, 2247

Fuel
Coal
Confiscation of by railways, 194, 334, 584
Mining
Director of operations, 2609, 2776
Government control, 1996
Western, 119, 169, 195, 341, 458, 523, 614, 1267, 1372, 1616, 1723, 1725, 2183, 2200, 2238, 2570, 2609, 2653, 2776, 3617, 4009, 4621
Ottawa prices, 1320
Pennsylvania, from, 2199
Prices and supply, 83, 665, 2092, 2292, 4621, 4788
Regulations *re* sale of, 1275, 2317
Transportation of, 1919, 3395, 4791
United States situation, 4788
Control, 1275, 2317
Controller
Appointment of, 2235
Assistant to, 4152
Staff of, 4245, 5422
Utilization of resources, coal, peat, oil shales, etc., 1405-1422
See also Mines and Minerals

Fullerton, Major T. F., employment of, 4508

Galt, Mr. Justice, report of, 599, 602, 2322, 2357; inquiry into, *see* McLeod-Tellier Commission

Game. *See* Northwest Game Bill

Gascons wharf, 2055

Gasolene. *See* Taxation

Gaspe steamship services, 2299, 2318, 2325

Gauthier, Mr. Louis J. (St. Hyacinthe)
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5003, 5182
Language reflecting on the Chair withdrawn, 2609
Military service, 2551
Referendum, 2555
War-time Elections Bill, 5824

Gauvreau, Mr. Charles A. (Temiscouata)
Bartlett, Major, 5422
Currie, Col. J. A., M.P., position and pay of, 595
Currie, General, despatch from, 4510

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*
Exchequer Court cases, 335
Government railways
Intercolonial, pension fund, 1476
Promotion of employees, 768
Jenkins, Lieut.-Col. S. R., 5422
Leigh, Major, 5422
L'Espérance, Hon. D. O., 4511
Lighthouse keepers' salaries, 3134
Louisville post office, 899
Military service, 2746
Exceptions, 3566
Recruiting in Quebec, 2748
Patent medicines, 335, 985, 1470
Riou, Mr. C S., 3904
Riviere du Loup, ferry service, 452
Seed grain for eastern Canada, 1150
Steamship service, Quebec, 2318
Temiscouata mail contract, 335
Thompson, Dr. Alfred, M.P., 5083

Gazelle, Noel, enlistment of, 337

Geological surveys, 4179

Georgian Bay Canal Commission, 452, 989, 3900, 5913

German, Mr. William M. (Welland)
Army
Equipment, 559
Medical service, 559, 3989
Officers, alleged surplus of, 560, 564
Recruiting, 560, 2631
Soldiers, voting of, 4701, 4718, 4818, 4893-4914
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4026, 4254, 4869, 4960, 5049, 5189
Civil servants, compulsory retirement of, alleged, 2059
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Branch Lines Company, 1375
High Commissionership, 4177
Loans to farmers, 1961
Military Service, 2630
Racing meets, limitation of, 322
Railways,
Government policy in regard to, 2219, 2221
Senate, proposed change in constitution of, 1131
Situation, inquiry into, 3408, 3414
Submarine warfare, 334
Taxation of income, 4072
Trent canal, 3405
War supplies,
Boots, 4062
Equipment generally, 559
Munitions, 5525
War-time Elections Bill, 5755
Welland canal, 3402
Woman suffage, 1508

Gerrie, Mr. Charles, appointment of, 4245

Gibson, Lieutenant William, position of, 5422

Girard, Mr. Joseph (Chicoutimi and Saguenay)
High cost of living, 2829
Military service, 2825, 3189, 3353
Recruiting, 2827
Riviere du Loup steamship service, 2358

Glass, Mr. S. Francis (East Middlesex)
Budget, 1432
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4039
Cheese, inspection of, 2268
Cold storage, 2080
Daylight saving, 3685
Grain Supervisors, 3699
Insurance, 4389
Lord's Day Observance Act, 936
Military service, 1676, 3145, 3224, 3230, 3277
Straw, utilization of, 4683
Taxation of business profits, 1646
Technical education, 1249
Unclaimed bank balances, 1010
War charities, 5484, 5491, 6064
War-time Elections Bill, 5602, 5686, 5740
Wheat, fixing of price of, 3696

Glen, Colonel Joseph, payments to, 1377

Goldman, Mr. I., employment of, 4510

Government Railways
See Canadian Government Railways

Government Railways Act Amendment Bill, 1r., 3845. 2r., 4339. Com., 4339, 4365, 4863. 3r., 4417
Amendment, proposed: Mr. Boulay, ruled out, 4382: Mr. Hughes, 4385; lost on div., 4387

Graham, Hon. George P. (South Renfrew)
Agriculture, development of, 2578
Aiken, Mr. G. O., 4151, 4508
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 835
Officers
Reversion to ranks of, 3997
Wives of, passports for, 3997
Soldiers, voting of, 4793-4834
Athletic associations, 5922
Bennett, Mr. R. B., M.P., reply to statement of, 804, 869
Breidert and Mudge patents, 1200
Canada Gazette, publication of, 3737
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4022, 4217, 4277, 4282, 4388, 4471, 4591, 4622, 4845, 5041, 5158
Capital punishment, 627, 1022
Charitable enterprises, organization and control over, 378, 5485
Chicago drainage canal, 302

Graham, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Civil Service
Appointments, 693, 2017
Employment of men in higher offices, 1259
Promotions, 2017
Companies Act amendment, 5922
Customs disposal of unclaimed goods, 3743
Defence of Canada, 359
Fisheries protection service, 4170
Food control, 2580
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5501
Government Railways
Cars, purchase of, 758, 1376
Promotion of employees, 770
Government Railways Act amendments, 4344, 4367
See under this head, Intercolonial; Transcontinental
Grain elevator facilities, 4188
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1183
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, loan to, 5299
Indians, British Columbia, 2340
Intercolonial, transfor of, alleged arrangements for,—denial, 804, 869
Judges, appointment of, 1807
McNab, Colin C., 578
Military buildings, inspector of, 1039
Military service
Classes, 3276
Contraventions of Act, 3225, 3349, 3580
Conscription of wealth, 2576
Enforcement, 3268
Exceptions, 3270, 3564, 3591
Exemptions, 3212, 3276
Industrial requirements, 2579
Insurance of war risks, 3557
Persons liable for service, 3128
Policies of leader of the Opposition, 2572
Quebec's attitude, 2572
Recruiting, 2573
Referendum proposal, 2582
Tribunals, 3160
Mines, Minister of, proposed, 2007
National Serivce Board
Expenses, 3676
Officers, 376
Noxious weeds, 2068
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4431
Packages, marking—inspection and sale, 4068
Parliament buildings, construction of, 4182
Parliament, extension of term of, 3458
Pensions, 6024
Post Office Department estimates, 2352
Prisoners in penitentiaries, release of for farm work, 803

Graham, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, 911
Public works expenditure, 5343
Quebec and Saguenay Railway bondholders, 669
Railway Act, the, 605, 3420-3453, 3522
Railways—material for use in France, 335, 1833
Recruiting, 375, 568, 2573
Ross rifle, 482
Royal Military College, 5310
Senate, appointments to, 928
Soldiers
Cessation of working pay, 457
Returned, appointment of to government positions, 1850, 1858, 6054
Voting of, 4793, 4834
Taxation
Income, 1631, 3771, 4073, 4104
Land, 1629
Wealth, 2576, 3461
Telegraphs and telephones, 3545
Telephone lines, government, 5364, 5382
Trade and Commerce Commissioners, 2327
Transcontinental railway operations, 1573
War charities, 378, 5485
War, prosecution of the, 2320
War-time Elections Bill, 5589, 5674, 5686, 5693, 5729-5771, 5856
Wheat, free, 642

Grain and grain products
Bran and middlings, 1867, 4468
Breweries and distilleries for, 1176
Commission, Chairman of, 3711
Congestion of in the West, 340
Diseases—rust, 2063
Elevators, 986, 2099, 2334
Claims of employees, 386
Facilities, 4189
Operation of, 3705
Flour, sales of between Canada and United States, 5273
Freight rates on, 2210
Grading of, 1265
Middlings, duty on, 1867
Rust, 2063
Seed
Eastern Canada for, 1150, 1188
Payment for advances, 1126
Purchase of, 4677, 4916, 4924
Supervisors. *See* Board of Grain Supervisors
Transportation of, 1682, 3396, 3412, 3712
Wheat
Commission, 1381
Exportation of prohibited, 3882
Free, 729, 747-756, 850, 864-884, 889
Prices, fixing of, 3688, 4687, 4887, 4926, 5206, 5218, 6000

Grain and Grain products—*Con.*
Surplus, purchases of, 1126
Telegram from Non-Partisan League, on, 4512, 4564, 4661
United States tariff on, 1342

Grande Prairie immigration hall, 1575, 1817

Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company Bills
1. Bill No. 33 (Mr. Currie) 1r., 585; withdrawn, 667
2. Bill No. 41 (Mr. Currie) 1r., 843; 2r., 896; com., 1375; 3r., 1445

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway
Financial statements respecting, 4058
Loan to, 5292
Removal of rails from, 5293
Report of Drayton-Acworth Commission, 4011

Gravel, Lieut. Gedéon, 1674

Gravelle, Mr. Oscar, position of, 1226

Great Britain, military service in, 2908
See Army Act

Great War Veterans Association, 1574

Green, Mr. Robert F. (Kootenay)
Railway Act, The, 3514, 3542, 3545
Telegraphs, provisions governing, 3542

Grenier, Mr. Armand, employment of, 3757

Grey, Ambrose, employment of, 1818

Grilse, H.M.C.S., 4563

Grosse Isle quarantine station, 5306

Guthrie, Mr. Hugh (South Wellington)
Bags and sacks, duty on, 1873
Bran and shorts, 1874
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5035
Coalition government, 2463
Enlistment, voluntary, 2454
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5502, 5903
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1179
Military service, 2452
Personal, attitude respecting, 3721
Tribunals, 3300
Soldiers
Returned, care of, 470
Voting of, 4410
Tariff revision, 1780
Taxation
Income, 1783, 2453
Wealth, 2453
War-time Elections Bill, 5598
Windsor immigration officer, 2357

Guysborough public building, 5914

Gwatkin, General, administration of military affairs by, 4419

Halifax
Dry docks, 5915
Railway terminals, 2214

Halifax & Eastern Railway, contractors, 304

Hansard. *See* House of Commons

Hants county apple inspectors, 1380

Harbours. *See* Public works

Hardy, Lieut. M. R., employment of, 4509

Harris, Capt. R. V., position of, 5422

Hay, inspection and grading of, 3402
See Inspection and Sale Act Amendment Bill

Hazen, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries)
Army
French front, visit to, 1563
Pensions, 1610
Wet canteens, 1561
British Admiralty, recruiting for, 4163
Coal, transportation of, 4791
Dry docks, 5887
Fish and fisheries
Advisory Board, 2151
Canneries, 2117, 3399
Department
Appointments, 2149
Estimates, 2149
Dogfish, 2176
Exhibit at Toronto, 2033
Herring, 2036
Inspection, 2035
Lobsters, packing of, 5426
Ministry of, proposed, 2030
Officers, 2163
Transportation, 2031
White fish, 2159
Fisher, Mr. Ward, appointment of, 2170
Fisheries Act Amendment Bill, 3399
Gwatkin, General, 4426
Imperial War Conference, 1556
Lake of the Woods water level, 4178
Live stock, shipments, inspection of, 1842
Marine Department, estimates, 1815, 1836, 1881, 1912
Meat and Canned Foods Act, 2114, 3400
Minto, steamer, food supplies for, 2175
Naval Service Department, estimates, 4157
Ocean Telegraph Act, 2024, 2108
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4426
Public Works Department estimates, 5890
Pugsley, Mr, statement of, 5274
Quebec harbour advances, 435, 577
Royal Naval College, 4163
St John harbour, 4187, 5892
Shipbuilding, 1557, 1665, 1912, 4164

Hazen, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Universal Radio Syndicate, Limited, 2024, 2108
War-time Elections Bill, 5717
Heals station rifle range, 1573, 1675
Heatherton, N.S, mail contract, 1817
Henderson, Mr. Geo. F., K.C., position of, 4010, 4211, 4243
See O'Connor
High Commissioner, Canadian, Office of, 4177
High cost of living, 129, 961, 2076, 2055
Yukon, in, 2199
See also Customs Tariff Act; Food Products; Price; O'Connor.
Highways, improvement of, 1217
Hindu immigration, 2145
Hobbs, Mr. Hugh, 1228
Home Defence, 336, 1038, 2628, 3955
Officers, recruiting of, 3134
Homesteads
Patents, delay of, 3759
Regulations, 1741, 1746
Settlers' names, 1819
See also Dominion Lands Act Amendment Bill
Hopetown post office, 989, 1474
Horses. *See* Agriculture
Hospitals
Marine, 1953
Military
Canadian Hospital No. 8, 1674
Conditions in, 54, 59, 464
Construction of in Canada, 4045
European, 527
Hospital trains, 2205
Parliament Hill, on, 1228
See Military Hospital Commission, *and* Canadian Army Medical Service
House of Commons
Accountant's office, lease of premises, 5703
Business of the
Adjournments. *See also general title* Adjournment
Ascension Day, 1422
Dominion Day, 2620
Imperial War Conference, for, 117, 597
Victoria Day, 1628
See also general title Adjournment
Daily routine orders, 1423, 1524
Morning sittings, 2619, 2755, 2833
Private Bills, extension of time, 585
Saturday sittings, 344, 2569
Wednesday sittings, 324
Clerk of the House, retirement of Dr. Flint, 6043, 6069
Committees, select standing, 296, 1956
Reports of, 2054
Estimates, 2359, 5784, 6045
House of Commons—*Con.*
Hansard, cost of, 607
Members
Active service, on, 713
Deceased, tributes to, 3
New, introduction of, 7
Sessional indemnity of, 5790, 6043
Messengers, proposed increases in salaries to, 4684, 6053
Officials
Appointments, 586, 642, 843, 1956
Deputy Sergeant-at-arms, 3
Library, clerk in, 2832
Pages, chief of, 522
Reporting Branch, 522, 5636, 5702, 5786, 5949
Salary increases to, 4834
Secretaryship abolished, 5702
Translator, Chief, 522
Troop, Mr. Herbert D., 434
Returns, complaint of delay in bringing down, 1373
Sergeant-at-Arms, death of, 6069
Speaker, election of, 1
See Speaker
Speaker's quarters, 5784
Effects removed and returned, 2058
Stenographers, 5788
Vacancies, 1, 605, 2836
Howe, Lieut. M. J., position of, 6066
Hudson Bay Railway
Expenditure, 596, 900
Terminals, 2205
See Canadian Government Railways
Hughes, Mr. J. J. (Kings, P.E.I.)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 231
Naval affairs, 236
Purchase of war supplies, 232
Record of the present administration, 231
The Ross rifle, 235
Statements of ex-Minister of Militia, 234
Agricultural Instruction Act, payments under, 455
Bartlett, Major, 4292, 4416
Bruce report, publication of, 3845
Campbell, Capt. G. H., 4508
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5044
De Wolf, Fred. T., 5703
Ex-Minister of Militia, correspondence relating to resignation of, 991
Fullerton, Major T. F., 4508
Government Railways Act amendment, 4352, 4385
Government railways, management and operation of, 783
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1177

Hughes, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*
Hardy, Lieut. M. R., 4509
Intoxicating liquor, 4396, 4404
Carriage on government railways, 591
James Simmonds Co., 5122
Labourers from the United States, 1193
Machine guns, 452
Magdalen islands steamship service, 2302
McQueen, Lieut. W. A., 4508
Military District No. 6, 5237
Military service, 2971
Referendum, 2977
Moffatt, Lieut. R. J., 5361
Potatoes
Marketing of, 5989
Powdery scab, 2269
Prince Edward Island
Medical officers, 4563
Patriotism of men of the province, 2974
Railway, widening of, 3902, 3945
Steamship service, 660, 3954
Princess Louise Fusiliers officers, 5271
Quebec, recruiting in, 2972, 2977
Ross rifle, 235
Shipbuilding, 1335
Souris breakwater, 3871
Steamship services, 2326
United Mine Workmen of Nova Scotia, 802
War-time Elections Bill, 5664

Hughes, Sir Sam (Victoria, Ont.)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 253
Appreciation of British military assistance, 253
Personal attitude and policy, 254, 271
Col. Armand Lavergne, 256
Dorchester campaign, 255
Canadian troops in the South African war, 256
Troubles in administration of military affairs, 256
Status of Canadian forces, 259
Military equipment, 262
Appointment of General Steele, 264
Method of purchasing war supplies, 265
Disposition and command of Canadian forces, 268
Recruiting, 269
Canadian industries and the war, 270
Army
Badges of identification, 5953
Canteens, 808
Enlistment, voluntary, 2434-2449
Medical service, 537, 4199, 4466
Recruiting
Correspondence with Prime Minister, 3090
Officers in Quebec, 3135
Rejected men, 3099

Hughes, Hon. Sir Sam—*Con.*
Soldiers, voting of, 4898
60th Battalion, 525
Bruce, Dr., report of, 602
Canadian overseas forces
Despatch of to the front, 574
Disposition and command of, 268
Status of, 259
Canteens, open, 536
Currie, Mr. J. A., statement of, 5773
Hospitals, military—Bruce and Babtie commissions, 538
Irish, Mr. Mark, statements of, 2707
Lessard, General, 368
Maclean, Mr. A. K., statements of, 2777
Military equipment, 262
Military service, 3135
Authority of Canada, 2435
Classes, calling out by, 3137
Compulsion, advantages of, 2438
Correspondence with Prime Minister, 2434, 2446, 2449
Labour, requirements of, 2441
Recruiting, alleged retarding of, 2442
Officers
Reversion in rank—pay in such cases, 5423
Unemployed, 573
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4198, 4207, 4419, 4422, 4444
Administrative staff, 4956, 4959
Pay and Records Office, 3106
Recruiting, 269, 366, 379
Correspondence with Prime Minister, 2446
Lessening of, reasons for, 2442
Resignation of, 602
Ross rifle, 416, 480-493, 2451
Steele, General, appointment of, 264
Von Donop, Stanley, 523
War supplies, method of purchasing, 265

Hughes, Brig.-Gen. W. S., position of, 5361

Hyde, Mr. J. W., position of, 301

Hydrographic surveys, 4173

Immigration
Agents, 1737, 1754
Clergymen and priests employed as, 5361
Montreal, 5122
Quebec, 5122
United States, in, 4914, 5361
Chinese. *See* Chinese Immigration Act Amendment Bill
Department, estimates, staff and salaries, 4914
Deportation and rejection, 803
Figures, 803
Forms, printing of in French, 899, 3133, 3134

Immigration—*Con.*
French-Canadians in the United States, 4914
Hindu, 1763
Inspection, 803
Military service, exemption of immigrants from, 1572
Officers
Salaries, 2245
Windsor, at, 2357
Quarantine stations, 5306, 5312
Regulations, 372, 525
Regulations, Chinese immigration, 447
Rejection of undesirables at N. B. ports, 454
Rimouski, immigrants landed at, 4151
United States, from, 1739, 1747
See also Emigration

Imperial Munitions Board
Clerks, 305
Construction of ships by, 1661, 1663, 1913
Imports, 1978
Labour, 1985
Employees, 5271

Imperial preference, 1532, 1584

Imperial War Cabinet and Imperial War Conference
Adjournment of Parliament, 117, 596, 603
Announcement of meeting, 42
Attendance of Canadian Prime Minister, 597, 603, 1525
Correspondence with Colonial Secretary, 5, 24
Minutes of, extracts from, 2354
Proceedings of, 1525
Cattle embargo, 1535
Dominions overseas, constitutional relations of, 1528, 1531
Development and control of natural resources, 1532
Imperial preference, 1532
India, representation of, soldiers' graves, 1534
References to, 15, 24, 42, 148, 294
Statements by British Prime Minister, 2354
Statement by Mr. Hazen, 1556

Imperial War Graves Commission, 1534

Income War Tax Bill. Res., 3765. 1r., 3793. 2r., 4070. Com., 4070, 4102, 4124. 3r., 4638. Senate amdts., 5475; no precedent, 5476, 5883; amendment proposed: Mr. Pardee, 4639; ruled out, 4648

India, representation of,—Imperial War Conference, 1534

Indians
Agents, Bear River, 1569
Department of Indian Affairs, estimates, 1891, 2340, 2346
Lands of, 1887, 2348, 2389
Cutting timber on, 1889, 1901
Surveys of, 1894
Valuation and protection of, 1887
See also, under this head, Provinces *and* Reserves
Provinces, in
British Columbia, 653, 1896, 2340
New Brunswick, 1889
Northwest Provinces and Territories, 1894
Nova Scotia, 1887, 2349
Ontario, 1886
Quebec, 1886
Reserves, 989
Blackfoot, 2389
Caughnawaga, 1735
Digby, 304
Edmunston, 4920
Kitsilano, 1129, 1899
Okanagan, 1378, 2341
Sydney, 3663
Royal Commission, British Columbia, 653, 1038, 1896

Industrial and Scientific Research Bureau
Advisory council, 5279
Expenses, 5276
See also Research Council Bill *and* Technical education

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. *See* Labour

Industrial requirements *See* Labour

Inland Revenue
Department
Appointments in 1916, 758
Employees at Montreal, 758
Estimates, 2360, 3817
Expenditure, 2380
Preventive, officers, 3837, 3847
Staff and salaries, 2360, 3380

Insolvent Traders. *See* Criminal Code Amendment Bills

Inspection and Sale Act Amendment Bill. Res., 4065. 1r., 4070. Withdrawn, 5887

Insurance
Civil Service, 3503
Premiums of men in military service, 3557
See also Criminal Code Amendment Bills

Insurance Act of 1910 Reenactment Bill. 1r., 1724. 2r., 2100. Ref. to Com., 2104. Com., 3848, 4138, 5196. 3r., 5205. Sen. amdts., 5956

Insurance Act Amendment Bills
Mr. W. H. Bennett
Bill No 45; 1r., 1037; withdrawn, 1157
Bill No. 50; 1r., 1568

Intercolonial Railway. *See* Canadian Government Railways

Interest Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 2569. 2r., 3401. Com., 3401. 3r., 3402

Interest on judgments, 900

Interior Department
Appointments to under section 21, 1351
Calgary offices, 668
Estimates, 652, 1344, 1735, 4916
Expenditure, 1344
French-speaking employees of, 2340
Orders in Council relating to, 6000
Political activity of employees, 2349

Internal Economy Commission, 45

International Fisheries Commission, 892

International surveys, 1735

Interprovincial bridges, 3888

Intoxicating liquors
Army camps, in *See* Army
Manufacture and sale of, 454
Prohibition of, 2008
See also "The Fiddlers" *and* Canada Temperance Act
Prosecutions for sale of, 1575
Sale of, 3818
See also Provincial Prohibitory Legislation

Inverness harbour improvements, 5325

Irish-Canadian Rangers. *See* Army

Jack, Mr. E. Bryden, position of, 4508

Jaffray, Mr. J. P., position of, 4062

Jails. *See* Penitentiaries

Jameson, Mr. Clarence (Digby)
Fisheries, proposed ministry of, 2026
Military Service Bill, 2969
Soldier Settlement Board, 3784
Technical education, 1243

James Simmonds Co., The, purchase of goods from, 5122

Jamesville breakwater, 5328

Jenkins, Lieut.-Col. S. R., duties and pay of, 5422

Joffre, General, 613

Judges Act Amendment Bill. Res., 1973. 1r., 1978. 2r., Com., 2136. 3r., 2137. Sen. amdt., 5954, 6062

Judgments, interest on, 900
See Interest Act Amendment Bill

Justice
Administration of, 1805
Baugh, Edward Levi, case of, 1814

Justice—*Con.*
Department, estimates, 1805, 5097. 5794, 5896, 6033, 6049
Exchequer Court
Cases, 335
Expenses, 1811
Publications, 5804
Judges
Appointment of, 1806
Provincial commissions, on, 593
Salaries, 1973, 5798, 5954
Saskatchewan and Ontario, 1973
Yukon, 5896
Minister of, payments to, 898, 1225
Provincial legislatures, powers of, 1807, 1811
Supreme Court, Chief Justice of, special allowance to, 6049

Kay, Mr. William F. (Missisquoi)
Ballots for overseas forces, 452
Food Controller's office,employees, 3502
Foster, Mr. A. De Witt, 303
Fuel Controller, staff of, 4245
Oleomargarine, prohibition of, 304
Parliament buildings, marble for, 2833
War profits and income tax—cost of collection, 4686

Kelly, Thomas, treatment of in penitentiary, and release of, 896, 4926, 5273, 5794

Kemp, Sir Edward (Minister of Militia and Defence)
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 815
Discharges, 3096
Enlistments
Total, 3098
Voluntary, 3381
Forestry battalions, 3950
Medical service, 3967
Officers
Pay of, 1628
Retention of on leave, 5902
Salutes to, 5425
Surplus, 3103
Pay and Records office staff, 3104
Rejected men, 3099
Soldiers
Behaviour of, 5235
Personal requests concerning, 4203
Separation allowances, 4203
Civil servants, enlisted, pay and separation allowances to, 663
Expeditionary Force, disposition of, 2356
Home defence campaign, 2628
Irish-Canadian Rangers, 195
Lens, valour of Canadian soldiers at, 5195
Military service, 2620, 3239
Classes, 3357
Discharges from army, 3096
Exceptions, 3270

Kemp, Sir Ed.—*Con.*
Exemptions, 2624
Home defence, 2628
Quebec, recruiting in, 2626
Referendum, 2623
Voluntary enlistment, 2624
Militia and Defence Department, estimates, 3949, 3967, 3980, 4044, 5218
Officers, alleged surplus of, 562
Pensions
Canadians in Imperial forces, to, 4688
Prisoners of war, 666
Money orders and parcels for, 714
Recruiting, 562
British subjects in the United States, 2482
Quebec, in, 2626
War affairs, Government, administration of, 3381
War Purchasing Commission, purchases by, 341
156th Battalion, 523

Kentville armoury
Caretaker, 4509
Militia stores, 4510

Knight, Mr. N. H. R., position of, 4952

Knowles, Mr. William E. (Moosejaw)
Army
Officers' wives, passports for, 3996
Soldiers, votes for, 4690, 4806, 4877
Budget, 887
Free wheat, 889
Canada Grain Act, proposed amendment, 2954
Canadian Government railways
Private cars, 4938
Intercolonial, appointment of officials, 659
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4637, 5022
Civil Service salaries, 2946
Coal, shortage of, 2294
Western supply of, 4621
Coalition government, 2901
Daylight saving, 3686
Farming industry, development of, 1787
Flax industry, 4683
Flour prices, 5214
Food control, 2002
Free wheat, 889
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5493
Immigration
Chinese and Hindu, 2141
United States, from, 1742
Indians, British Columbia Commission, 653
Industrial and scientific research, 5277
Inland Revenue Department estimates, 2371-2381

Knowles, Mr. W. E.—*Con.*
Intercolonial railway, appointment of officials, 659
Interior Department employees, political activities of, 2350
Legislators, free transportation for, 4935
Military service, 2895
Date of second reading of Bill, 2322
Referendum, 2900
Senate amendments, 4665
Mining industry, 657
Moosejaw, enlistments at, 5122
Moosejaw News, patronage, 2708
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 4670
Postal clerks, salaries, 2708
Prices, contract fixing of, 385, 1617
Public works expenditure, 5333
Racing meets, limitation of, 324
Renault, Raoul, appointment of, 2371
Seed grain, 4678
Collections, 2351
Shipbuilding, British Columbia, 4940
Tariff revision, 1785
Taxation, income, 4075, 4105
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo railway, 2614
Toronto Telegram, statement of, 5085
Trade and Commerce Department, estimates, 2338
War charities, 5493
War-time Elections Bill, 5637, 5658, 5721, 5810, 5818, 6083

Kyte, Mr. George W. (Richmond)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 195
Appointment of Senators for Nova Scotia, 196
The high cost of living—war profits, 197
National Service Commission, 200
Resignation of ex-Minister of Militia, 201
Canadian Army Medical Service, 201
Separation allowances, 203
Political patronage in military affairs, 203
Army
Medical service, 201
Soldiers' assigned pay, 3224
Bear River post office site, 1378, 1569
Budget, 956
Free wheat, 956
Business profits, 959
High cost of living, 961
Control of foodstuffs in Australia, 963
Taxation of business profits, 965
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4041, 5010, 5165
Censors at Louisburg, 4008, 4048
Civil Serice appointments, 647

Kyte, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
Coal, 1998
Shortage of, 1919
Cost of living, O'Connor Commission report, 700, 961, 3914, 4010
Flour, 1039
Food control, 961, 988
Customs Department officials, 5101
Dawson post office, 4952
Dredge Cape Breton, loss of, 596, 1024, 3881
East Bay wharves, 5315
False Creek dredging, 900, 1126
Fish and fisheries, 2050
Advisory Board, 2152
Dogfish, 2179
Officers, 2157, 2161
Flags on public buildings, 4146
Flint, Dr., retirement of, 6044
Flour, price of, 1039
Food control, 1998
Fraser river channel improvements, 1126
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5904
Heals station rifle range, 1573
Imperial Munitions Board Labour, 1985
Inland Revenue Department officials, 2377
Intercolonial railway — improvement of grades, 456
Judges' salaries, 1974
Leblanc, Dr. B. A., 2283, 4416
Lewis machine guns, 590
Louisburg
Censors, 4008
Pilot Commissioners, 3677
Wireless station, 5122
Macdonald, Dr. J A., 2283
Mail contracts, 3636, 3639
Maritime Provinces military affairs, 5228
Military District No. 6, 5228
Military Hospitals Commission, 4243
Military service
Exemptions, 5271
Tribunals, 3158
Militia Department estimates, 5221
National Service Commission, 200
Naval Service officers at Halifax, 6000
Neilly, Dr., position of, 2707
Nova Scotia public works, 5315, 5324
O'Connor report, 4010
Ogilvie Flour Mills Company, Limited, 1818, 2389, 3677
Ottawa Journal-Press—correction of statement, 3759
Pacific Dredging Company, 1126
Parliamentary secretaryships, 4211
Pensions, 6018
Point Tupper mail service, 3502
Pommery, Mr. Samuel, 4952
Port Malcolm wharf, 3866

Kyte, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, 915
Rainbow, H.M.C.S., sinking of vessels by, 457
Recruiting, 2482
Returned soldiers, appointment of to goveernment positions, 6055
Richmond county medical officers, 3758
Ross rifle factory, taking over of by the Government, 663
Salt, shortage of, 3556
Shipbuilding, 5434
Steamship services, 2325
Sydney industrial sites, 3956
Taxation
Business profits, 965
Income, 4115, 5291
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5336
Turner, Mr. Harvey, 1469
Urquhart, Mr. Hector, 5367
Vancouver drill hall site, 456
War supplies
Munitions contracts, 5526
Purchase of, 4053
Waterford explosion, 5775
Women munitions workers, 4063
Yukon
Administrator, 5122
Commissioner, 3677

Labour
Attitude of on military service, 2426, 2488, 2451, 2604, 2663, 2795, 2871, 2958, 3725, 3732
Australian labour troubles, 698
Bureaus, 118
Chinese labourers, 2139
Conditions on munition work, 2492
Department administration, 1269
Assistant Deputy Minister, abolition of office of, 686
Estimates, 686, 1112, 1166, 1989, 3652
Staff and salaries, 686
See also Mines and Minerals, Coal
Fair wages and inspection officers, 3652
Farm labourers from the United States, 665, 1193, 1740, 1747, 3504, 4512
Government elevators, claims by employees, 386
Imperial Munitions Board, 1985
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1112, 1166, 1270
Military service, attitude to
See under this head Attitude
Strikes. *See* Coal *and* Thetford
Brantford moulders, 2322
Sorel strike, 1912, 1935
Yukon miners, 3086
Thetford mines. *See that title*

Labour—*Con.*
United Mines Workmen of Nova Scotia, 802
Women munitions workers, 4063

Lacasse, Mr. Isidore, employment of, 5272

Lachance, Mr. Arthur (Quebec Centre)
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5080, 5192
Faguy, Gaudiose, 2284
High cost of living, 2922
Military Service Bill, 2919
St. Charles river dam, 2525

Lafortune, Mr. David A. (Montcalm)
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5072, 5187
Capital punishment, 632
Coalition government, 3014
Criminal Code amendment, jurors, 4335
Military service, 3004
Referendum, 3013
Montreal, postmaster, 582
Ottawa Journal-Press, statement in, 3085
War supplies, munitions contracts, 5541

Lake of the Woods water level, 2775, 4178

Lalor, Mr. Francis R. (Haldimand)
Budget, 1096
Comparision of Conservative and Liberal administrations, 1097
Revenue and expenditure, 1098
Our part in the war, 1098
Fiscal policies, 1101
Reciprocity, 1103
Dominion Canners Company, 1105
Civil Service salaries, 2245
Coal, 2097
War-time Elections Bill, 5876

Lanctot, Mr. Roch (Laprairie-Napierville)
Arthurs, Lieut.-Col. James, 5914
Belford, Capt. J. F., 5703
Bernard, Lieut.-Col. E. S., 5703
Breadner, Mr. R. W., 3676
Budget, 1221
The farming situation, 1221
Free wheat, 1221
Embargo on hay, 1222
Canada's prosperity, 1223
The Nationalist party, 1224
Payments to Minister of Justice, 1225
Business Profits War Tax, 3676
Canadian Bank of Commerce, 4686
Canadian Northern Railway acquisition of, 5065
Caron, Mr. Hector, 4151
Davidson, Sir Charles, payments to, 898
Dean, Lieut. R. I., 5703
Doherty, Hon. C. J., payments to, 898, 1225
Food Controller, staff of, 4413

Lanctot, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Fuel Controller, assistant to, 4152
Hay, embargo on, 1222
Ice breakers, 1818
Imperial Munitions Board employees, 5271
Intercolonial railway, damage claims, 2707
Judges' salaries, 5801
Laporte, Mr. Hormidas, 4510
Military Service, 2962
National Service Commission employees, 4787
National Trust Company, directors of, 4685, 4417
Plaxton, Mr. C. P., 4416
Postmaster General, recruiting by, 4415
Rimouski
Immigrants, landing of, at, 4151
Medical officers, 4509
Public works employees, 4244
War measures, 525
War Veterans Association, 1574
Wealth, conscription of, 2965

Landry, Mr. Justice, findings of, 3109, 3609, 4512, 5248

Lapointe, Mr. E. (Kamouraska)
Civil Service employment of men in higher offices, 1260
Dussault, Albert, employment of, 457
Exchequer Court Act Amendment Bill, 1422
Inland Revenue Department estimates and officials, 361, 2364, 3825
Military service
Contraventions of Act, 3341
Exemptions, 3304, 6002
Voluntary enlistment, 2514
Referendum proposals, 2521
Provisions of the Militia Act, 2519
Quebec's position, 2515
Murray Bay railway service, 617
Quebec, available men for military service in, 3255
Riviere Ouelle-Murray Bay steamship service, 643
St. Roche Traverse light-keeper, 1378
War-time Elections Bill, 5807
Women in the Civil Service, 1260

Lapointe, Mr. Louis A. (Montreal, St. James)
Alcoholic liquors, revenue from sale and manufacture of, 304
Army—Soldiers, voting of, 4725
Bank Act amendment, 1037
Canadian Northern Railway acquisition of, 5036
Grain, fixing of price of, 3704
Hansard, cost of, 607
Military Service, 2770
Exemptions, 2773, 3226, 3308

Lapointe, Mr. Louis A.—*Con.*
Quebec's contribution of men, 3256
Recruiting, 2772
Quebec electoral lists, 6002
Senate Hansard, cost of, 1571
War-time Elections Bill, 5621, 5639, 5722, 5741, 5759, 5865

Laporte, Mr. Hormidas, payments to, 4510

Latchford, Ont., plant and buildings, sale of, 5706

Laurentian, steamer, 4563

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid (Quebec, East)
Address in reply to, the Governor General's Speech, 17
Canada's Governor General, 17
The war situation, 18
German peace proposals, 19
Our soldiers at the front, 20
Laxity of present administration, 20
Control of our military forces, 20
Equipment of Canadian troops, 23
The fiftieth Anniversary of Confederation, 24
Imperial War Conference, 24
Amqui-St. Leonard mail contract, 3903
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 813
Control of, by Canada, 20
Discharges, 3111
Equipment, 23
Recruiting
Quebec, in, 2395
Retarding of, 3094
Rejected men, 3101
Soldiers, voting of, 2403, 3727
Army Act, regulations, 3111
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J., address to, 1772
Canadian Northern Railway acquisition of, 4216, 4625, 4635, 5128
Capital punishment, 622
Coalition government, 3727
Correspondence with Sir Robert Borden, 2690
Confederation, fiftieth anniversary of, 24
Connaught, the late Duchess of, 610
Daylight saving, 3681
Defence of Canada, 358
Fisheries protection service, 4166
Galt, Mr. Justice
Report of, 2057
Rogers, Hon. Robert, criticism of, by, 599
Government Railways Act amendment, 4384
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Branch Lines Company, 1375

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
House of Commons
Business of the House, 1524
Morning sittings, 2619, 2775
Saturday sittings, 325, 2569
Wednesday sittings, 325
Clerk of the House, retirement of, 6070
Officials, appointments of, 586
Rights of House in dealing with taxation, 5479
Speaker's quarters, 5784
Imperial War Conference, 24
Adjournment of Parliament, 118
Visit of Prime Minister to, 1542
Insurance, 3848
Intoxicating liquor, 4397
Landry, Mr. Justice, report of, 4152, 5250
Mace, vote of thanks to donors of, 1469
McLeod-Tellier Commission, 2357, 5245
Members, deceased, tributes to, 4
Migratory birds, 3657
Military Service, 3111, 3254
Appeals, 3177
Board of Selection, 5084
Burden of Proof, 3319
Classes, 3132, 3140
Conscription, need of, considered, 2396
Contraventions of Act, 3324, 3337
Exceptions, 3559
Exemptions, 3207, 3362
Labour, attitude of, 3725
Men, available, 3724
Parliament, power of, 2392, 3723
Persons liable for service, 3116
Quebec enlistments, 2398
Referendum, 2403, 3721, 3728
Senate amendments, 4663
Tribunals, 3149, 3165, 3296, 3575, 5880
Votes for soldiers, 3727
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 4668
National Service Commission, 309
Newsprint paper, 757
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4195
Parliament
Extension of term of, 2396, 3420, 3484
Printing of, 5950, 5952
Parliamentary secretaryships, 4195, 4206
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, claims under, 5972
Point of order—Hon. Robert Rogers' reference to Mr. Justice Galt, 599
Prisoners, proposed enlistment of, 1014
Quebec and Saguenay Railway purchase and completion of, 303
Quebec harbour advances, 435
Railway Act, the, 606
Railway material, removal of to France, 310, 1372
Rogers, Hon. Robert, resignation of, 4739

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Ross rifle, 477, 3487
Scientific and industrial research, 3911
Senate, proposel change in constitution of, 1148
Right of to amend taxation bills denied, 5479
Soldier Settlement Board, 1163
Soldiers, votes for, 2403, 3727
Speaker, election of, 2
Taxation
Business profits, 1637
Income, 4084, 4114, 4122, 4132
Senate's right to amend taxation bills denied, 5479
Transcontinental railways, removal of rails to France, 1229, 1266
United States, declaration of war by, 612
Viviani, M., address to, 1367
War
Expenditure, 476
Supplies, munitions contracts, 5518
Votes ($500,000,000), 585
War-time Elections Bill, 5421, 5572, 5637, 5652, 5706, 5805, 5849
Woman suffrage, 1499

Laval, steamer, 1470

Lavergne, Col. Armand, 256, 1038, 2619

Leblanc, Dr. B. A., employment of, 2283, 4416

Le Blanc, Maurice, position and salary of, 1816

Lefebvre, Major Alfred, position and pay of, 1037, 2618, 3003

Legislatures, members of provincial, free transportation. *See* Railway Act Amendment Bills

Leigh, Major, position of, 5422

L'Espérance, Hon. D. O., appointment of to Senate, 4511

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe (Rouville)
Abbotsford postmaster, 608
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 136
National government, 136
The Opposition's duty, 137
Ross rifle, 137
True loyalty, 139
Attitude of the leader of the Opposition, 140
Great Britain's attitude in the war, 141
Quebec's view of the war, 141
What England and France are accomplishing, 142
Nationalism in Quebec, 143
The Dorchester election, 146
Recruiting in Quebec, 147

Lemieux, Hon. R.—*Con.*
The Imperial War Conference, 148
The fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, 150
Alcohol, distilling of, 3743
Angers, Captain, dismissal of, 758
Anglo-French delegates, visit of to Canada, 669
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 806, 840, 1226
Demobilization, plans for, 3118
Enlistment, 2463-2478
Recruiting in Quebec, 363, 3136
Recruits, urban and rural, 3135
Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, suspension of, 690
Bell, steamer, 1377
Brindle, Mr. William, 3758
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4043, 4217, 4278, 4554, 4600-4619, 5046 5184
Cattle, British embargo on, 987
Civil Service insurance, 3503
Civil Service salaries, 583, 1804, 2241
Enlisted men, pay of, 2254
Coal
Confiscation of by railways, 584
Ottawa prices of, 1320
Cold storage, 2076
Courcelette, steamer, 1377
Criminal Code amendments, 4464
Jurors, 4306
Customs
Duties payable on Crown's goods, 2127
Silks, valuation of for customs, 1574
Customs and immigration forms, 3133, 3134
"Defeat or Victory," 1473
Dorchester county election, 146
Dynamite outrages in Montreal, 5423
Elevator men, pay of, 2946
Exhibitions, 2260
Farmers' Bank, shareholders of, 301
Fish, transportation of, 3556
Foodstuffs, control of, 2471
France, promotion of trade with, 597, 2307
French-Canadians in the United States, 4914
French-speaking employees, Department of Agriculture, 2264
Gaspe steamship service, 2299
Gerrie, Mr. Charles, 4245
High cost of living, 2055, 2077
Hudson Bay railway, 5090
Immigration
Agents, 1760
Department, printing of forms in French, 899

Lemieux, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Hindus, of, 1763, 2144
Japanese, of, 2144
Indians—Caughnawaga hospital, 1886
Inland Revenue Department
Estimates, 3831
Officials, 3817
Montreal, at, 758
Insurance of war risks, 3557, 3589
Intercolonial railway, cars, shortage of, 1378
Intoxicating liquor
Prohibition of, 4401
Sale of, 3819
Jack, Mr. E. Bryden, 4508
Kelly, Thomas, 4926, 5794
Labour bureaus, 118
Laval, steamer, 1470
Lessard, General, 363, 2055
Levis railway, station, 2208
Magdalen Islands
Cable service, 5408
Steamship service, 2303
Mail matter, registration of, 668
Matane Harbour light, 1575
McWilliams, Mr., dismissal of, 2167
Military service
Burden of proof, 3318
Contraventions of Act, 3329
Enlistment — Canada compared with United States and France, 2463
Exceptions, 3560
Exemptions, 3131
Insurance of soldiers, 3557, 3589
Militia Act, provisions of, 2465
Persons liable to serve, 3117
Pledges of government, 2467
Quebec's position, 2473, 3137
Referendum, 2478
Regulations, 3316
Tribunals, 3158
Mining industry, development of, 4181
Mitchell, Private J. F., death of, 1377
Montreal postmaster, 523, 581
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3746
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4202, 4420, 4442
Parcel post, 2075
Parliamentary secretaryships, 4202, 4207, 4212, 4420
Parliamentary sessions, expense of, 1262
Quebec harbour advances, 577
Improvements, 3879
Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix; Quebec and Saguenay, and Lotbiniere and Megantic Railways, 4848, 5454
Railway Act, The, 3514, 3716
Railway company, advance to, 2100

Lemieux, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Ross rifle, the, 137
Rouville county mail carrier, 608
Ste. Anne bridge, 3888
Sainte Luce, changing of name, 673
St. Malo railway buildings, 1128
Soldiers, postage on parcels for, 1263
Soldier Settlement Board, 1165
Steamship service, France, 2307
Sulphur, embargo on, 4889
Taxation
Income, 3776, 4071, 4086
Wealth, 2469
Technical education, 1229, 1252
Telegraph service, 2108, 2113
Thompson, Mr., employment of, 4008
Vaudreuil bridge, 3888
Victoria bridge toll rates, 672
War, prisoners of, 4194
War-time Elections Bill, 5550, 5633, 5641
Washington Conference, Canadian delegates to, 1127
West Indies, promotion of trade with, 2289
Wharves, 1944

Lens, valour of Canadian soldiers at, 5195

Lessard, General, position and services of, 363, 365, 368, 2055

Levis railway station, 1129, 2208

Lewis, Mr. J. H., position of, 2944

Life insurance. *See* Insurance

Life saving. *See* Naval Service

Liquor. *See* Intoxicating liquors

Little Bras d'Or dredging, 3886

Live Stock. *See* Agriculture

Live Stock and Produce Bill. Res., 4287. 1r., 4292. Ref. to Com., 4417. Com., 5503. 3r., 5514

Loans
Farmers, to. *See* Bank Act Amendment Bills
Public. *See* Finance

Lockhart, Mr. Hugh, employment of, 1265

Lockport Cold Storage Company, 2202

Loggie, Mr. William S. (Northumberland, N.B.)
Budget, 1280
Reply to Mr. Crothers, 1280
Canada's contributions to the war, 1282
Taxation proposals, 1282
Freer trade policies, 1283, 1287
Free wheat, 1286
The Dominion Canners Company, 1289
Reply to Mr. Edward's criticism of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 1290
Coalition Government, 2988

Loggie, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*
Dominion Canners Company, 1289
Fish and fisheries
Development of industry, 2047
Lobsters, 2049, 2155, 5426
Free wheat, 1286
Government railways, branch lines, 2223
Military Service, 2984
Referendum, 2986
Recruiting, 380
Shipbuilding, 1929
Soldiers, voting of, 4778
Steamship service, 2311
Taxation
Business profits, 1645
Income, 4069

Lord's Day Observance Act
Suggested suspension of, 936

Lotbiniere and Megantic Railway
Completion and operation of, 4948, 5452

Louisburg
Pilot Commissioners, 3677
Wireless station at, 5122

Louisville post office, 899

Lovett, James, dismissal of, 453, 759

Loyal Orange Order, 85, 91

Macdonald, Mr. E. M. (Pictou)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 47
The fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, 47
Imperial War Conference, 47
The War, 48
The present Government and the war, 49
Extension of term of Parliament, 50
Canada's participation in wars of the Empire, 51
Recruiting, 51
Political patronage, 52, 55
Conscription, 54
Conditions in military hospitals, 54, 59
Administration of military affairs, 54
Government expenditures, 60
The winning of the war, 61
Aeroplane service, 805, 844
Army
Allowances, separation, 336, 383, 387, 4006
Camps and canteens, 535, 820, 1266
Canteen system in England, 718
Conscription, 54, 893
Criticism of military affairs, duty of the Opposition, 571
Enlistment of Canadians in the United States, 3758
Hospital No. 8, 1674
Irish-Canadian Rangers, 195, 458

Macdonald, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Medical service, 527, 3962
Pensions, 845
Recruiting, 51, 360, 372
Advertising of, cost, 986
State of, 936
Unfit men, of, 697, 4006
United States, in, 3758, 3904
Soldiers
Farms, employment on, 1677
Medical treatment of, 3962
Voting of, 4692, 4704, 4729, 4741, 4786, 4792, 4834, 4876, 4887
Army and Navy Veterans, 5911
Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, suspension of, 688
Babtie, report, Dr. Bruce's reply to, 669
Bull, Mr. Perkins, 1130
Canadian Government Railways
Cars, purchase of, 4928
Coal purchases, 664, 667, 3388
United States, in, 592
Employees Magazine, 452
Level crossing near Trenton, 304
Quebec and Saguenay, etc., 5460
Safety-first inspectors, 337
Steamers, purchase of, 669
See under this head Government Railways Amendment Act *and* Intercolonial Railway
Canadian Northern Railway acquisition of, 4030, 4283, 4544, 4606-4618, 4628-4632, 4864, 4996, 5124
Carson, Major General, 986
Coal, Western mining of, 159, 614
Criminal Code amendments, jurors, 4296, 4322
Customs duties on goods of the Crown 1979, 1982
Dominions Royal Commission, 2338
Emigration of Canadians, 987
Food control, 2001, 3744
Supplies for Great Britain, 2260
France, trade with, 2312
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5904
Government Railways Act amendment, 4339, 4366, 4386
Grain, 4679
Gwatkin, General, 4419
Heals station rifle range, 1675
High cost of living, 695, 3935
Hospitals, military, 54, 59
Hudson Bay railway expenditure, 900, 5088
Immigration
Chinese of, 2143
Regulations, 447

Macdonald, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Indians, 2349
Kitsilano, 1129
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1123
Inland Revenue Department
Estimates, 3825, 3827, 3833, 2842
Expenditure, 2380, 2384
Officials, 2360
Intercolonial Railway
Cars, 2226
Employees, promotion of, 779
Operation of, 776
Judges' salaries, 5955
Kentville armoury
Caretaker, 4509
Militia stores, 4510
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 1129
Loan ($100,000,000), 4416, 4621
Lobster fishing, 2155, 5425
Master mariners, 4416
Medically unfit persons, certificates to, 5423
Military bands, 4044
Military service, 2947
Board of Selection, 2954
Contraventions of Act, 3339
Exemptions, 2955
Labour, attitude of, 2958
Quebec, position of, 2959
Referendum, 2961
Minto, steamship—food supplies, 2179
Munitions contracts, 4928
New Glasgow-Mountville mail service, 1037
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3935
Overseas Military Forces, Ministry of, 4417, 4442
Overseas Militia Department, non-combatant positions in, 4786
Parliament, extension of term of, 3478
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, claims under, 5958
Pensions, 6005-6033
Canadians in Imperial Forces, for, 4662
Pictou
Freight, handling of, at, 303
Marine and Fisheries agency, 304, 596, 1937
Rural mail routes, 900
Post Office Department, estimates, 2352
Prince Edward Island
Car ferry, 2305
Freight for, 1037
Steamship service, 3389
Prisoners of war, 666
Provincial governments, duties payable by, 2119, 2129
Provincial legislatures, powers of, 1807
Public works expenditure, 1038
Railway Act, The, 3426, 3439, 3441
Railway Department, steamers purchased by, 669

Macdonald, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Railway employees, payment of salaries of, 5998
Robb, P.A., 1572
St. John harbour works, 5894
Scientific and industrial research, 3912
Senate, appointments to, 932
Shipbuilding, 802, 1325, 1341, 1914, 1934, 1661, 5430
Soldiers, votes for, 1393, 1399
Stellarton
Public building, 4951
Postmaster, 669, 897, 3758
Submarine situation, 1320, 1339
Taxation
Business profits, 1641
Income, 1652, 3775, 5884, 5886
Wealth, 3480
Taxation measures; Senate's power to amend denied, 5477
Technical education, 1241
Trade and Commerce, South America, 2331
United States
Labourers from, 665
Tariff, changes in, 1264
Vancouver Harbour Commissioners, 1575
Victoria Sealing Company, 5958
Walsh, J. J., 1675
War charities, 5482
War supplies
Munitions contracts, 5517
Political patronage in purchase of, 4050, 4053
Ross rifle, 477, 479
Trenton, contractors for, 303
Wealth, conscription of, 3480
Yukon territory, 1736

Macdonald, Dr. J. A., employment of, 2283

Macdonald, Mrs. Jessie, separation allowances to, 5361

Macdonell, Mr. A. C. (South Toronto)
Military service, 2847
Parliament, authority of, 2848
Quebec situation, 2852
Referendum, 2849
Reinforcements, need of, 2853
Railway Act, The, 3433, 3533
Soldiers, voting of, 2850

Mace, presentation of, 1468

Machine guns. *See* War supplies

Maclean, Mr. Alexander K. (Halifax)
Aldershot camp grounds, 3295, 3419
Apples, embargo on, 5776
Army
Allowances, 4001
Enlistments, 4152

Maclean, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*
Soldiers
Leave of absence for, 4005
Voting of, 1398, 4702, 4712, 4736, 4741, 4786, 4820, 4876, 4887, 4889, 4914, 5196
Atlantic mail service, 452
Baxter, Leslie E., 3418
Bay State Fish Company, 2321
Budget
Trade and financial condition of Canada, 722
Income and expenditure, 723
Political patronage, 726
Taxation of business profits, 727
Free wheat, 729
Encouragement of production, 733
Canadian Northern Railway, 5057
Censorship, 5493
Coal mining, 616
Companies Act Amendment Bills, 843, 1151, 5918, 5942
Customs—bonded goods, 1854
Digby government lands, 2321
Dodge, L. B., payments to, 306
Dredge Cape Breton, 1026
Dry docks, 4458, 5889, 5917
Eaton, Ernest, 3419
Flour, price of, 1059
Food Controller, powers of, 3943
France, trade with, 2314
Government Railways Act amendment, 4361
Halifax and Eastern Railway contractors, 304
Industrial and scientific research, 5281
Intercolonial Railway stations, naming of, 3386
International Fisheries Commission, 892
Letter carriers, salaries of, 581
Loan ($100,000,000), 343
Lockport Cold Storage Company, 2202
Lovett, Mr. James, dismissal of, 453
McLeod-Tellier Commission, 5252
Military District No. 6, 5229
Military hospitals, 4045
Military service, 2674
Classes, 3289
Enforcement, immediate, not desirable, 2681
Exemptions, 3218, 3209, 3309
Motor boat Alase, 5360
Moxom, Major, 4415
Muchaboom wharf, 304
Newsprint paper, 1645
Nickerson, William C., 2283
Nova Scotia Patrol Service, 5423
Outlook Publishing Company, 607

Maclean, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*
Parliament, extension of term of, 3420
Political patronage, 726
Public works expenditure, 5308
Renault, Raoul, appointment of, 2363
Ross rifle, 423, 426, 478
Salt, shortage of, 1373
Schaffner, Mr. L. P., dismissal of, 438
Scientific and industrial research, 3909, 3957
Senate, appointments to, 924
Shipbuilding, 1669, 5442
Senate, proposed change in constitution of, 1140
Soldier's cove wharf, 5339
Taxation
Income, 3766, 3767, 4070, 4111, 4124
Business profits, 727, 1660
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5386
United States, head tax on Canadians, 892
Vessels in government service, 1130
War supplies—mattresses and covers, 6065
War-time Elections Bill, 5595, 5637-5702, 5707-5771, 6072
Polling divisions under, 6070
Windsor Junction mail service, 5913

Maclean, Mr. W. F. (South York)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 130
Party co-operation, 130
National government, 132
Loans to farmers, 134
The winning of the war, 135
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4531
Civil Service, appointments and promotions, 2018
Conscription, 1550
Federal law and its enforcement, 3263
Food control, 3750
Government Railways Act amendment, 4362
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1181
Imperial War Conference, 1548
Letter carriers, 1805
Loans to farmers, 134
Military service, 1550
Enforcement, 3263
Railway Act, The, 3423
Telegraph service, 2109
War supplies, purchases of by British Government, 4952
War-time Elections Act, 5593

MacNutt, Mr. Thomas (Saltcoats)
Aliens, enlistment of, 3656, 4413
Ottawa Journal-Press, statement of, 3655
Parker, Mr. R. G. M., 2201
Soldier Settlement Board, 3790
Tariff revision, 1718, 1727

Macpherson, Capt. Kenneth C., position and pay of, 4292, 4416, 4685

McCoig, Mr. A. B. (West Kent)
Army, soldiers' pay, 3217
Beans for seed, duty on, 671
Cold storage plants, 1628, 2078
Flour, price of, 1063
Food control, 2087
Grain, congestion in the West, 340
Henderson, Mr. Geo. F., K.C., 4243
Hogs, inspection of, 2271
Cholera, 2273
Loans to farmers, 1965
Military service, 2785
Exemptions, 3218
Potatoes, supply of, 936
Titus, Private John, 2237
Tractor engines, duty on, 674
Training camps in Canada, 899

McCraney, Mr. Geo. E. (Saskatoon)
Alcohol for public institutions, 5103
Army, medical service, 3995
Budget, 949
Taxation, 951
Policies, after the war, 953
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4551, 4633, 5174
Coal, western mining of, 2184
Dominion Lands Act Amendment Bills, 1157, 3805, 3811
Elrose mail service, 899
Fuel, 1417
Homestead patents, delay in, 3759
Immigrants—exemption from military service, 1572
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1166
Military service, 2558
Enforcement, 2560
Exemptions, 1572, 3221, 3369
Referendum, 2559
Parliament, railway transportation for members of, 3519
Provincial legislators, free transportation for, 300, 683
Railway Act, The, 3519
Seed grain indebtedness, 302, 1126
Soldiers, returned, care of, 475
Soldier Settlement Board, 1164
Taxation, income, 3778, 4075, 4094, 4099
War-time Elections Bill, 5559, 5643-5702, 5712

McCrea, Mr. Francis N. (Sherbrooke)
Budget, 1300
Taxation of business profits, 1300
The pulp and paper industry, 1302
Flour, price of, 1069
Horses, purchases of pure bred, 2279
Military service, 3035

McCrea, Mr. F. N.—*Con.*
Potatoes supply of, 1087
Pulp and paper industry, 1302, 1464
Railway Act, The, 3444
Sherbrooke exhibition grounds, 302
Taxation, business profits, of, 1463
War-time Elections Bill, 5862

McCurdy, Mr. F. B. (Parliamentary Secretary, Department of Militia and Defence)
Army camps, sale of liquor in, 833
Military Service Bill, 2890
Parliamentary secretaryships, 4210, 4450
War-time Elections Bill, 6085

McCutcheon, Stanley, dismissal of, 306

McGee, the late Thos D'Arcy, monument to 3899

McInnis, Mr. M. A., assistant to Fuel Controller, 5422

McKee, A. J., steamer, 669, 4925, 4939

McKenzie, Mr. Daniel D. (North Cape Breton)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 78, 83
The attitude of Nova Scotia, 79
Mal-administration of the present Government, 81, 89
Canada's duty in regard to the war, 80
Militia Department affairs and the late Minister, 82
Loyal Orange Order, 85
Political patronage in recruiting, 86
Voting of soldiers, 87
Representation of Cape Breton in the Senate, 89
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 826, 1567
Enlistment of Canadians in British Army, 385
Forestry battalions, 4509
Recruiting, 86
Soldiers' votes, 87, 4729, 4759
Baddeck mail contract, 1819
Bell, Mr. Alexander Graham, 5783
Budget, 1809
Record of the present Administration, 1090
Political patronage, 1092
Purchase of horses in Nova Scotia, 1093
Development and progress under late Administration, 1094
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4039, 4521, 5032, 5162
Civil Service, promotions, 4667
Coal, 2005
Confiscation of by railways, 194

McKenzie, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Criminal Code amendment, jurors, 4305, 4330
Customs
Duties payable on Crown's goods, 2130
Officials, 5100
Preventive service, 1882
Dry docks, 4463
Fish and fisheries
Officers, 2170
Development of industry, 2045
Fisher, Mr. Ward, 2170
Flags on public buildings, 4147
Flour, 1879
High price of, 1076
Fuel, 1418
Control of, 2317
Government Railways Act amendment, 4375
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1178
Highland Brigade, 552
House of Commons—messengers, 6053
Imperial Munitions Board clerks, 305
Imperial War Conference, 1565
Indians, 1893
Sydney reserve, 3664
Inland Revenue Department
Estimates, 2379, 3840
Expenditure, 2379, 2388
Officials, 3840
Insurance, 2102, 4393
Intercolonial Railway
Boisdale contracts, 4415
Claims, 3416
Operation of, 784
Rates on coal, 4292
Stations at North Sydney, McKinnon's Harbour and Christmas Island, 2227
Sydney train service, 2222
Jamesville breakwater, 5328
Judges' salaries, 1976
Labour, 1174, 1988
Conditions on munition work, 2493
Letter carriers, salaries of, 583
Little Bras d'Or dredging, 3886
Magdalen Islands cable service, 5407
Mail contracts, 3637
Margaree harbour improvements, 5336
Matheson post office, 3502
Military service
Appeals, 3185
Burden of proof, 3322
Classes, 3289
Contraventions of Act, 3588
Exemptions, 3232
Labour, attitude of, 2492

McKenzie, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Referendum, 2498
Tribunals, 3173
Morton, Dr. A., position of, 5706, 5913
North Sydney
Customs service, 607, 1852
Railway station, 2227
Nova Scotia steamship service, 2286
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3753
Investigations of, 3653, 3928
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4424, 4449
Parliamentary secretaryships, 4449
Patenaude, Hon. E. L., resignation of, 2494
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, claims under, 5975
Pensions, 6017
Provincial Governments, duties payable by, 2130
Public works—harbour improvements, 4186
Quarantine service, 3756
Quebec railways, 5473
Racing Form, The, 306, 336, 896
Railway Act, The, 3533
Railway mail clerks, 3650
Renault, Raoul, appointment of, 2368
St. Peter's canal, 3406
St. Pierre Miquelon mail service, 3649
Schaffner, Mr. L. P., dismissal of, 443
Shipbuilding, 1566
Soldiers, votes for, 1397
Soldier's cove wharf, 5337, 5341
Soldier Settlement Act, administration of, 4917
Steamship services, 2324, 2286
Submarine situation, 1333
Taxation, income, 4128, 4135, 4658
Technical education, 1239
Telegraph and telephone lines, 4191, 5362, 5401
War
Charities, 5490, 6062
Expenditure, 549
Supplies, munitions contracts, 5537
War-time Elections Bill, 5606, 5670, 5751, 5841
Wharves, 1945
Wheat, fixing of price of, 3694
Woman suffrage, 1516

McKenzie, Lieut. F. J. S., payments to, 986

McLean, Mr. Angus A. (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Prince Edward Island Railway, 3947
Pensions, 6013
Submarine situation, 1327

McLeod-Tellier Commission
Appointment of, 2056
Counsel, 3418
Expenses of, 5245

McLeod-Tellier Commission—*Con.*
Report of, 4291
Sittings of, 2322, 2357
See also Galt, Mr. Justice, *and* Landry, Mr. Justice

McMillan, Mr. John A. (Glengarry)
Cheese purchases by British Government, 1774
Dairying industry, 2256

McNab, Colin C., proposed allowance to, 578

McNeil, F. C., payments to, 1380

McNeil, Lt. John D., promotion of, 5272

McQueen, Lieut. W. A., employment of, 4508

McSpadden, Lt.-Col., position of, 2618

McWilliams, Mr., dismissal of, 2165

Magdalen Islands, cable service, 5407

Magladery, Mr. Thomas, M.L.A., position and pay of, 4685

Mails. *See* Post office

Manitoba, County Court judges, 5083

Maple sugar. *See* Food products

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 109, 119
Canada and the war, 109, 119
The Nationalist party, 109, 120
The Dorchester election, 111, 120
Recruiting in Quebec, 112, 119, 127
Quebec, past and present. 123
National service, 126
The high cost of living, 129
Army, Fifth Canadian Division, 459
Béland, Hon. Dr., M.P., 311, 341
Bonaventure
Breakwater, 988
County, mail service, 1126
Recruiting officer, 1675
Campbellton-Gaspe steamship service, 1126, 1228, 1959
Carleton Beach protection works, 1126
Civil Service, salaries, 2238
Court, Private Harry Ivan, 3295
Cross Point wharf, 988, 1228, 1571
Customs Department, dismissals from, 1844
Dagneau, John F., 1471
Daylight saving, 3685
Dorchester county election, 111, 120
Elaine, steamer, 1379
Gascons wharf, 2055
Gaspe steamship services, 2325
Government Railways Act amendment, 4343
Hopetown post office, 989, 1474
Interprovincial bridges, 3891
Intoxicating liquors, 2008
Le Blanc, Maurice, 1816

Marcil, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Marcil, Private Joseph, 893
Maria Beach protection works, 898
Matapedia public highway, 1379, 1816
Migratory birds, 3660
Miguasha wharf, 1126
Military service
Classes, 3354
Exceptions, 3564
Exemptions, 3219, 3307, 3364
Persons liable for service, 3129
Quebec situation, 2428, 3257. *See under this head,* Quebec
Referendum, 2432
Militia Department, employees, 312
Montreal, customs collectorship, 311
Nationalist party, 109, 120
New Carlisle, war expenditure in, 1575
New Richmond post office, 898
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4209
Packages, marking of,—inspection and sale, 4067, 4070
Paspebiac wharf, 898, 988
Paspebiac-Hopetown mail service, 1126
Pratt Bros., payments to, 1570
Prisoners of war, exchange of, 341
Quebec and Oriental railway, 1674
Quebec, recruiting in, 112, 127, 213, 342, 2428
Railway Act, The, 3513
Read, Lance Corporal, 717
Renault, Raoul, appointment of, 2375
Restigouche river, bridging of, 988
Ross rifle, 422
Ruisseau le Blanc breakwater, 898
St. Charles de Caplan wharf, 898
Separation allowances, 386
Shigawake post office, 898
Shigawake East post office, 988
Shipbuilding, 1921, 1930
Soldier Settlement Board, 3626, 3789
Taxation, income, 4102, 4123, 4130
United States troops, training of in Canada, 2482
War-time Elections Bill, 5641, 5717, 5813
Wharves, 1944

Marcile, Mr. Joseph E. (Bagot)
Budget, 1292
Trade and financial conditions, 1293
The French-Canadian people, 1294
Recruiting, 1294
Transcontinental railway, 1295
Government appointments and dismissals, 1296
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4998
House of Commons Accountant's office, lease of premises, 5703
Military Service Bill, 3053
Recruiting, 1294

Margaree harbour improvements, 3867, 5330

Maria Beach protection works, 898

Marine
- Coastal regulations, 1912
- Hospitals. *See that title*
- Icebreakers, 1818, 1836
- Insurance. *See that title*
- Life-saving, 1949
- Lighthouse and coast service
  - Agencies, 1936
  - Compressors, sale of, 4920
  - Lights, experiments with, 2173
  - Maintenance and repairs, 1940
  - Salaries, 1939, 3134, 6049
  - Signal service, 1942
- Maritime road repairs, 1815, 1947
- Minto, steamer, food supplies for, 2175
- Navigation
  - Aids to, 1940
  - Obstructions to, 1841
  - Schools, 1838
- Ocean and river service, contracts for provisions, 4923
- Pilotage, 4922, 6049
- Pilots' pensions, 1948
- St. Lawrence signal and telegraph service, 1471
- Shipbuilding, 242, 292, 703, 1325, 1342, 1551, 1556, 1565, 1566, 2293
  - Contracts by Imperial Munitions Board, 1371, 1661, 1663, 1913
  - Government aid to, 802, 1371
  - Government vessels, 1912
  - Vessels under construction, 665, 1666
  - Wooden, vessels, construction of, 1775, 1924
- Steamers, government
  - Construction, 1912
  - Maintenance and repairs, 1836
  - Revenue cruisers, 1881
- Steamship services. *See that title*
- Vessels
  - Commandeering of, 662, 1667
  - Government service, in, 1130
  - Investigations into, 1838
- Wharves, repairs to, 1943

Marine and Fisheries Department
- Appointments, 1937
- Estimates, 655, 1815, 1836, 1912, 4920, 6049
- Pictou agent, 1936
- Services of, 2027

Maritime Provinces
- Elections, 207
- Military affairs, 5226

Marlow, Lt.-Col. F. W., appointment of, 1227

Martell, Lieut. L. H., position and pay of, 5914

Martin, Mr. Méderic (Montreal, St. Mary's)
- Food control, 2094, 2097
- High cost of living, 708
- Letter carriers, salaries of, 580, 1474
- Military service, 2813
  - Amendments, 2820
  - Quebec situation, 2813
- Oleomargarine, 2202, 2283
- Soldiers, behaviour of at public gatherings, 5233
- Taxation, income of, 4127
- War-time Elections Bill, 3612

Matane harbour light, 1575

Matapedia public highway, 1379, 1816

Matheson post office, 3502

Matthews-Blackwell, Limited. *See* O'Connor

Matthews, Mr. L., 1228

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amendment Bill. Res., 2114. 1r., 2116. 2r., 2149. Ref., to Com., 2149. Com., 3400. 3r., 3401. Sen. amndts., 5425

Medicine Hat, military reserve, 301

Meighen, Hon. Arthur (Solicitor General)
- (From p. 4926 Secretary of State and Minister of Mines.)
- Army
  - Desertions, 3111.
  - Discharges, purchase of, 3112
  - Enlistment, 2530
- Budget. 845
  - Revenue and expenditure of Canada, 846
  - Fiscal policies, 848
  - Free wheat, 850
  - Amendment of Mr. Turriff, 859
- Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4257. 4264, 4580, 4597-4614, 4631, 4842, 5133
- Capital punishment, 619, 636
- Censorship
  - Censors and decoders, 576
  - "The Fiddlers," 5947
- Coalition government, 3732
- Companies Act amendment, 5918-5942
- Flour, price of, 1073
- Free wheat, 850
- McLeod-Tellier Commission, 5245, 5255
- Military service, 3237-3261
  - Appeals, 3175, 3301
  - Burden of proof, 3318
  - Classes, 3140
    - Calling out by, 3130, 3271
    - Division into, 3355
  - Contraventions of Act, 3325-3352, 3360, 3579
  - Exceptions, 3362-3371
  - Exemptions, 3130, 3188, 3196, 3205, 3211, 3219, 3272, 3303, 3362

Meighen, Hon. A.—*Con.*
Expenses, 3262, 3361
Labour, attitude of, 3732
Parliament, authority of, 2530
Penalties, 3271
Persons liable for service, 3116, 3125
Quebec situation, 2536
Referendum, 2533
Regulations, 3314
Tribunals, 3149, 3295, 3574
Passports for women, 5783
Press statements correction of, 4889
Provincial legislators, free transportation for, 685
Senate, appointments to, 926
Soldiers
Returned, appointment of to government positions, 6058
Votes for, 1390, 3730
Transcontinental railway—removal of rails to France, 1229, 1266
United Grain Growers, Limited, 894
War charities, 6062
War supplies, Ross rifle, 479, 493
War-time Elections Bill, 5582, 5637-5702, 5708-5771, 6076
Merritt, Col. W. H., collection by for Aviation Fund, 5362
Michaud, Mr. Pius (Victoria, N.B.),
Blain, Lieut. Roswell, 4245
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5028
Civil Service promotions, 2021
Dalhousie militia buildings, 454
Danis, Joseph M., 2618
Farm labourers from United States, 4512
Immigration regulations, 454
Intercolonial railway, 798
Mail service, 3639
Military Service Bill, 2808
United States, head tax on foreigners entering, 1266
Middlebro, Mr. William S. (North Grey)
Army, soldiers' votes, 4894
Breidert and Mudge patents, 1199
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4512
Companies, incorporation of, 5939
Food control, 2509
Government Railways Act amendment, 4378
House of Commons—sessional indemnity of members, 6046
Military service, 2502
Exemptions, 2506, 3202
Parliament authority of, 2503
Provinces, recruiting by, 2511
Referendum, 2502, 2512
Pensions, 6010
Soldier Settlement Board, 3624

Middlebro, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*
Taxation
Business profits, 2508
Wealth, 2507
Income, 4073, 4106
Migratory Birds Convention Bill. 1r., 2525. 2r., 3657. Com., 3657. 3r., 3662
Miguasha wharf, 1126
Military
Bands, 4044
Districts
Nos. 3 and 10, 455
No. 6, Halifax, Capt. R. V. Harris, 5422
Officers, 5226, 5236, 5422
Forces
Overseas, Minister of, 4195, 4417, 4441
Administration of, 4200
Hospitals. *See that title*
Trains, 2205
Military and Naval Aid Bill ($500,000,000). *See* War Appropriation
Military Hospitals Commission, 464, 473, 4243
See also Canadian Army Medical Service *and* Hospitals
Military Service. *See also* Army *and* Conscription
Appeals, 3175
Army Act, provisions of, 3111
Authority of Parliament, 2392, 2419, 2435, 2465, 2530, 2539, 2622, 2632, 2643, 2669, 2743, 2848, 2851, 2911, 3031, 3723
Available men, 2390, 2439, 2455, 2551, 3049, 3255, 3371
Board of selection, 2954, 5083, 5474
Burden of proof, 3318
Certificates, 3261
Classes
Calling out by, 3130, 3138, 3272
Division into, 3353
Contraventions of Act, 3324, 3360, 3579
Correspondence between Prime Minister and ex-Minister of Militia, 2434, 2446, 3086
Council, 5314
Enforcement, 2416, 2545, 2560, 2681, 2744, 2780, 3262
Examiners, medical, 6069
Exceptions, 3269, 3362, 3559
Exemptions, 2607, 2624, 2806, 2955, 3043, 3130, 3187, 3272, 3303, 3362 5417, 6002, 6068
See also under this title Classes *and* Persons liable for service
Expenses, 3262, 3361
Great Britain, military service in, 2908
Industrial requirements, 2441, 2579, 2798, 3020
See also Labour

Military Service—*Con.*
Insurance premiums of soldiers, 3557, 3589
Labour, attitude of. *See* Labour
Medically unfit persons, certificates to, 5423
Penalties, 3271. *See under this title,* Classes
Persons liable for service, 3116
Quebec Province, relation to, 2398, 2424, 2428, 2473, 2515, 2536, 2543, 2549, 2602, 2626, 2638, 2659, 2685, 2697, 2704, 2716, 2728, 2736, 2748, 2754, 2784, 2792, 2812, 2828, 2841, 2852, 2866, 2898, 2926, 2959, 2965, 2998, 3005, 3017, 3037, 3257, 3255
See also Quebec
Referendum proposed, 2403, 2478, 2498, 2521, 2527, 2533, 2555, 2582, 2589, 2601, 2623, 2632, 2651, 2659, 2665, 2670, 2713, 2729, 2736, 2787, 2849, 2858, 2860, 2882, 2889, 2894, 2900, 2961, 3013, 3028, 3046, 3721, 3728, 3730
Registrars, 3174, 5900
Regulations, 3235, 3314
Selective draft features, 2438, 2458, 2910, 2954
See also, under this title, Board of Selection
Tribunals, 3149, 3295, 3301, 3574, 5881
Location of, 4193

Military Service Bill, 1917. 1r., 2184. 2r., 2390, 2434, 2458, 2483, 2526, 2571, 2592, 2654, 2709, 2777, 2833, 2881, 2903, 2944, 2947, 3004. Div., 3085. Com., 3086, 3110, 3135, 3187, 3237, 3295, 3353, 3375, 3554, 3557. 3r., 3718. Sen. amdts., 4663
Amendments proposed
Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 2403; lost on div., 3074
Mr. Barrette, 2524. Point of order respecting, 2844; Committee of inquiry into, 2880, 2944. Lost on div., 3074
Mr. Copp, 3075; lost on div., 3084

Military Service Council, 5314

Military Voters' Bill, 1917. 1r., 4406. 2r., 4688. Com., 4693, 4740, 4792, 4874, 4889. 3r., 5086, 5195
Amendments proposed: Mr. Pugsley, (1) 4762; lost on div., 4774. (2) 4892; lost on div., 4907. Mr. German, 4907; lost on div., 4909. Sen. amdts., 5956

Militia and Defence
Department
Administration of, 82, 287
Automobiles, 2525, 3903
Employees, 312
Estimates, staff and salaries, 3949, 3962, 4044, 5218
Drill halls, control of, 4146

Militia and Defence—*Con.*
Ex-Minister of,
Charges by, 226, 234
Resignation of, 164, 287
Correspondence relating to resignation of, 991
Headquarters staff at Halifax, 5226
Home defence, 336, 359, 1038, 2628, 3955
Officers, recruiting of, 3134
Military buildings, inspector of, 1039
Overseas Minister of. *See* Overseas Forces
Permanent force, 4055
Princess Louise Fusiliers, officers of, at Halifax, 5271

Mill feeds. *See* Grain

Milsom, Major J. C., inquiry into conduct of, 1265

Mines and Minerals
Department estimates, 657, 4179, 5780
Ministry of, proposed, 2007
Smelting, provision for, 66
Zinc, bounties on, 2330
See also Fuel

Minister of the Overseas Military Forces, the Parliamentary Secretary of the Department of Militia and Defence, and the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs Bill. Res., 4195. 1r., 4215. 2r., 4417. Com., 4441. 3r., 4661
Amendments proposed: Mr. Lemieux, 4448; lost on div., 4449. Mr. Proulx, 4453; lost on div., 4453
See also Parliamentary Secretaryships

Mint, Royal, Ottawa Branch, 1474

Mitchell, Private J. F., death of, 1377

Moffat, Lieut. R. J., expenses of, 5361

Molloy, Mr. John P. (Provencher)
Army allowances, 3082
Kelly, Thomas, treatment of, 896
Loans to farmers, 1964
Military Service, 3082
Railway mail clerks, 4102
Tariff revision, 1776

Moncton
Armoury site, 4787

Mondou, Mr. A. A. (Yamaska)
Military service, 2989
Montreal Gazette, statement of, 3004

Montreal
Contributions to the war, 249
Customs collectorship, 311, 648
Immigration agents, 5122
Inland Revenue officials at, 758

Montreal—*Con.*
Postmaster, 523, 581
Post office sub-station, 596
Public building, 305

Montreal Trades and Labour Council, 2198

Monuments, erection of, 3896, 3899

Moore, Major Rev. A. H., 1265

Moosejaw
Enlistments, 5122

Moosejaw News patronage, 2708

Morphy, Mr. H. B. (North Perth)
Army
Soldiers, voting of, 4701, 4756, 4786, 4815, 4900
Cheese manufacture, regulations, 2265
Civil Service salaries, 2013
Companies, incorporation of, 5941
Criminal Code amendments, jurors, 4299, 4324
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5906
Insurance, 5196
Live Stock and Produce Bill, 4290, 5505, 5513
Military service
Classes, 3142, 3284, 3291
Exemptions, 3193, 3364
Persons liable for service, 3118
National Gallery of Canada, 5301
Pensions, 6010
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5378

Morris, Mr. James (Chateauguay)
Budget, 973
Nationalist party, 974
Free wheat, 975
The record of the Government, 975
Military Service, 2978
Newspaper article, correction of, 1775
Woman suffrage, 1523

Morton, Dr. A., position of, 5706, 5913

Mounted Police
See Royal Northwest

Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal, 4835

Maxom, Major, position of, 4415

Muchaboom wharf, 304

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Russell)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 225
Proposed committee of inquiry, 225
Charges by ex-Minister of Militia, 226
Army medical service, 227
The Ross rifle, 228
Armstrong, S. A., 802

Murphy, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Army
Medical service, 227, 3978
Overseas forces, proposed holiday for, 5902
Rejected men, 3100
Soldiers, voting of, 4760, 4812, 4890
Baugh, Edward Levi, 1470, 2481
Canada Gazette, publication of, 3738
Canadian Northern railway acquisition of, 4593-4608, 4637, 4972
Cheese purchases by British Government, 1863, 2197
Civil Service appointments, 643, 648, 2021, 2238
Under Order in Council of Jan. 1, 1917, 3003
Promotions, 4666
Firearms in Quebec hardware stores, 5083
Flour, alleged profit on, 5085
Georgian Bay Canal Commission, 3901
Hospital on Parliament Hill, 1228
Inland Revenue Department, estimates, 2388
Latchford, Ont., plant and buildings, sale of, 5706
Lessard, General, 365
Marlowe, Lt.-Col. F. W., 1227
McLeod-Tellier Commission, 5251
McSpadden, Lt.-Col., 2618
Military Service, 2538
Enforcement, 2545
Labour, attitude of, 2543
Quebec, attitude of, 2543
Senate amendments, 4665
Montreal
Post office sub-station, 596
Public building, 305
Monuments, erection of, 3900
Ottawa, government land in, 1130
Parliament buildings
Brick for, 337
Contract for construction of, 454
Stone for, 304
Parliamentary secretaryships, 4213
Public Works Department architect, 5104
Recruiting of British subjects in United States, 2482
Rideau canal, lighting of, 1939
Ross rifle, 228, 421
Substitute for, 1012, 1594
Valuation of factory, 1265
Taxation, income, 4131, 4649
War supplies, clothing, 3556
War-time Elections Bill, 5618, 5656, 5669, 5732, 5764

Murray Bay railway service, 617

National Battlefields Commission, 2061

National Gallery of Canada, 3898, 5301
National Government, 132, 136, 161, 177
See Coalition
National Organization for War, pamphlet, 4685
National Service, 71, 93, 126, 170, 191
Cards, 2479
Distribution and return of, 361, 667, 713, 1376
Effect of on recruiting, 361, 374
Commission, 64, 200
Employes of military age, 4787
Expenditure, 3676
Officials, 309, 376, 3676
Purpose of, 370, 2413
Statement by the Director General, 6086
National Trust Company, 4417, 4685
National Transcontinental Railway. *See* Canadian Government railways
Nationalist party, 109, 120, 143, 179, 1224
Statement by Prime Minister, 4564
Naturalization Acts, administration of, 3741
Naval Service
Department
Estimates, staff and salaries, 660, 4157
Statement by the Minister, 4157
Grilse, H.M.C.S., command of, 4563
H.M.C.S. Niobe and Rainbow, 4162
Life saving, 661
Master mariners at Halifax, 4416
Officers at Halifax, 6000
Patrol service, 4163, 4164, 4170, 5243, 5274
Recruiting for British Admiralty, 4159
Transport service, 4161
Wilfrid C., vessel, 4062
See Air Service
Niobe
See Naval Service
Neely, Mr. D. B. (Humboldt)
McInnes, M. A., 5422
Military Service Bill, 2778
Sifton, Sir Clifford, statement of, reply to, 5774
Tariff revision, 1730
Taxation, farm implements, 1730
War-time Elections Bill, 5587, 5643-5652, 5724, 5821
White, Rev. Ward, 3903
Neely, Captain D. B., M.P., position and pay of, 6066
Neilly, Dr., military position of, 2707
Nesbitt, Mr. Edward W. (North Oxford)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 94
Canadian troops at the front, 95
Nesbitt, Mr. E. W.—*Con.*
Economy in government expenditure, 95
Camp Borden, 96, 100
National Service cards, 96
Expenditure on public works, 97
Political patronage, 97
Military officers, 98
Recruiting, 98
Army
Medical service, 542
Soldiers
Pay, 3216, 5223
Voting, 4705, 4769, 5196
Bran, prices of, 4466
Brantford moulders' strike, 2322
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4501, 4609, 4632, 5131
Cattle, British embargo on, 920
Cheese purchases, 2197, 2258
Cold storage, 2255
Criminal Code Amendment, proposed, 1677
Daylight saving, 3684
Farm labour, 3510
Government Railway Act amendment, 4346
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1179
Insurance, 3850, 5200
Live stock exchanges, 4289, 5503
Loans, public, 347
Military Service
Classes, 3143
Exemptions, 3211, 3216, 3272
Quebec situation, 2594
Voluntary enlistment, 2592
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3747
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4208
Penitentiaries, 6036
Pensions, 6016
Political patronage, 97
Potatoes, 1437
Quebec railways, 5463
Railway Act, The, 3520, 3530
St. John harbour works, 5895
Scientific and industrial research, 3911
Taxation
Business profits, 1436, 1445, 1654
Wealth, 2597
Telegraph and telephones lines, 5400
Tractor engines, duty on, 677
United Grain Growers, Limited, 895
War charities, 5481
War expenditure, 541
New Brunswick Public Works. *See* Public Works
New Carlisle, war expenditure in, 1575
New Glasgow-Mountville mail service, 1037
New Hamburg postmaster, 6053
New Richmond West post office, 898

Newsprint paper, 757, 1464, 1645
See Pulp and paper

Nicholson, Mr. Donald (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 238
Canada under Conservative rule, 238
Enlistments from Prince Edward Island, 241
Prosperity of Canada, 241, 243
Shipbuilding, 242
The French-Canadian people, 243
Military Service, 3001

Nickerson, W. H., dismissal of, 1472

Nickerson, William C., employment of, 2283

Nickle, Mr. W. F. (Kingston)
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 838
Forestry battalions, 3951
Pensions, 1615
Canadian Northern railway acquisition of, 4587
Civil Service salaries, 2250
Industrial and scientific research, 5284
Military Hospitals Commission, 473
Military Service
Classes, 3290
Exemptions, 3203
Packages, marking of—inspection and sale, 4066
Penitentiaries, officials, 6037
Pensions, 6011, 6033
Quebec railways, 5462
Railway Act, The, 3532, 3540, 3604, 3608
Royal Military College, 5310
Senate, proposed change in constitution of, 1141
Separation allowances, 382
Soldiers, returned, care of, 472
Taxation, income, 4074, 4107
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo railway, 2611
War charities, 5488
War-time Elections Bill, 5753, 5837

Nixon, Mr. A. W., military position of, 6067

Non-support
See Criminal Code Amendment Bills

North Battleford, government employees, 453

Northrup, Mr. W. B. (East Hastings)
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5497, 5904
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1184
Parliamentary sessions, expense of, 1261, 2524
Racing meets, limitation of, 321

North Sydney customs service, 607, 1852

Northwest Game Bill, The. 1r., 2569. 2r., 3665. Com., 2665, 4659. 3r., 4661

Nova Scotia
Electoral lists, 6068
Judge for district No. 6, 6003
Patrol service, 5423
Public works. *See* Public works

Ocean Telegraph Act Repeal Bill. Res., 2024. 1r., 2026. 2r., 2108. Rep., 2114. 3r., 2137

O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C. *See* Food: Investigation

Officers. *See* Army

Ogilvie Flour Mills Co., earnings and taxes of, 198, 1818, 2389, 3677

Oil, bounties, 2329

Oil-boring machinery, 301

Oleomargarine, 304, 2202
Resolution of Montreal Labour Club, 2283

Oliver, Hon. Frank (Edmonton)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 67
Our obligations in the war, 68
Recruiting, 69-77
National service, 71
The present Administration and the war, 77
Aliens, homestead rights of, 3808
Army
Allowances, 3079
Enlistment
Alberta, in, 3373, 3375
Retarding of, 2411-2415
Unfit men, of, 4003
See, under this head, Recruiting
Expeditionary force, 1816
Forestry battalions, 3951
Medical service, 3975
Officers, salutes to, 5425
Pensions, 384
Recruiting, 69
Edmonton, in, 366, 3371, 3375
Expenses, 1959
Government, 3371
Unfit men, 3107
United States, in, 3759
See, under this head, Enlistment
Soldiers
Pensions, 1603, 4051
Returned, care of, 474
Separation allowances, 383, 387
Voting of, 4791, 4812, 4892-4914
Widows of, 3806
Binder twine, 2333
British Cattle Supply Company, 1817
Bruce, Dr., report of, 1343, 1525

Oliver, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Canada Year Book, 2337
Canadian Government railways, rolling stock, 4930
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4304, 4505, 4610-4619, 5180
Capital punishment, 630
Cloakey, George, 1819
Coal, western mining of, 2200, 2238, 2525, 2653, 2776
Cold storage, 2259
Conscription, statement in L'Evenement, 434
Customs Tariff Act, proposed amendment, 1685, 1689, 1727, 1776
Dominion Lands officials, 1675
Dominion Lands Act amendment, 3793-3812
Drake, steamer, 4245
Edmonton railway bridge, 3892
Edson, town of, 1816
Elevators *See, under this title,* Grain
Experimental stations, 2065
Fiddlers, the. *See, under this title,* "The Fiddlers"
Fisheries, Lac la Biche, 2158
Flour, 5209, 5212
Sales between Canada and United States, 5273
Free food, proposed amendment, 1686
Food control, 2081
Freight rates, 3715
Game in the Northwest, 3665
Government employees, political activity of, 2349
Grain
Board of Supervisors, 3697
Elevators, 2334
Transportation of, 1681, 3396, 3412, 3712
Wheat
Export, prohibition of, 3882
Prices and control, 3690, 4512, 4661, 4687, 4887, 5209, 6000
Grande Prairie immigration hall, 1575
Grey, Ambrose, 1818
Homestead regulations, 1747
Homesteaders, names of, 1819
House of Commons
Estimates, 2359
Sessional indemnity of Members, 6047
Howe, Lt. M. J., 6066
Hudson Bay railway, 5092
Immigration, 1764, 2140, 2148
United States, from, 1747
Indians
Kitsilano reserve, 1899
Lands, 1888
Okanagan reserve, 1378, 2341
Industrial and scientific research, 5280

Oliver, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Inland Revenue Department officials and expenditure, 2362, 2380-2387
Intercolonial railway, rails, 1575
Interior Department employees, 1344, 2349
Live stock
Exchanges, 5508
Improvement of, 2278, 2281
Mail service, 3638
Merritt, Col.—Aviation Fund, 5362
Military service
Authority of Parliament, 2419
Available men, 3371
Burden of proof, 3322
Classes, 3358
Contraventions of Act, 3328, 3351, 3360, 3579
Enforcement, 2416
Exemptions, 3195, 3227, 3234, 3311, 3364
General provisions, 2411, 3238
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 301, 335, 4674
National service, 71, 361, 370, 374, 2413
National Transcontinental railway, 2209, 2218
North Battleford government employees 453
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3938
Oil bounties, 2329
Parliament, extension of term of, 3496
Patriotic Fund, 3079
Penitentiaries—officials' salaries, 6043
Pensions, 6005-6033
Poplar trees, conservation of, 3742
Public buildings
Construction, 4181
Rentals, 4149, 5097
Repairs, 5106, 5304
Telephone service, 4147
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 1575
Railway material, removal of to France, 301, 310, 1473-1474, 1615, 1628, 1820, 3407-3408, 3398, 5293
Railways
Expenditure on, 2233
Operation of, 3412
Transportation of coal by, 3395
Recruiting. *See, under this title,* Army
Rogers, Lt.-Col. Maynard, 1818
Ross rifle, 427, 432, 478, 510
Shore, George, suspension of sentence on, 1373
Soldier Settlement Board, 2780, 3625
Tariff revision, 1776
Taxation, 1677
Income, 4644
Telegraph and telephone lines, 3893, 5389

Oliver, Hon. F.—*Con.*
"The Fiddlers" forbidden circulation, 3503. 3654, 3881, 5942. 5944
War
Charities, 3489
Government, administration of, 3371
Munitions contracts, 5532
War-time Elections Bill, 5553, 5638-5702, 5816
Ways and Means—amendment to motion for second reading of resolutions, 1677
Yukon
Judges' salaries, 5897
Miners' strike, 3086
Prices and cost of living, 2199, 2237, 2481, 2525, 2945

Orangemen. *See* Loyal Orange Order

Ottawa
Government land in, 1130
Rents paid by the Government in, 4149, 5097

Outlook Publishing Company, payments to, 607

Overseas Minister of Munitions. *See* War

Overseas Forces, Minister of the, 5
Non-combatant employees of Department, 4786
See Minister of the Overseas Forces, etc., Bill

Overseas forces. *See* Army.

Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T. (Megantic)
Military Service Bill, 2916
Thetford mines labour trouble, 1113

Pacific Dredging Company, 1126

Packages, marking of. *See* Inspection and Sale Act Amendment Bill

Palmerston post office building, 1127

Papineau, Mr. Louis J. (Beauharnois)
Lefebvre, Major Alfred, 1037, 2618, 2003
Military service, 2997

Paquet, Mr. Eugène (L'Islet)
Budget, 1297
Union and solidarity of the Canadian people, 1297
The financial position of Canada, 1298
Munitions manufacture, 1299
Development of agriculture, 1300
Food products, imports and exports of, 1573
Immigration, 803
Military service, 2789
Public health, 992
Repatriation of Canadians, 803

Pardee, Mr. Frederick F. (West Lambton)
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 823
Enlistments, 1125
Medical service, 3971

Pardee, Mr. F. F.—*Con.*
Budget, 1304
Investigation into cost of foodstuffs, 1304
Plea for better Canadianism, 1307
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5136
Drawbacks, payments of, 1818
Food products, control of, 1304
Georgian Bay Canal Commission, 452
Home Defence Force, 1038
Judges on provincial commissions, 593
Lavergne, Mr. Armand, 1038
Lewis machine guns, 2201
Mackenzie, Lieut. F. J. S., 986
Military service
Exemptions, 3191
Personal attitude respecting, 3721
Persons liable for service, 3127
Tribunals, 3163
National Gallery, 5303
National Service cards, 1376
New Hamburg postmaster, 6053
Parliament, extension of term of, 3481
Pensions, 6007
Post office employees—salaries, 6051, 6053
Returned soldiers, 459
Shipbuilding at Prince Rupert, 4787
Taxation
Income, 4118, 4638
Wealth, 2528
Traction engines, duty on, 680
War-time Elections Act—tribunals, 6070

Paris, Ontario, recruiting in, 601

Parker, Mr. R. G. M., salary and position of, 2201

Parks, Canadian National; Jasper, 1477

Parliament
Adjournment of—Imperial War Conference, 117
Extension of term of, 15, 37, 157, 172, 175, 189, 223, 293, 2396, 3419.
Address to His Majesty the King, 3453, 3475; Div., 3501
Proposed amendment of Mr. Graham, 3461; Div., 3483
Statement by Prime Minister—no action, 3504
Members
Military pay of, 713
Railway transportation for, 3519
Printing of, 2007, 5901
Report of Committee on, 5949
Sessions—expense of
Motion for Committee to consider, 1261
Committee appointed, 1568
Joint action with Senate proposed, 2024
Reports, 2524, 5636

Parliament Buildings
New
Brick for, 337
Construction of, 454, 4181
Marble for, 2833
Stone for, 304
Old—destruction of—indemnities for losses, 4413

Parliamentary Procedure
Adjournment motion for discussion of definite matter of urgent public importance
Discussion closely limited, 1176
When allowable, 5517, 5547
Appeal from ruling of Chairman, 2366
Bills
Discussion on introduction of, 4410
Discussion of subsequent to amendments being reported from Committee, 5771
Printing of in both languages, 5550, 5559
Sections allowed to stand not debatable, 4752
Censored publications, quotation from in Parliament, 5492
Closure
Applied
Canadian Northern Railway Bill, notice, 5121; carried, 5123
War-time Elections Bill. 2r., 5565, 5566. 3r., 5806
Concurrence in resolution of Committee of Supply not debatable, 5095
See Speaker
Rules of debate under, 5002, 5015, 5121, 5123, 5565
Committee of Supply
Application of rule 17c to Saturday sittings of, 5891, 5901
Procedure in discussing items of which votes are made up, 4947
See, under this head, Concurrence
Committee of Ways and Means amendments when in order
Moved, 478
Chairman's ruling, 521
Resolutions from, amendment to second reading must be relevant, 1686
Concurrence in resolution of Committee of Supply—form of notice, 5095
Irrelevancy, 2362, 2374, 5235, 5237
Language reflecting on the Chair, 2567, 2609
Letter read in violation of rules of the House, not printed, 3956
Motions, debatable, 5094
Motion for delay, Speaker's ruling, 3078
Order of business, 5891, 5901

Parliamentary Procedure,—*Con.*
Order of the day lapsed for want of a quorum, reinstatement of, 2877
Orders of the Day—motion to read, 5703
Petitions, form for presentation of, 2284
Privilege—statement of member, how limited, 599
For Privilege, *see that title*
Questions
Answers to, discussions on, 4959
Not in proper form, 4834
Receiving report of Committee of Supply—form of notice, 5095
Saturday sittings, Committe of Supply, how constituted in, 5890
Senate
Regularity of its proceedings not to be questioned in House of Commons, 5498
Taxation measure amended by, 5480, 5883
Sitting of House suspended, 1766
Taxation exclusive rights of House of Commons over, 5480, 5883
Votes and Proceedings, correctness of entry in, Committee to inquire into appointed, 2880. Report of, 2944

Parliamentary Secretaryships, 5
See Minister of the Overseas Forces, etc., Bill

Paspebiac wharf, 898, 988

Paspebiac-Hopetown mail service, 1126

Passports, Atlantic, for women, 3996, 5783

Patenaude, Hon. Esioff L. (Secretary of State)
Post Office Department estimates, 660
Resignation of office, 2199, 2235
Correspondence with Prime Minister, 2494
Secretary of State Department, of the, estimates, 655
Victoria bridge toll rates, 672

Patent medicines, 1470
Classification of, 335
Controller of, resigns, 986
Legislation, inquiry as to proposed, 985
Regulations governing, 3817

Patent Record, printing of, 2062

Patriotic Fund. *See* Canadian Patriotic Fund

Patronage. *See* Political

Pay and Records Office, 3104

Payne, Mr., employment of, 5272

Peace
Dominions, consultation with on, 300
Proposals
President Wilson's, 103
Rumoured, 4466

Peat, 1405, 1422

Pelagie Sealing Treaty, claims under, 5953

Penitentaries
Dorchester, 1813
Meat supplies for, 337
Guards, salaries, of, 5803
Kelly, Thomas, treatment of, 1813
See Kelly
Officials, salaries of, 5898, 6033
Portsmouth, 3418
Prisoners
Enlistment of, proposed, 1012, 1814
Labour of, 6036, 6040
Release of, for work on farms, 803
Report of inspector, 3419

Pennsylvania coal, embargo on, 2199

Penny Bank Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 1773. 2r., Com., 3r., 2059

Pensions
Military, 1594
Amount required for, 5899
Board of Commissioners and staff, 608, 4176, 4958
Canadian in Imperial forces, for, 4662, 4688
Dependents of soldiers, 4051
Erroneous announcement denied, 5423
European war, 6005
Militiamen, 6004
Patriotic Fund, agents in applications, 382
Proposed bill, 845
Inquiry concerning, 4293
Revision of scale, 5424
Naval, pilots, 6049
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 5704

Perley, Sir George Halsey
Appointment as Minister of the Overseas Forces, 5

Petroleum. *See* Oil

Pictou (County)
Rural mail routes, 900

Pictou (Town)
Contractors for war supplies at, 303
Freight, handling of, at, 303
Marine and Fisheries agency, 304, 596, 1936

Plaxton, Mr. Charles P., position of, 4416

Point Tupper mail service, 3502

Political deadlock, rumoured, 1971

Political meetings, attendance of soldiers at, 4338

Political patronage, 203, 205, 287, 726
Recruiting, in, 86, 97, 154, 162

Pollution of streams, 454

Pommeroy, Mr. Samuel, position of, 4952

Poplar trees, utilization of, 3742

Port Hood wharf, 5336

Port Malcolm wharf, 3866

Post Office
Country postmasters, salaries of, 3634, 3642
Department
Estimates, 660, 2352, 2360, 3633, 5898, 6051
Staff and salaries, 660, 3633, 5898, 6051
Letter carriers, salaries of, 580, 1474, 1805, 2244
Mail carriers, 2243-4, 2708
Mail clerks, French-speaking, 5272
Mail contracts, 3635
Mail matter for soldiers, 3644
Mails, misuse of, 893, 1027
Parcel post, 2072, 3634, 3639
Prisoners of war, to, 3958
Postal clerks salaries, of, 2708, 3639
Railway mail service, 2244, 3650, 4102, 6051
Registration of mail matter, 668
Rural mail service, 3634, 5898
Carriers, 2247, 3634, 3636, 3643
Routes, number of, 2247
Signs, printing of, in French and English, 5999

Potatoes. *See* Agriculture *and* Food products

Power, Mr. William (Quebec, West)
Military Service, 2805

Pratt Brothers, payments to, 1570

Press censorship, 3503, 3654, 3718, 3881, 3995, 4059

Prices, fixing of. *See* Criminal Code Amendment Bills, Food *and* Cold storage

Prince Edward Island
Car ferry, 2205, 2304
See also Steamship services
Enlistments from, 241, 4563
Freight, handling of, 1037
Military organization, 5422
Payments to under Agricultural Instruction Act, 455
Public works. *See that title*
Steamship service, 660, 3389

Prince Edward Island Railway. *See* Canadian Government railways

Prince Rupert, shipbuilding at, 4787

Princess Louise Fusiliers, 5271

Printing, Government, 3737

Prison Labour, utilization of, 6036, 6040

Prisoners. *See* Penitentaries *and* War

Private Bills, discussed
Aerial League of the British Empire, 3633
Alliance Nationale, 1547
Bishop of Mackenzie River, 868
Breidert and Mudge Patents, 1199
Canadian Association of Stationary Engineers, 1198
Cascade Scenic Railway Company, 4365
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5496, 5541, 5902
Grain Growers Grain Co., Ltd., 1110
Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company, 1373
Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire and the Children of the Empire (Junior Branch), 5495
Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Co., 1110
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo railway, 2590, 2609, 3865, 3955, 3980
United Grain Growers Limited, 893

Privilege, questions of
Barrette, Mr.—statement in Halifax Chronicle, 3352
Blondin, Hon. P. E.—statement in Ottawa Evening Journal, 339
Boulay, Mr.—statement in Ottawa Citizen, 2776
Bureau, Mr.—statements in Montreal Gazette, 2709, 4730
Burnham, Mr.—correction of remarks in Hansard, 869
Clark, Mr. Michael—statements in the press, 3617
Descarries, Mr.—vote on Military Service Bill, 3846
Graham, Mr.—statement of Mr. R. B. Bennett, 804, 869
Hazen, Mr.—statement by Mr. Pugsley, 5274
Hughes, Sir Sam
Statement of Mr. Mark Irish, 2707
Statement of Mr. A. K. Maclean, 2777
Statement of Mr. Currie, 5773
Knowles, Mr.—statement in Toronto Telegram, 5085
Lafortune, Mr.—Ottawa Journal-Press, 3085
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid—statement of Sir Clifford Sifton, 4009
MacNutt, Mr.—Ottawa Journal-Press, 3656
Mondou, Mr.—statement in Montreal Gazette, 3004
Neely, Mr.—statement by Sir Clifford Sifton, 5774
Oliver, Hon. Frank—statement in L'Evenement, 434
Pugsley, Hon. William
Mr. Justice Landry, 3109
Statements of the Prime Minister, 3609

Privilege, question of—*Con.*
Statement in Toronto Star, 4959
Newspaper reports, 5273
Rogers, Hon. Robert—Ottawa Citizen editorial, 599
Sévigny, Hon. Albert—statement in Montreal Gazette, 2058
Sinclair, Mr.—statements in Ottawa Journal, 4927
Taylor, Mr. J. D.—remarks of Mr. Thomson, 1370
White, Sir Thomas—Toronto Globe editorial, 2707
Wilcox, Mr.—statement in Toronto Globe, 47

Prohibition or Restriction of the sale and use of Intoxicating Liquors Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 4192. 2r., com., 4395. 3r., 4405. *See also* Intoxicating liquors, Canada Temperance Act *and* Provincial prohibitory legislation

Proportional representation, 902

Proulx, Mr. Edmond (Prescott)
Boyce, George H., 1472
Canadian Association of Returned Soldiers, 4951
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5075
Cox, John, 1472
Criminal Code amendments, jurors, 4305
Customs Department, motor car for, 1476
Dillon, Major G. P., 1958
Georgian Bay Canal Commission, 5913
Gibson, Lieut. Wm., 5422
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1179
Grilse, steamer, 4563
Hants county apple inspectors, 1380
Harris, Capt. R. V., 5422
Hughes, Brig.-Gen. W. S., 5361
Interprovincial bridges, 3890
Jaffray, Mr. J. P., 4062
Knight, Mr. N. H. R., 4952
Laurentian, steamer, 4563
Macpherson, Capt. Kenneth C., 4292, 4416, 4685
Magladery, Mr. Thomas, 4685
Military service, 3056
Exceptions, 3563
Exemptions, 3189, 3192, 3366
Militia Department automobiles, 3903
National Organization for War, 4685
Nixon, Mr. A. W., 6067
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4431, 4449
Pensions, 6005
Quebec railways, 5474
Salter, R. J., 1472
Senate, the, proposed change in constitution of, 1144

Proulx, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Spence, Andrew, 1472
Steamer C. E. Tanner, 5362
Taylor, Lt.-Col. J. D. M.P., 986
Tremain, Lieut.-Col. H. B., M.P., 608, 1472
War supplies—hay, 338
War-time Elections Bill, 5623, 5669, 5829
Webb, Lieutenant, 4563
Wood, Lieutenant, 4563

Provincial governments, duties payable by, 2119, 2129

Provincial prohibitory legislation. Bill in aid of, 1r., 4192; 2r. and Com., 4395; 3r., 4405; Senate amendments, 5514
See also Intoxicating liquors, Prohibition *and* Canada Temperance Act

Public health, proposed department of, 992

Public Service Committee, recommendations of, 3633

Public Service Loan Bill. Res., 242. 1r., 353. 2r., 435. Com., 435. 3r., 476

Public Works
Buildings
Alberta, 5312
British Columbia, 1126, 5312
Generally, 4147, 5314
Manitoba, 5311
Nova Scotia, 4145
Ontario, 4146, 5309, 5412. *See* Ottawa
Quebec, 1935, 4145, 5309
Saskatchewan, 4146, 5312
Department
Automobile, purchase of, 2480
Estimates, 652, 1935, 3867, 3882, 4145, 4181, 5096, 5304, 5314, 5362
Staff and salaries, 3893, 5104
Dredging
British Columbia, 5359
Dredge Cape Breton, loss of, 596, 668, 1024, 3881
Dredge No. 6, 5404
Generally, 5096
Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, 3887
Maritime Provinces, 5359
Ontario and Quebec, 3886, 5359
See, under this title, Harbours and Rivers
Dry docks. *See* Dry Docks Subsidies Act Amendment Bill
Expenditure 1916-17, 1038
Harbours and Rivers
British Columbia, 3885, 5304, 5357
Manitoba, 5356
New Brunswick, 3872, 4185, 5347, 5411, 5890
Nova Scotia, 3866, 5314

Public Works—*Con.*
Ontario, 3883, 5355
Prince Edward Island, 3871
Quebec, 3879, 5353
See Quebec Harbour Advances Bill
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 3884
See, under this title, Dredging
Roads and bridges, 3888, 5360
Wharves, 1943

Publication Committee, 5791

Pugsley, Hon. William (St. John City)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 286
The political situation, 286
Returned soldiers and political patronage, 287
Administration of military affairs under late Minister of Militia, 287
Utilization of our natural resources, 291
Shipbuilding, 292
The Dorchester campaign, 293
Canada's naval policies, 293
Extension of term of Parliament, 293
Imperial War Conference, 294
Army
Desertions, 3111
Discharges, purchase of, 3112
Enlistments, 2647
Soldiers
Returned, employment of, 3846, 6057
Voting of, 2651, 4689-4736, 4740-4786, 4808-4834, 4874-4887, 4889-4914
165th Regiment, 1725
Bathurst harbour improvements, 3872
Budget, 863, 870
Trade conditions, 863
Free wheat, 864, 870
The Minister of Inland Revenue, 879
Amendment of Mr. Turriff, 881
Canadian Government railways
Branch lines, 2228, 2232
Cars for, 4928
Employees, promotion of, 762
Intercolonial railway
Coal, freight rates on, 3511
Maritime Express service, 8
Passenger service, 2207
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4230, 4248, 4486, 4837, 4990-5015, 5108
Capital punishment, 631
Civil servants, enlisted—pay and separation allowances, 664, 2252
Civil Service
Officials, proposed dismissal of, 3633
Salaries, 1791, 2012

Pugsley, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Coal
Prices and supply, 665, 2092
Maritime Provinces, in, 4063, 5085
Transportation of, 4138
Coastal regulations, 1912
Conscription, 1555
United States citizens, of, 1743
Criminal Code amendments, jurors, 4293, 4334
Customs, duties payable by provincial governments, 2121, 2133
Daylight saving, 2945
Divorced persons, re-marriage of, 46, 1383, 1524
Dominion Lands Act Amendment, 3796
Dredging, 5096
Drill halls, control of, 4146
Dry docks, 4455, 5772, 5888, 5917
Fish and fisheries
Licenses, 2150
Lobsters, 4171
Sardine fisheries, 4168
Flint, Dr., retirement of, 6044
Food control, 2091
Free wheat, 864, 870
Fuel, 1421
Game in the Northwest, 3670
Grosse Isle quarantine station, 5306
Hansard, correction of statement in, 6067
Members' sessional indemnity, 6048
Morning sittings, 2619
Stenographers, 5788
Hudson Bay railway, 5086
Immigration, 2141, 2146
Imperial Munitions Board, imports, 1978
Imperial War Conference, visit of Prime Minister to, 1551
Indian lands, 1908
Insurance, 3849, 3864, 4138, 5198
Landry, Mr. Justice, findings of, 3109, 3609, 5265
See under this title, McLeod-Tellier
Lighthouse keepers' salaries, 6049
Live stock exchanges, 5504
Loans to farmers, 1962
Loans, public ($100,000,000), 342
Mail contracts, 3635
McLeod-Tellier Commission, 5245, 5265
See under this title, Landry, Mr. Justice
Military Service, 2642, 3254
Appeals, 3175, 3181
Classes, 3144, 3287
Definitions, 3111
Enforcement, 2651
Enlistments, voluntary, 2647
Exemptions, 3209, 3213

Pugsley, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Militia Act, 2643
Persons liable for service, 3123
Referendum, 2651
Soldiers, voting of, 2651
Tribunals, 3164, 3574
National Service Commission, remuneration to officials of, 309, 457
Newspaper reports, correction of, 5273
Order of the day, reinstatement of, 2877
Ottawa public buildings
Rents paid by Government, 4149, 5097
Telephone service, 4147
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4446
Packages, marking of—inspection and sale,—4065
Parcel post, 2072
Parliament, extension of term of, 3468, 3475
Parliamentary secretaryships, 4452
Peace proposals, 300
Potatoes, removal of duty on, 703
Provincial legislators, **free** transportation for, 684
Public Works Department
Estimates and expenditure, 3871, 5414, 5306, 5413
Quebec, railways, operating expenses of, 5452
Railway Act, The, 606
Railways, material for use in France, 1826
St. John harbour improvements, 3875, 5349, 5413
Shipbuilding, 665, 703, 1371, 1551, 1775, 1912-1928, 2293, 5432-5452
Soldier Settlement Board, 3618
Steamship services, 2292
Supply, voting one-sixth for 1917-18, 2946
Supreme Court, allowances to Chief Justice, 6050
Taxation
Business profits, 1636
Income, 4089
Wealth, 3471, 3475
Telegraph and telephone service, 5364, 5401
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo railway, 2616
Toronto News, statement of, 4959
Vancouver harbour improvement, 5304
Volunteers to operate trains in France, position of, 5123
War charities, 5482
War supplies
Munitions, 5527
Ross Rifle, 501
War-time Elections Bill, 5629, 5640, 5657, 5751-5771

Pugsley, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Wealth, conscription of, 3471, 3475
Woman suffrage, 309, 672, 759, 1482, **1521**, 1594 1627, 4958

Pugsley, Lieut. J. A., position of, 4895

Pulp and paper
Newsprint, fixing of price of, 1302

Quarantine service, 3756

Quebec (City)
Firearms in hardware stores, 5083
Harbour master, 897
Immigration agents, 5122

Quebec (Province)
Bridges, 3889
Electoral lists, 6002
Judges' salaries, 5798
Military districts Nos. 3 and 10, 455
Public Works. *See that title*
Recruiting in, 94, 112, 119, 127, 147, 160, 185, 213, 221, 342, 363, 2398, 2424, 2515
Officers, recruiting of, 3135
See Military Service Bill *and* French Canadian

Quebec Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway, completion and operation of, 4948, 5452

Quebec and Oriental railway, 1674

Quebec and Saguenay railway
Bondholders, 669
Completion and operation of, 303, 668, 1575, 4948, 5452
Expenditure, 1658
Legislation concerning, proposed, 458

Quebec Harbour Advances Bill. Res., 435. 1r., 438. 2r., 577. Com., 577. 3r., 578

Quebec Harbour Commission, 436

Racing Form, The, exclusion from mails of, 306, 336, 896

Racing meets, limitation of. *See* Criminal Code Amendment Bills

Radiotelegraph service. *See* Telegraphs, *also* Ocean Telegraph Act

Railway Act Amendment Bills
1. Bill No. 13, Mr. Cochrane, general. 1r., 194; 2r., 602; special committee, 602; motion to amend, stands, 605; com., 3420, 3511, 3592, 3716; 3r., 3740
2. Bill No. 18, Mr. McCraney, free transportation for provincial legislators. 1r., 300. 2r., 685. Ref. to Railway Com., 685

Railway Commission, 1862, 3407

Railway mail clerks. *See* Post office

Railways
Alleged advance to Company, 2100
Bridges, 3889

Railways—*Con.*
Cattle getting on tracks, 3549
Coal
Confiscation of, by, 584
Handling of, by, 3395, 3402
Constables, 3599
Employees, payment of salaries of, 5956
Expenditure on, 2233
Fires from locomotives, 3552, 3602
French language, printing of literature in, 3511
Material, removal of to France, 310, 335, 1229, 1266, 1372, 1473, 1474, 1615, 1628, 1690, 1820, 3407, 3409, 5293
Overdue trains, notice of, 3594
Situation, 2219, 2221, 4011, 4058, 4217, 4247, 4467, 4512, 4566, 4622, 4835
Cost of inquiry into, 3408
Traffic, congestion of, 587
For Canadian Government railways, see that title
For individual railways, see their titles

Railways and Canals
Department
Estimates, staff and salaries, 2202, 3385, 3402, 4925, 4928, 5428
Steamers purchased by, 669

Rainbow, His Majesty's Canadian Ship, 457, 1472
See Naval Service

Rainville, Mr. Joseph H. (Deputy Speaker)
Emigration to the United States, 3285
Military service
Classes, 3285
Exemptions, 3189, 3194, 3218
Farmers, of, 6002
See Deputy Speaker

Ralston, Major J. L., position and pay of, 6067

Rankin, Captain Ramsay, position of, 987

Recruiting. *See* Army
For recruiting by localities, see names of localities

Reid, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Customs)
Canadian Government railways
Intercolonial, management of, 769
Passenger service, 2207
Promotion of employees, 769
Quebec, 4948, 5452, 5458
Civil Service appointments, 644, 1023
Coal, confiscation of by railways, 585
Customs
Crown goods, duties payable on, 1978-1985, 2119
Departmental estimates, staff and salaries, 643, 1843, 1881, 5098, 5777
Disposal of unclaimed goods, 3743

Reid, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Imperial Munitions Board imports, 1978
Montreal collectorship, 648
Revenue cruisers, 1882
Dredging, 5096
Dry docks, 5771
Flint, Dr., retirement of, 6044
House of Commons—sessional indemnity of Members, 6047
Naval Service Department estimates, 660
Pensions, 6004, 6533
Public Works Department estimates, 5104, 5304, 5314, 5362
Railway Act Amendment Bills, 5997
Schaffner, Mr. L. P., dismissal of, 440
Shipbuilding, 5440, 5453
Spittal, Major, dismissal of, 646, 651
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5362
Reid, Lance Corporal, allowances to, 717
Renault, Raoul, appointment of, 2361
Repatriation of Canadians, 803
Research Council Bill. 1r., 2357. 2r., 3905. Com., 3909. 3r., 3957
Restigouche river, bridging of, 988
Returns, complaints of delay in bringing down, 1373
Rhodes, Hon. Edgar N. (Cumberland). *See* Speaker
Richmond county medical officers, 3758
Rideau canal
Lighting of, 1939
Pretoria Avenue bridge, 4926
Rimouski
Medical officers, 4509
Public works engineer, 4244
Recruiting officers, 456
Riou, Mr. C. S., payments to, 3904
Riviere du Loup-Tadoussac ferry, 452, 2358
Riviere Ouelle-Murray bay steamship service, 643
Robb, Mr. James A. (Huntingdon)
Bags, duty on, 1867-1881
Bran and middlings, duty on. 1867-1881
Budget, 969, 1317, 1319
Tariff changes, 969, 971
Free wheat, 970
Duty on mill feeds, 971
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5055
Farm labour, 3509
Free wheat, 970
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1182
Harbour facilities, 4190
Live stock exchanges, 5507
National Transcontinental freight rates, 3394
Rural mail service, 3641
Taxation—income, 4106
Robb, P. A., employment of, 1572
Robidoux, Mr. Ferdinand J. (Kent, N.B.)
Military service, 2703
Authority of Parliament, 2703
Enlistment in Quebec, 2704
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5380
Robinson, Captain J. T., appointment of, 1377
Roche, Hon. W. J. (Minister of the Interior)
Agricultural labourers from the United States, 1194
British Columbia Indian Commission, 653
Dominion Lands Act Amendment Bill, 159, 2832, 3793-3817
Farm labour, 3507
Frank, Alta., moving of residences at, 4919
French-Canadians in the United States, 4914
Game in the Northwest, 3665, 4659
Homestead regulations, 1741, 1747
Immigration
Agents, 1738
Chinese, 843, 2139
Department estimates, 4914
Regulations, 449, 525
Indians, 2340, 2349
Department estimates, 1886
Sydney reserve, 3663
See Indians
Interior Department
Employees, political activities of, 2350
Estimates, 652, 1344, 1735
French-speaking employees of, 2341
Orders in Council relating to, 6000
Migratory birds, 2525, 3657
Seed grain collections, 2352
Soldier Settlement Act, administration of, 4917
Soldier Settlement Board, 686, 1157, 2653, 3618, 3779
Surveys, 1345, 1735
United States' head tax on Canadians, 892
Rogers, Lt.-Col. Maynard, salary of, 1818
Rogers, Hon. Robert (Minister of Public Works)
Dry docks, 4456, 5915
Ottawa Citizen, statement of, 599
Public works
Buildings, 4145, 4181
Department: estimates, staff and salaries,, 3866, 3882, 3893, 4145, 4181, 5104
Harbours and rivers, 3866, 3882, 4187
Roads and bridges, 3888
Resignation from the Cabinet, 4736
Ross, Mr. Duncan C. (West Middlesex)
Army
Officers, surplus, 3104
Soldiers, votes for, 1393
Substitutes, buying of, 3113

Ross, Mr. D. C.—*Con.*
Food control, 3045
Assistants to Food Controller, 4244
Industrial and scientific research, 5284
Military service, 3041
Army Act regulations, 3113
Exemptions, 3224
Persons liable for service, 3126
Tribunals, 3170
Taxation
Income, 4652
Wealth, 3045
Unclaimed bank balances, 1001
War supplies, horses, 453
War-time Elections Bill, 5677, 5687
William Davies Co., 4151

Ross rifle. *See* War supplies

Rouville county mail carrier, 608

Roy, Judge L. R., payments to, 1130

Royal Assent, The, 603, 3766, 5084

Royal Astronomical Society of Canada, 5304

Royal Military College, 5310

Royal Mint, Ottawa branch, 1474

Royal Naval College, 4163

Royal Northwest Mounted Police
Pensions, 5704
Salaries and contingencies, 4147
Saskatchewan and Alberta, duties in, 301, 335
Subsistence, etc., 4667

Ruisseau le Blanc breakwater, 898

Russell, Mr. T. A., purchase of motor trucks by, 266, 280

Salt. *See* Fish

Salter, R. J., payments to, 1472

Sand Point wharf, 5316

Sauve, Pte. James, application of for pension, 5776

Savings banks, deposits in, 4685

St. Charles de Caplan wharf, 898

St. Charles river dam, 2525

St. Jerome post office, 899

St. John and Quebec Railway Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 2433. 2r., Com., 3r., 3401

St. John harbour improvements, 3875, 4185, 5347, 5411, 5890

St. Lawrence Flour Mills Company, Government contracts with, 4509

Sainte Luce. Changing of name, 673

St. Maurice river improvements, 1381

St. Peter's canal, 3406

St. Pierre-Miquelon mail service, 3649

St. Roch Traverse lightkeeper, 1378

St. Romuald public works, 1129

Schaffner, Mr. F. L. (Souris)
Army, enlistment of unfit men, 4004
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5061
Cattle, British embargo on, 918
Civil Service, 2246
Daylight saving, 3683
Flour prices, 5214
Grain, rust in, 2067
Military service, exemptions, 3365
Ottawa public buildings, 4150
Public headth, 1001
Rural mail carriers, 2247
Taxation
Farm implements, 1713
Income, 4096

Schaffner, Mr. L. P., dismissal of, 438

School lands, western, 1378

Scientific and Industrial research. *See* Research Council Bill

Scotch Hill post office, 3649

Scout, motor boat, 5271

Scott, Mr. F. S. (South Waterloo)
Budget, 884
Canada and the war, 885
Free wheat, 885
Present prosperity, 886

Secretary of State, Department of the, estimates, 655, 3737, 5242

Security Life Insurance Company Bill. 1r., 2479. 2r., 2592. Com., 3r., 2857

Seed grain, 302, 303, 305
See Grain

Seguin, Mr. Paul A. (L'Assomption)
Enlistments, 1476, 1572
Military Service Bill, 2765

Senate
Appointments to, 924
Hansard, cost of, 1571
Proposed change in constitution of, 1131
Taxation measures, precedent in amendment denied, 5480, 5883

Sévigny, Hon. Albert (Minister of Inland Revenue)
Army camps, sale of liquor in, 837
Inland Revenue Department
Estimates, 2360, 3817
Expenditure, 2379
Military service, 2636
Exceptions, 3572
Quebec, recruiting in, 2638, 3256

Sévigny, Hon. A.—*Con.*
Privilege—statement concerning effects removed from Speaker's chambers after Parliament Buildings fire, 2058
Renault, Raoul, appointment of, 2361
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5385, 5391

Sexsmith, Mr. John A. (East Peterborough)
Agriculture and Colonization, report of Committee, 1956
Railway Act, The, 3443, 3543, 3546, 3605
Telegraphs and telephones, 3543, 3546

Shaw, F. D., dismissal of, 1847

Sherbrooke exhibition grounds, 302

Shigawake post office, 898

Shigawake East post office, 988

Shipbuilding
British Government, for, 4164
Canadian-built ships, 591
Prince Rupert, at, 4787
Railway Department, for, 4939, 5429
See Marine

Shipping. *See* Marine *and* Transportation

Shore, George, suspension of sentence on, 1373

Sinclair, Mr. John H. (Guysborough)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 150
The fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, 150
The winning of the war, 151
Canadian soldiers at the front, 152
Military record of the Government, 152
The Ross rifle, 154
Political patronage, 154
Commandeering of ships, 155
Small arms ammunition, 156
Extension of term of Parliament, 157
Army
Casualties, July, 1917, 4151
Enlistments, July, 1917, 4151
Medical service, 3969
Officers, surplus of, 3102
Recruiting, 2884
Soldiers, age of on enlisting, 4001
Canada Temperance Act, 5243
Canadian Government railways, ice for, 301
See, under this title, Intercolonial
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4600, 4872, 5061
Civil servants, enlisted, pay and separation allowances to, 663
Civil Service, 649
Appointments under sec. 21, 607, 1023, 1351, 1937
Coalition government, 2887
Customs Department staff, and expenditure, 649, 1845

Sinclair, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
Dredges, 668, 1025, 5405
Fish and fisheries
Advisory Board, 2152
Bounties, 457
Development of industry, 2040
Exports, 454
Investigation of problems, 5288
Laws, violation of, 2389
Lobsters, packing of, 5427
Marketing, 2042
Salt, 1027, 2044, 2290
Telephone method, 2176
Transportation, 3392, 4933
Trawlers, 300
Food inspectors, 607
Government Railways Act amendment, 4371
Grain, seed, 4680
Guysborough public building, 5914
Heatherton mail contract, 1817
High cost of living, 707
Hudson Bay railway expenditure, 596
Immigration regulations, 312, 525
Inland Revenue Department officials, 758
Intercolonial railway
Appointment of officials, 658
Branch lines, 3386
Tracadie siding, 2618
Intoxicating liquors, prosecutions for sale of, 1575
Manitoba County Court judges,, 5083
Margaree harbour improvements, 5332
McCutcheon, Stanley, dismissal of, 306
Migratory birds, 3661
Military District No. 6, 5236
Military service
Appeals, 3179
Classes, 3141
Referendum, 2881
Tribunals, 3157
Military Voters' Bill, 4694, 4726, 4728, 4758-4786
Navigation, training in, 1839
Nickerson, W. H., 1472
Nova Scotia judges, 6003
Ottawa Journal, statement in, 4927
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4445
Parliament, extension of term of, 157
Pensions, 6030
Political patronage, 154
Pollution of streams, 454
Public Works Department estimates, 3868, 3874
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 668
Quebec harbour advances, 437
Railway Act, The, 3526, 3529
Railway Commission, appeals from, 1863
Rainbow, steamship, 1472

Sinclair, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
Returns, delay in bringing down of, 1373
Ross rifle, 154, 425, 451
Rural mail service, 5898
St. John harbour works, 5896
Salt for fish curing, 1027, 2290
Sand Point wharf, 5316
Savings banks deposits, 4685
Shipbuilding, 1671, 1923, 5434, 5452
Small arms ammunition, 156, 2480
Soldiers, returned, appointment of, 6059
Soldier's Cove wharf, 5337
Sonora preventive officers, 4244
Steam trawlers, 300
Steamship services, 2288, 2300
Steele, Arthur, dismissal of, 338
Submarine situation, 1328
Superannuation payments, 595
Technical education, 1247
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5371
Toronto water-borne traffic, 454
Tracadie Inland Revenue officer, 1817
War-time Elections Bill, 5567, 6081
Welland canal, 3404
Wells, Clarence, 2480
White, N. W., payments to, 1038
Whitehead life saving station, 1469

Small Arms Ammunition. *See* War supplies

Smith, Pte. J. I., discharge of, 3418

Smith, Mr. William (South Ontario)
Army, casualties, 2201
Cattle, British embargo on, 923
National Service cards, 2479
Railway Act, The, 3442

Smith's Falls postmaster, 1570

Soldiers. *See* Army

Soldiers' Settlement Board
Advances to soldiers, 4918
Commissioners, 4917

Soldier Settlement Board Bill. Res., 1157, 2653, 3618. 1r., 3630. 2r., 3779. 3r., 3792

Sonora preventive officers, 4244

Sorel, strike at, 1912, 1935

South African War—Canadian contingent, 2200

Speaker (Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes), rulings and statements of
Adjournment motions, when in order, 5517, 5547
Amendments ruled out not subsequently debatable, 1686
Bills
Not debatable in detail on motion for leave to introduce, 4410
Printing of in both languages, 5550

Speaker—*Con.*
Censored publications, quotations from in Parliament, 5944
Closure
Bill reported amended, amendments not debatable; Rule 17A overrides Rule 56, 5771
Concurrence in resolution of Committee of Supply not debatable, 5095
Crown property, Bills to dispose of, must have Crown's consent, for third reading, 1157
Flint, Dr., retirement of, 6044
House of Commons
Estimates, 2359, 5784
Officials, 5786
Interjections, 2596
Irrelevancy, 444, 5478
Language reflecting on the Chair to be withdrawn, 2567
Letters from persons outside referring to House proceedings not to be quoted, 3956
Member must take his seat when Speaker addresses House, 4410
Motions dealing with questions already before House, 1017, 1022, 1150
Motions, irregular
Repetition of matters disposed of, 1867
Substantial repetition of notice of motion standing on order paper, 1490, 1508, 1523
Taxation, to levy, without recommendation by the Crown, 3078, 4648
Order of the day, reinstatement of, 2878, 2880
Orders of the Day, on, extended remarks irregular, 665, 804
Petitions, form for presentation of, 2284
Privilege, statements under to be confined to denial of matters complained of, 599, 3612, 3614, 3616
Questions and answers
Answers not debatable, 4959
Questions not to contain allegation of fact or inuendo, 4834
Quorum, absence of, 2877
Reply, privilege of, confined to mover of substantive motion, 1880
Order of speakers varied by unanimous consent, 1015
Rules, lenient interpretation not to establish a precedent, 3078
Saturday sittings, Committee of Supply, how constituted (Rule 17C), 5891
Senate proceedings, regularity of not to be questioned in House, 5498

Speaker—*Con.*
Taxation, amendment by Senate of a Bill; rights of House to be reserved by special declaration, 5480, 5883
Unanimous consent; change in order of Speakers permitted, 1015
Unparliamentary expressions
"A man who was ashamed, Sir, of what he was doing," 5587
"Vile motives," 4313
Votes and Proceedings, error, not immediately discovered, referred to special committee, 2880
Ways and Means, amendment to second reading of resolution reported from Committee must be relevant, 1686
See also Deputy Speaker *and* Parliamentary procedure

Spence, Andrew, position of, 1472

Spittal, Lt.-Col. C. D., dismissal of, 645, 651, 1127

Spotten, Judge, 1127

Stanfield, Mr. John (Colchester)
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 823
Medical service, 3984
Government railways, promotion of employees, 765

Stayner public building, 5412

Steamers utilized by British Government, the C. E. Tanner, 5362

Steamship services
Australia and New Zealand, 2285
Canada
British Columbia, 2299
Magdalen Islands, 2302, 2326
New Brunswick, 2292, 2297, 2323
Nova Scotia, 2286, 2299, 2300, 2304, 2319
Prince Edward Island, 2303, 2319, 3389, 3945
Quebec, 2299, 2318, 2325
China and Japan, 2298
France, 2307
Great Britain, 2285, 2291, 2297
Ireland, 2292
Newfoundland, 2286, 2291
South Africa, 2291
South America, 2287
United States, 2299
West Indies, 2287
See also Transportation

Steam trawlers. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Steele, Arthur, dismissal of, 338

Steele, General, appointment of, 264

Steele, Mr. Michael (South Perth)
Aerial League of the British Empire, 3633
Alcohol, on charge to medical stores, loss of, 2776
Army, soldiers, voting of, 1383, 4825
Canadian Association of Stationary Engineers, 1198
Cheese purchases, 2258
Coal, shortage of, 83
Cold storage, 2079
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5496
Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire, 5495
Public health, proposed department of, 992
Railway Act, The, 3442, 3452
Scientific and industrial research, 3909

Stefansson expedition, 4173

Stellarton, N.S.
Postmaster, 669, 897, 3758
Public building, 4951

Stevens, Mr. H. H. (Vancouver)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 62
Our troops at the front, 62
Reply to criticisms of Mr. Macdonald, 62
The Ross rifle, 63
National Service Commission, 64
The smelting and refining of ores, 66
Care of returned soldiers, 67
Army, soldiers, voting of, 4749
Canadian Northern Railway acquisition of, 4965
Enlistment, 2421-2428
Fisheries, proposed ministry of, 2029
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1182
Indians, Kitsilano Reserve, 1902
Military Service, 2421
Enlistment, interference with, 2421
Labour's attitude, 2426
Quebec's attitude, 2424, 2428
Referendum, 2427
National Service Commission, 64
Ross rifle, 63
Shipbuilding, 5445
Telephone lines, 5402
Wealth, conscription of, 2427
Woman suffrage, 1522

Stewart, Mr. T. J. (West Hamilton)
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo railway, 2590, 2609, 3865, 3955, 3980
Tractor engines, duty on, 680

Submarine situation, 1320

Sulphur, United States embargo on export of, 4889

Superannuation payments, 595

Supply Bill. *See* Appropriation Act

Supply, committee of, 353, 578-584, 643-663, 1112-1124, 1166-1176, 1344-1361, 1735-1766, 1790-1815, 1835-1862, 1881-1912, 1912-1956, 1989-2006, 2061-2099, 2149-2183, 2202-2235, 2255-2282, 2285-2320, 2323-2364, 2359-2388, 3385-3399, 3402-3417, 3633-3654, 3687-3716, 3737-3740, 3740-3757, 3817-3844, 3866-3881, 3882-3902, 3949-3955, 3962-3979, 3980-4008, 4044-4058, 4145-4150, 4157-4191, 4666-4684, 4914-4926, 4928-4951, 5098-5108, 5205-5242, 5242- 5270, 5275-5314, 5314-5360, 5362-5415, 5428-5474, 5777-5805, 5890, 5892-5900, 5948, 5997, 6004-6060
For details see titles of departments and subjects

Supreme Court Act and Exchequer Court Act amendment Bill. 1r., 2568; 2r., Com., 3r., 3630

Surveys, 1345, 1357
Astronomical, 4917
Generally, 1345, 1357, 3898
Geological, 4179
Hydrographic, 4173
Indian Lands, 1894
International, 1735

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Army camps, sale of liquor in, 829
Coalition government, 2690
Flour, price of, 1080
Live stock purchases, 2280
Military service, 2682
Classes, 3282
Quebec, recruiting in, 2685
Referendum, 2692
Railway Act, The, 3545, 3547
Railways, government operation of, 2234
Rural mail carriers, 3636
Soldier Settlement Board, 3786
Soldiers, behaviour of, 5234
Soldiers, votes for, 1395
Telegraphs and telephones, 3545
War-time Elections Bill, 5685, 5860
Women Suffrage, 1477

Swiss Army manoeuvres, attendance of Canadian officers at, 5219

Sydney
Harbour improvements, 5342
Industrial sites, 3956

Tanner, C. E., Steamer or Motor Boat, 5362

Tariff. *See* Customs *and* Customs Tariff Act

Taxation. Senate amendment of taxation measure no precedent, 5476
Special
Business profits, 719, 727, 737, 745, 750, 959, 965, 1432, 1437, 1447, 1628, 2107
Comparative statement, 2508
Cost of collecting, 4686

Taxation—*Con.*
Returns of business concern, 4245
See Wealth, Conscription of
Income, 719, 738, 1424, 1441, 1631, 1687, 3760, 3767, 4070, 4102, 4124, 4638
Cost of collecting estimated, 4686
See also Income War Tax Bill
Land, 1630
Hudson's Bay Co., lands, 986
Patent medicines, 363
Use made of funds obtained by, 4177
Wealth, 2453, 2469, 2508, 2528, 2576, 2587, 2597, 2608, 2671, 2728, 2859, 3045
See Wealth, Conscription of

Taylor, Mr. James D. (New Westminster)
Army
Medical service, 3981
Non-commissioned officers, 1608, 3999
Officers, employment of, 565
Recruiting, 565
Soldiers
Pensions, 1607
Voting of, 4703, 4757-4786
Fraser river dredging, 5357
Hindu immigration, 2145
Military service, 3145, 3275
Thomson, Mr. Levi, reply to statement of, 1370

Taylor, Lt.-Col. J. D., M.P., payments to, 986

Technical Education, 1229
See Industrial and Scientific Research.

Telegraphs, telephones and radiotelegraphs
Government lines
Alberta and Saskatchewan, 3892, 5393
British Columbia, 3893, 5365, 5395, 5410
Manitoba, 5411
Magdalen Islands cable, 5407
New Brunswick, 5379
Nova Scotia, 5362
Prince Edward Island, 5407, 5411
Quebec, 5384
Telephones for, 4147
Ocean service, 2024, 2108
Provisions governing, 3542, 3546
Radiotelegraph service, 4159
Subsidies, 3892
West India cable, 2339

Temiscouata mail contract, 335

"The Fiddlers," circulation of forbidden, 3503, 3654, 3718, 3881, 3955, 4059, 5942

Thetford Mines, labour trouble at, 590, 606, 1113

Thoburn, Mr. William (North Lanark)
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5909
Military service, 3358
Postmasters, salaries of, 3642
Technical education, 1238

Thompson, Mr., of Winnipeg, employment of, 4008

Thompson, Mr. Alfred (Yukon)
Game in the Northwest, 3668
Yukon, cost of living in, 2571

Thompson, Dr. Alfred, M.P., employment and salary of, 5083

Thomson, Mr. Levi (Qu'Appelle)
Army, soldiers' pay, 3216
Budget, 976
The duty on farm machinery, 977
Inequalities in the tariff, 979
Free wheat, 982
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5143
Dominion Lands Act amendment, 3811
Free wheat, 982
Military service, 2993
Exemptions, 3193, 3225
Railway transportation for Members of Parliament, 3521, 3523
Soldier Settlement Board, 3629

Thornton, Mr. Charles J. (Durham)
Packages, marking of,—inspection and sale,—4066
Railway Act, The, 3544
Telegraphs and telephones, 3544

Three Rivers
Harbour improvements, 3879
Public buildings, 662

Titus, Private John, 2237

Tobin, Mr. Edmund W. (Richmond and Wolfe)
Bromptonville postmaster, 1129
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5052
Horses for war purposes, 1123
Military service, 2810
Militia Department motor cars, 2525
Ross rifle, 2054
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5388
Wool, exportation of, 1130

Toronto water-borne traffic, 454

Tracadie
Inland Revenue officer, 1817
Railway siding, 2618

Tractor engines, duty on, 674

Trade and Commerce
Agents and commissioners, 2326
Department of
Estimates, 1835, 2285, 2323, 3687, 3737, 5205, 5275
Publications, 5275
Foreign trade
France, 597, 2307
South America, 2331

Transportation
West Indies, 2288
Coal, of, vessels for, 4791
Grain, 3712
Lake and ocean freight rates, 3715
Legislators, for, 4935
Problems, report of Royal Commission on, 1012
Terminal facilities, 4189
See also Marine, Railways, Shipbuilding, *and* Steamship Services

Tremain, Lieut.-Col. H. B., M.P., pay and allowances to, 608, 1472

Trent canal, 759, 2206, 3405, 3417

Trenton, N.S., contractors for war supplies at, 303

Truax, Mr. R. E. (South Bruce)
Brampton-Palestine mail route, 590
Military Service Bill, 3048
Royal Mint, Ottawa branch, 1474

Turgeon, Mr. Onésiphore (Gloucester)
Army—dental corps, 4008
Budget, 1108, 1194, 1201
Government railways, 1108
Canada's prosperity, 1195
Taxation, 1197, 1201
Protection or free trade, 1197
Conservative and Liberal policies contrasted, 1203
Duty on potatoes and flour, 1204
Free wheat, 1205
The shipping industry, 1206
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5029
Caraquet and South Shore railway, 3387
Flour, duty on, 1204
Free wheat, 1205
Goldman, Mr. I., 4510
Insurance, 4390
Intercolonial railway, operation of, 795
Lobsters, 2050
Military service, 2667
Classes, 3354
Exceptions, 3572
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4434
Potatoes, duty on, 1204
Salt, shortage of, 1319
Senate, proposed change in constitution of, 1143
Shipbuilding, 1931
Shipping industry, 1206
Soldiers, returned appointment of to government positions, 1858
Soldiers, votes for, 1394
Taxation—business profits, wealth, income, 1197, 1201, 2671
War-time Elections Bill, 5557

Turriff, Mr. John G. (Assiniboia)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 175
The fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, 175
Extension of term of Parliament, 175
National government, 177
Taxation of war profits, 178
The Nationalist party, 179
Recruiting in Quebec, 185
Enlistment of Canadians, 187
The manufacture of munitions, 188
Cost of the war to Canada, 189
Extension of term of Parliament, 189
Increased production, 190
National service, 191
Recruiting from the Civil Service, 192
The Ross rifle, 193
Aliens, naturalization of, 3814
Anderson, Mr. Daniel, 1265
Army
Officers, surplus of, 3103
Rejected men, 3099
Ashcroft mail service, 668
Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, suspension of, 687
Beans for seed, 1473
Blow, Dr., payments to, 668
Budget, 746
Trade relations with Great Britain, 746
Free wheat, 747, 750
Government expenditure, 747
Taxation of business profits, 750
Revenue of Canada, 755
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5026
Civil Service
Disfranchisement of Civil servants, proposed, 2020
Recruiting from, 192
Daylight saving, 3684
Dominion Lands Act amendment, 3798
Farm labour for western Canada, 3504
Flour, price of, 1070
Food Control, 1999, 3751
Fuel, 1414
Grain
Breweries and distilleries, for, 1180
Commission, 1381
Elevators, 3707
Grading of, 1265
Rust in, 2063
Wheat
Free, 747, 756
Surplus, purchase of, 1126
United States tariff on, 1342
Hobbs, Mr. Hugh, 1228
Loans to farmers, 1968
Lockhart, Mr. Hugh, 1265

Turriff, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*
Mails, alleged misuse of, 893, 1027
Matthews, Mr. L., 1228
Military service, 3719
Exemptions, 3192, 3272
National service, 191
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3751
Palmerston post office, 1127
Parliament, extension of term of, 189
Patent records, 2063
Pensions, revision, 5424
Potatoes for seed, 1473
Proportional representation, 902
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 1658
Railway Department estimates, 3410
Robinson, J. T., 1377
Ross rifle, 193, 489
Saskatchewan coal miners' strike, 3237
Senate, proposed change in constitution of, 1137
Smith, Pte. J. I., 3418
Soldier Settlement Board, 3779
Spotten, Judge, 1127
Taxation
Business profits, 178, 750, 1458
Income, 1463
Tractor engines, duty on, 678
National Transcontinental railway, operation of, 657
War
Prisoners of, parcels to, 3958
Prosecution of the, 1591
War-time Elections Bill, 5711, 5836
Woman suffrage, 1518

Turner, General, appointment of, 268, 279

Turner, Mr. Harvey, position of, 1469

Union Government
See Coalition Government; National Government

United Mines Workmen of Nova Scotia, 802

United States
British subjects in, recruiting of, 2482, 3904
Declaration of war by, 610
Exodus of Canadians to, 3285
Farm labourers from, 665, 1740, 1747, 1193, 4512
French Canadians in, 4914
Head tax on foreigners entering, 892, 1266
Tariff
Changes in, 1264
Wheat, on, 1342
Troops, training of, in Canada, 2482

Universal Radio Syndicate Limited. *See* Ocean Telegraph Act

Urquhart, Mr. Hector, dismissal of, 5367

Vancouver
Dredging in False Creek, 900, 1126
Drill Hall site, 456
Harbour Commissioners, 1575
Harbour improvements, 5304

Venereal diseases, 817, 839, 869

Verville, Mr. Alphonse (Maisonneuve)
Army, soldiers, attendance of, at public meetings, 5231
Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, suspension of, 686
Canadian Northern Railway acquisition of, 5066
Civil Service salaries, 2245
Cold storage, 2089
Food control, 1989, 2089
High cost of living, 710
House of Commons, sessional indemnity of Members, 6047
Labour
Attitude of on Military service, 2795
Requirements, 2798
Military Service, 2795
Moore, Major Rev. A. H., 1265
Tariff revision, 1789
Taxation, income, 4103, 4121, 4130
Technical education, 1237
Thetford Mines labour trouble, 590, 606, 1120
War-time Elections Bill, 5741

Veterans
Army and Navy, Bill, 5421

Victoria bridge toll rates, 672

Victoria, B.C.
Breakwater, 1381

Victoria Sealing Company, 5958

Viviani, M., visit and address to Parliament of, 1318, 1361, 1362

Votes for soldiers. *See* Army, Soldiers

Voters Lists
Provision for under War-time Elections Bill, 5418

Walsh, J. J., payments to, 1675

War
Charities. *See* Charities Bill
Defence of Canada. *See* Militia and Defence
Expenditure, 274, 354, 386, 408, 476, 522, 525, 549, 718, 2936
See also War Appropriation Bill
Loans, 720, 2774
Minister of Overseas Services, proposed, 277, 279
Pay and Records office, 1355
Prisoners of, 666
Arrangements for exchange of, 4194

War—*Con.*
Money orders for, 714
Parcels for, 714, 3958
Prosecution of the, 2320, 3371, 3375
Motion of Mr. Currie, 1576
Submarine situation, 1320
Taxes
See Taxation
Supplies
Boots, 4062
Clothing, 556, 3556
Davidson Commission, 249
Equipment, 40, 262
Hay, 338
Horses, 453, 1093
Machine guns, 590, 2201
Mattresses and covers, 6065
Methods of purchase, 232, 265
Motor trucks, 262, 266, 280, 558
Munitions, 31, 36, 188, 4928, 5517, 5541
Rifles
Importations of, 1125
Ross, 63, 154, 193, 228, 235, 451, 2451, 3487
Correspondence brought down, 7
Factory, 663, 1265
In Committee (statement by Prime Minister), 388-434; resumed, 477-522
Substitute for, 1012, 1594
Small arms ammunition, 156, 2480
Supplies
Patronage in purchase of, 4050, 4053
Pictou contractors for, 303
Trenton contractors for, 303
Transports, 1280
Transportation of, 33, 36
Trophies, exhibition of, 6003
Wagons, 556
See War Purchasing Commission

War Appropriation ($500,000,000) Bill. Res., 354, 386, 408, 476. 1r., 522. 2r., 525. Com., 525, 549. 3r., 585

War Charities Bill. 1r., 5242. 2r., 5424. Com., 5424, 5481, 6062. 3r., 6065
See also p. 378

War Purchasing Commission, 32, 340
See War Supplies

War Revenue Act
Prosecutions under, 2379, 3835
See Inland Revenue Department, Estimates

War-time Elections Bill. 1r., 5415. 2., 5550, 5565. Com., 5637, 5706. 3r., 5805, 5806
Closure applied, 5565, 5706, 5806

War-time Elections Bill—*Con.*
Amendments proposed: Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 5576; lost on div., 5628. Mr. Pugsley, 5629; lost on div., 5635. Mr. Neely, 5650; lost, 5659. Mr. McCraney, 5659; lost on div., 5660. Mr. Lapointe, lost on div., 5770. Mr. Neely, 5824; lost on div., 5879
Senate amdts., 6071

War-time Elections Act
Female enumerators, 6071
Polling Divisions, 6070
Qualifications of voter, 6092
Tribunals, candidates for federal elections serving on, 6070

Washington Conference, Canadian delegates to, 1127

Waterford, N. S., explosion at, 5775

Ways and Means, Committee of, 584, 1436, 1445, 1628, 3760, 5242, 6061
Amendment, Mr. Oliver, 1677
See Budget and Taxation

Wealth, Conscription of
Amendments to address for extension of term of Parliament, Mr. Graham, 3641, 3471, 3480
Statement by Finance Minister, 3187
See Taxation

Webb, Lieutenant, position of, 4563

Webster, Mr. John (Brockville)
Army, 122nd Battalion, 5083
Budget, 953
The dairying industry, 953
Canada's part in the war, 956
Cheese, manufacture and sale of, 2268
Packages, marking of—inspection and sale, 4068

Weichel, Mr. William G. (North Waterloo)
Military Service Bill, 2801
National Transcontinental Railway, ties, 455
War-time Elections Bill, 5832

Weights and measures, inspection of, 2383, 3842

Welland canal
Construction of, 2206, 3402, 4925
Dynamiters of, 4926

West Edmonton forest rangers and homestead inspectors, 1476

Western Canada, farm labour for, 3504

Wheat. *See* Grain

White, Rev. Ward, position of, 3903

White, Sir Thomas (Minister of Finance)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 272
Reply to statements of Sir Sam Hughes, 272
War expenditure, 274
Proposed Minister of Overseas Services, 277, 279
Appointment of General Turner, 279, 280
Purchase of motor trucks and transports, 280
Canada and the war, 282
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 818
Medical service, commission of inquiry into, 542
Soldiers, life insurance of, 3589
Officers, unattached, 563
Beans, duty on, 671
Bran and shorts, duty on, 1870
British Government and Canadian Pacific Railway Financial arrangement Bill, 1369, 2059
Budget, 718, 937
National income and expenditure, 718
War expenditure, 718
Income taxation, 719
Taxation of business profits, 719
War loans, 720
Trade of Canada, 721
Free wheat, 937
Amendment of Mr. Oliver, 949
Business Profits War Tax, 5290
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4011, 4217, 4247-4287, 4467, 4595-4620, 4622-4638, 4835-4873, 4960-5015, 5154
Canadian Pacific railway—Bill to facilitate financial arrangements, etc., 1369, 2059
Civil Service
Enlistments from, 2014, 2253
Promotions, 2010
Salaries, 2008, 2238
Civil Service Act amendment, 2008, 2238
Customs Tariff Act amendment, proposed, 1689
Enlistment, voluntary, 2583
Finance, Department of, estimates, 1790, 1796
Flour, price of, 1053, 1088
Fuel, 1419
Grand Trunk Pacific railway, loan to, 5292
Rails, removal of from, 5296
Hughes, Sir Sam, reply to statement of, 3110
Military Service Bill, 2582
Voluntary enlistment, 2583
Progress of the war, 2584

White, Sir T.—*Con.*
Canada's position, 2584
Our duty to the men at the front, 2585
Conscription of wealth, 2587
Referendum proposals, 2589
Income War Tax Bill
See, under this title, Taxation
Inland Revenue Department estimates, 2381, 3832
Insurance, 1724, 2100
Life insurance of soldiers, 3589
Insurance Act Amendment Bills, 3848, 4138, 5196
Loans to farmers, 1960
Loans, public, 720
$100,000,000 for Public Service, 342, 435, 4957
Amount received and commission paid, 4957
McNab, Colin C., 579
Members, deceased, tributes to, 5
Motor trucks, purchase of, 280
National Gallery of Canada, 5301
Newsprint paper, 757, 1646
Penny Bank Act, 2061
Pensions, 845
Denial of erroneous statement, 5423
Proportional representation, 908
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 1658
Railway, situation in Canada, 4011, 4058
Recruiting, retarding of, 3110
Senate, appointments to, 930
Shipbuilding, 666
Imperial Munitions Board contracts, 1661
Soldier Settlement Board, 3788
Supply, vote for three months, 2946
Tariff revision, 1689
Taxation measures; Senate amendment no precedent, 5476
Taxation
Business profits, 178, 719, 1438, 1635, 2108
Returns by business concerns, 4246
Income, 719, 1441, 1449, 1631, 3760, 3768, 4070, 4102, 4126, 4638
Wealth, 2587
Toronto Globe, correction of editorial in, 2707
Unclaimed bank balances, 1004
United Grain Growers, Limited, 894
War charities, 5434, 5481
War expenditure, 718
War finance, vote of $500,000,000, 542
War supplies for British Government, 4953, 5522
War taxation
See, under this title, Taxation

White, Sir T.—*Con.*
Wealth, conscription of, 3187
See, under this title, Taxation

Whitehead life-saving station, 1469

Williams Head quarantine station, 5312

Wilcox, Mr. Oliver J. (North Essex)
Racing meets, limitation of, 8, 313
Toronto Globe—correction of statement in, 47
Tractor engines, duty on, 676

Wilfrid C., vessel, 4062

William Davies Co., 4151
See Food Investigation

Wilson, Mr. Charles A. (Laval)
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5069
Criminal Code amendment, jurors, 4300, 4326
Military Service Bill, 2925
Contraventions of Act, 3328
Exemptions, 3303
Quebec, recruiting in, 2926
Penitentiaries, salaries of guards, 5803
Potato consignments, 607
Railway Act, The, 3444, 3447
Ships built in Canada, 591
Soldiers, voting of, 4722
Taxation, income, 4073

Wilson, Mr. Gordon C. (Wentworth)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 9
Canada and the war, 9
Tribute to deceased Member, 10
Provision for returned soldiers, 10
National service, 10
Canada's financial stability, 11
Fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, 11
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo railway, 2610

Windsor, N.S.
Tribune building, 1380
Wharf repairs, 1380

Windsor, Ontario, immigration officers, 2357

Windsor Junction, N.S., mail service, 5913

Wireless telegraph. *See* Telegraphs

Woman suffrage
Enfranchisement under War-time Elections Bill, 5416
Pugsley, Mr., motion and amendments by
Notice stands, 309; postponed, 672, 759
Amendment to motion of Mr. Sutherland, 1488
Ruled out by Mr. Speaker, 1490, 1508
Amendment to amendment of Sir Robert Borden, 1522

Woman suffrage—*Con.*
Sutherland, Mr., motion of, 1477, 1627
Borden, Sir Robert, amendment of, 1508
Inquiry by Mr. Pugsley, 4958

Women
Atlantic passports for, 3996, 5783
Munition workers, 4063

Wood, Lieutenant, position of, 4563

Wool, exportation of, 1130

Wright, Mr. William (Muskoka)
Grain, 5208
Wheat, fixing price of, 3694, 3703
Live stock exchanges, 5512
Public Works Department estimates, 5335
Railway Act, The, 3514

Wright, Mr. W.—*Con.*
Railway transportation for Members of Parliament, 3521
Soldier Settlement Board, 3629
Woman suffrage, 1479

Yarmouth harbour improvements, 3870

Year Book, Canada, 2337

Yukon territory, 1736
Administrator, 5122
Commissioner of, 3677
Expenditure, 592
Judges' salaries, 5896
Miners' strike, 3086
Population, 593
Prices and cost of living, 2199, 2237, 2481. 2571, 2954

Zinc. *See* Mines and minerals